



Agrarian questions in global Palestine: past, present and future

Fadia Panosetti, Taher Labadi & Ahmad Heneiti

To cite this article: Fadia Panosetti, Taher Labadi & Ahmad Heneiti (21 Aug 2025): Agrarian questions in global Palestine: past, present and future, The Journal of Peasant Studies, DOI: [10.1080/03066150.2025.2537878](https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2025.2537878)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2025.2537878>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 21 Aug 2025.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 2169



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Citing articles: 1 [View citing articles](#)

Agrarian questions in global Palestine: past, present and future

Fadia Panosetti ^a, Taher Labadi^b and Ahmad Heneiti^c

^aMargaret Anstee Centre for Global Studies, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ^bDepartment of Contemporary Studies, French Institute of the Near East – IFPO, Jerusalem – Palestine; ^cLaboratoire Architecture Ville Urbanisme Environnement, University of Paris-8, Saint-Denis, France

ABSTRACT

This article introduces and invites contributions to the *Forum on Palestine: Agrarian Questions Unsettled*. While agrarian political economy has received renewed attention in the Arab region, Palestine remains largely absent from debates on old and new agrarian questions. This article brings Palestine into conversation with critical agrarian studies, arguing that agrarian questions offer a valuable framework for examining how interlocking capitalist-colonial power structures shape issues of land, food, ecology, production, and social reproduction in Palestine. It also highlights the insights that Palestine can contribute to broader agrarian debates, challenging prevailing blind spots and enriching understandings of global agrarian struggles and transformations.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 28 March 2025
Accepted 2 July 2025

KEYWORDS

Agrarian questions;
Palestine; Arab region;
colonialism; war; agrarian
struggles; capitalism;
territorial sovereignty

1. Introduction

In December 2024, a delegation of *La Via Campesina* (LVC) traveled to Palestine at the invitation of the *Union of Agricultural Work Committees*, one of the largest Palestinian agricultural development organizations and the first Arab organization to join the LVC (La Via Campesina 2024). The 10-days visit aimed to express solidarity with the Palestinian people amid the genocidal war in Gaza, while also allowing delegates to witness firsthand the escalating settler violence in the West Bank. Since October 7, 2023, Israel has killed at least 65,000 Palestinians (Jamaluddine et al. 2025) and intensified its assault on Palestinian lands, life-sustaining infrastructures and agricultural systems. In Gaza, the systematic destruction of around 70 percent of agricultural lands, 83 percent of all plant life, 3700 greenhouses structures and most water wells and tanks (Forensic Architecture 2024) has contributed to plunging almost two million people into a state of catastrophic hunger. In the West Bank, the delegation observed alarming developments, including the confiscation of over 5000 hectares of agricultural lands, the

CONTACT Fadia Panosetti  fp431@cam.ac.uk, fadia.panosetti@ulb.be  Margaret Anstee Centre for Global Studies, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

destruction of crops and agricultural infrastructures, and heightened settler violence, all of which contribute to the displacement of Palestinians from their lands.

Representing more than 180 farmers' organizations and some 200 million small-scale farmers, peasants and rural workers worldwide, the LVC delegation's visit was a powerful expression of solidarity in a moment when Palestine and the solidarity movement with Palestine are under attack globally. Against this backdrop, Palestinian organizations like UAWC work relentlessly to shed light on Palestine's global land and agrarian justice issues. At the same time, through their work to protect the land and build a food sovereignty movement on the ground, they reaffirm the centrality of Palestine as site of struggle against the uneven dynamics of agrarian change emerging in relation to entangled processes of settler colonialism and neoliberal development under ongoing occupation. Notwithstanding this, agrarian Palestine has received little attention by agrarian scholars over the last decades and crucial issues of land, agriculture and food have been often overlooked or, at best, framed through the lens of human rights abuses and international law violations.

As a matter of fact, this region has long remained marginalized in academic debates on land grabs, urbanization, labor migration, social reproduction, food sovereignty and climate change – rarely appearing in prominent critical agrarian studies journals and remaining a blind spot in debates on old and new agrarian questions. This exclusion builds on the widespread perception of Palestine as an exceptional case, somehow a residue of the past, as if colonialism and war were not normal tools of accumulation for capital in our global present. As a result, the diverse ways in which heterogeneous Palestinian rural communities use their lands, produce their food and make a living while also interacting with colonial regimes of law, settler capital, and global markets is often overlooked. This trend has been further reinforced by the lack of attention in Middle East and Palestinian studies to rural issues and agrarian questions, especially since the 1990s.

This article aims to address this gap and to reflect on how agrarian questions can provide a valuable framework for examining the ways in which interwoven structures of capitalist and colonial power shape land, food, ecology, production, and social reproduction, as well as agrarian struggles and global solidarity in and beyond Palestine. It positions Palestine as a critical site for exploring and conceptualizing broader agrarian studies issues, including land, food production, labor, agricultural development, climate change and collective liberation. Bringing Palestine in conversation with critical agrarian studies and agrarian political economy, and vice versa, it introduces a new JPS forum that aims to foster discussion around a simple question: What can old and new agrarian questions tell us about Palestine and what can Palestine tell us about these questions?

