

(483). Nor, we should add, did they become rural proletarians. They were - and to a great extent are - in large part, a suspended peasantry!

We have dwelled at some length on the Carmi/Rosenfeld thesis because it illuminates the historical roots of the present conditions of Palestinian peasant-workers more recently under Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. It also provides some sharp contours which will help us to compare and contrast the way in which the fate of the peasantry in the West Bank today diverges from the formative conditions which typified the peasant-workers of Mandatory Palestine.

But what does this analysis tell us about the impact of peasant-proletarianization on the social fabric of the Palestinian village, and rural society in general? Rosenfeld and Carmi seems to define these changes by an absent condition, namely non-capitalization of agriculture and the absence of meaningful differentiation among the peasant classes, rather than by describing what actually happened or is happening in the Palestinian village. This definition by negation becomes clear when a concrete empirical examination of occupational change in one village was undertaken by one of the two authors elsewhere (Rosenfeld, 1970). The unproductive agriculture system is seen here as giving rise, when exposed to the demands for wage labour from outside, to a "residual peasantry" whose source of livelihood lies outside the village but whose traditional outlook and peasant consciousness is reinforced by continued state intervention on the side of an eroding and disintegrating village leadership (Rosenfeld, 1970:167-168).

This conception of a peasantry whose "transformations" are anchored in the externally-based (urban) labour market, has been criticized for its excessive emphasis on the pull factor of wage labour to the absence