

discussed here and rejected the class reductionist approach which views share-tenancy primarily as an agency for 'siphoning the agrarian surplus' on behalf of absentee landlordism, and suggested a more complex model which traces the evolution and persistence of the institution despite the penetration of capitalist relations in agriculture.

In Chapter 6 I discuss the colonial roots of peasant proletarianization, based as it was on the chronic indebtedness of the farmer and demographic pressures on the land (Warriner, 1948). Landlessness in Mandatory Palestine gave rise neither to agrarian capitalism, nor to substantial differentiation in the countryside. The key to this 'stagnation' lies in the preoccupations of the Arab landed classes - who invested their surplus primarily in merchant capital, and in the maintenance of a backward rentier status - and in the pattern of cyclical involvement of the surplus rural population in urban employment (Rosenfeld and Carmi, 1974). But peasant internal migration had the significant consequence of weakening and de-stabilizing traditional rural structures, and the network of authority they had established with the urban landed-merchant élites. This de-stabilization occurred at the economic level, through the supplementation of agricultural income with wage labour; and at the political level, through the creation of direct networks of involvement in the national labour markets which circumvented the local potentates.

Outmigration of peasants, on the other hand, had a more complex effect on rural households. Viewed internally, it seems to have had initially a differentiating function within village stratification, at least because of the substantial investment it involved on the part of the household. But as patterns of migration stabilized, they appear to have had the opposite effect: homogenizing currents within village strata reinforced by the remittances sent home. Again viewed from a comparative perspective