This conversation began in the spring of 2024 with an online seminar series, entitled '*Palestinian agricultural development between colonialism, globalisation, and liberation*', and continued into 2025 with a second cycle of seminars. These seminars have been a space of discussion and exchange among scholars, activists and practitioners on how agrarian transformations have emerged in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and across Palestine in relation to the co-articulation between settler colonialism and global capitalism, as well as to the politics of heterogeneous Palestinian agrarian classes that grapple with and oppose these forces in their quest for land and life. This article is an invitation to explore these critical topics further and to connect current issues in Palestine with

broader themes in agrarian political economy by contributing to the *JPS Forum on Palestine: Agrarian Questions Unsettled*.

The remainder of this article is as follows: the first section reviews contemporary debates on the Agrarian Question (hereafter AQ), highlighting key gaps in current research, particularly regarding the Arab region and Palestine. The second section traces the evolution of Palestinian agrarian studies, examining how scholarship has engaged with issues of dispossession, economic transformation, and resistance under changing political-economic circumstances. Finally, the third section brings critical agrarian studies in dialog with Palestinian studies, positioning Palestinian agrarian struggles within broader global debates on land, labor, and food sovereignty while exploring how Palestine can inform current AQ debates.

2. Land and agrarian questions: current debates and absences

In the twenty-first century, the multiplication and intensification of global land and agrarian struggles has brought renewed scholarly attention to the Agrarian Question (AQ), reinvigorating long-standing debates on agrarian capitalism, colonialism, and the politics of heterogeneous agrarian classes over land, labor, and the means of social reproduction in the countryside. In this current historical conjecture, debates on the AQ are more alive than ever, offering powerful insights into rapidly shifting rural worlds and agrarian landscapes. After reviewing some of these debates in the first part of this section, we will highlight some of the silences and omissions that characterize the current research agenda on the AQ, with the aim of starting a new thread of conversation that could fill this gap.

2.1. The ‘classical’ agrarian question and its afterlives

Rooted in the foundational work of Marx and Engels, the AQ emerged in the nineteenth century as a framework to study the development of capitalism in agrarian societies and the consequent fate of the peasantry. In its ‘classical’ version, the AQ focused on how capitalism seized control of agriculture and the role of agriculture in ushering in the accumulation process necessary for national industrialization, as well as the implications of this for class differentiation and agrarian struggles. These issues have invigorated over a century of debate, for which some detailed critical surveys already exist (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010). What interests us is to explore how today’s context for and objects of land and agrarian struggles have redefined the contour of the AQ, challenging traditional formulations, as well as the assumption that the AQ has been resolved (Bernstein 2006). As Jacobs (2018, 888) has rightly pointed out, the AQ cannot be resolved on purely theoretical grounds as it is ‘not only an object in theory but also an object of empirical investigation’.

The problem with treating the AQ as a theoretical abstraction rather than a set of social, economic, political, and environmental processes that define the conditions of life, and death, on the land for millions of people across the world is that it invisibilizes the heterogeneity of agrarian political struggles emerging in today’s global context, marked by deeply interconnected and mutually reinforcing food, agrarian and climate crises. These crises have become particularly acute over the last decades of neoliberal economic restructuring, further exacerbated by wars and military conflicts. For instance, a recent

study conducted on the greenhouse gas emissions of the Gaza war revealed that, in just the first 120 days, its emissions matched the total annual emissions of 26 individual countries (Neimark et al. 2024).

It is within this context of profound crisis and uncertainty that a new grammar of social conflict and agrarian struggles has emerged, shedding light on the on-going relevance of the AQ in the twenty-first century while bringing into view new aspects of it.

First and foremost, within current agrarian struggles – understood here as the diverse behaviors and practices through which working people challenge and oppose colonial-capitalist social relations – land, and the control of it, has emerged as a critical issue. Land has historically been fraught with conflicts and struggles at a global level (Guldi 2022; Sikor and Lund 2010). However, its political and economic significance seems to have generally increased over recent decades, spurring renewed attention to the land question – who owns it, how it is used, and what politics arise from it (Borras et al. 2011). These debates have gained new vitality after the 2007–2008 financial, food and energy crisis that brought millions of hectares under the control of corporations and financial capital, with states often playing a central role in these processes by promoting the formalization and commodification of land, which, once detached from social bond, can be easily traded on the market (Wolford et al. 2024). Described as development opportunities by its proponents, and as ‘land grabs’ by its opponents, the acquisition of large tracts of land for productive, speculative or conservationist purposes has revitalized debates on land politics and the role that dispossession continues to play in both primitive and advanced forms of (global) capital accumulation (Borras and Franco 2024; Harvey 2003, 2009).

