

took place within Arab society corresponding to its progressive subordination to Jewish society.

Sherif Kana'ana in a study of survival strategies of Arabs in Israel (1975), provides a sharp case for such differentiation focusing on the Arab villages in the Galilee. Kana'ana dismisses the centrality of 'hamula' organization for explaining Arab social structure, stressing a conception of the situation "along the lines of socio-economic classes which cut across hamulas" (1975:8). (It should be noted that the author classifies a clan as a sub-category of hamula, rather than the reverse). If Palestinian society was 'beheaded' in the cities Kana'ana -- in contrast to Rosenfeld, above -- holds that it nevertheless retained its rural hierarchies, especially in the Galilee. Here three distinct classes are suggested: landlords, middle peasants and landless or poor peasants (ibid.). The latter stratum is crucial in explaining the character of Arab integration into Israeli society since it constitutes the first link between the two structures through wage labour:

The village has changed from a self-contained subsistence to a cash economy. This has undermined the landowner's previously privileged position. As wages for labour have increased outside, the availability of poor peasants to work cheaply have declined. (Kana'ana, 1975:10)

Since middle peasants have the capacity to sustain themselves for a longer period in a 'subsistence economy', and the landlords were looked at suspiciously by the Israelis (because of their former leadership role in the resistance), poor peasants were "rewarded" by being given permits to work in Jewish towns. Thus "a true lumpen-proletariat had been created."

At night they slept mainly in the ruins of Arab homes bordering the Jewish section, in deserted mosques or in bus depots. Soon these bunking places became labor markets where employers came and announced what they wanted and asked who among this reserve army of the unemployed would accept the lowest wages. This usually