Scholars have examined drivers of the global land rush and its varied consequences for rural populations – highlighting how its impacts vary along lines of class, gender, ethnicity, caste, and generation (Fairbairn et al. 2014; Levien, Watts, and Yan 2018). While amplifying preexisting social and economic inequalities, the expansion of agribusiness plantations, conservation areas and energy parks also contributes to the creation of new patterns of social differentiation, generating cycles of further dispossession and loss (Shattuck et al. 2023). As a result, land is increasingly concentrated in a few hands, whether through violence or other means. Yet, as rural people are dispossessed of their land, their labor is rendered increasingly redundant to capital (Li 2011). While this echoes the historical experience of Indigenous communities for whom dispossession didn’t necessarily generate exploitation but rather abandonment, expulsion or elimination (Coulthard 2014), this reality is now becoming widespread, raising new debates on the relationship between dispossession and exploitation (Gago and Mezzadra 2017). Rather than separate forces with distinct outcomes, these processes appear increasingly interwoven, giving rise to new forms of exclusion, coercion and control.

A central focus of these debates remains the AQ of labor, that is how do ‘working people’ (Shivji 2017) make a living and reproduce the conditions of their existence under contemporary capitalism. According to Bernstein (2009, 73; 2025), it is rather important to capture the different experiences of emerging ‘classes of labour’ who pursue their livelihoods across ‘different sites of the social division of labor: urban and rural, agricultural, and non-agricultural, as well as wage employment and self-employment’. Indeed, rural households’ livelihood portfolios have hybridized (Hecht 2014), reflecting a reconfigured gender division of labor within and outside of the house, as well as new patterns of

migratory, informal and precarious labor across both rural and urban spaces. Rural out-migration to global cities gives rise to more complex and hybrid forms of politics, such as land occupations for urban agriculture and food production (Jacobs 2024). This new centrality of land in urban struggles not only blurs the traditional urban-rural dichotomy that characterized the ‘classical’ AQ but also complicates its productivist bias (Mezzadri et al. 2024).

A main contribution of agrarian, feminist, and indigenous movements in recent decades has been to reveal the multiple forms of labor – extending beyond waged work – on which capitalism relies for endless accumulation. These include the biological and intergenerational reproduction of labor that, alongside the unpaid work of nature – appropriated as a source of productive inputs and waste discharge – form the foundations of capital’s endless accumulation (Cousins 2022; Moore 2015). To this, a third form of unpaid labor must be added: the extraction of wealth and resources from the colonies, a historical process that continues to structure global capitalism. Taken together, the ‘unpaid work of women, nature and the colonies’ represent capitalism’s background conditions of possibility, as well as the terrain of intense struggles (Fraser 2017; Mies 1986). Land remains central to these struggles which, in turn, highlight that land is neither a mere commodity nor an object like any other: it is the basis of life. Thus, struggles for land can be – indeed, often are – struggles for sustaining life and, more broadly, to defend alternative ways of inhabiting and relating to the world, while asserting the very possibility of collective futures.

At the same time, such struggles have brought into view how class articulates with other relations of social difference that have historically been produced and exacerbated by interlocking structures of oppression and domination operating across multiple scales, from the local to the global (Levien, Watts, and Yan 2018). The creation and intensification of these inequalities across different geographies didn’t in fact happen all at once or in uniform ways but were rather shaped by the operations of settler colonialism¹ and imperialism on a world-scale and the forms of resistance they encountered on the ground. As such, questions of gender, race, nature, colonialism, and imperialism that were largely sidelined in debates of the classical AQ are now inseparable from iterations of the AQ that now appear as a constellation of interconnected questions.

Yet, as the AQ takes new forms and meanings, its modes of investigation continue to be largely shaped by ‘capital-centric epistemology’ (McMichael 1997) characteristic of the classical AQ. While this is by no means hegemonic and is increasingly being challenged by new generations of critical agrarian scholars, it is important to shed light on the blind spots that such perspective has created, on the one hand, on the diversity of political, territorial, and violent processes driving change in agrarian relations and politics in different regions, and on the other hand, on some regions that, due to on-going wars, military occupation, territorial invasions, and violent disposessions, continue to be considered as ‘exceptional’. This is especially evident in the case of Palestine, and the broader Arab region (Ajl 2021), where on-going settler colonialism, wars and imperial policies have profoundly influenced dynamics of agrarian change, development trajectories, and the

¹That is a structure of domination in which the colonizers seek not only to control but to replace the Indigenous population, often through land dispossession, economic subjugation, and the dismantling of native social structures (Wolfe 2012).

destiny of rural and territorial communities. In turn, these policies have contributed to marginalization of this region as a critical site of agrarian inquiry. We will now turn to examine the silence surrounding the region in more detail.

2.2. Regional silences in the AQs debate

Despite hosting a rural population of 120 million – 84 million of whom depend primarily on small-scale agriculture – the Arab region has long remained absent from debates on AQs and, more broadly, from Western academic journals concerned by issues of agrarian change and rural development (Riachi and Martiniello 2023). This exclusion is particularly paradoxical given the region's rich agrarian histories and its contemporary relevance for understanding broader patterns and dynamics of agrarian change. The growing number of recent contributions in critical agrarian studies focusing on the Arab region attests to the increasing urgency of addressing this gap. These include Basha (2022) on the agrarian question in Yemen; Henderson (2021) on agro-capitalism in the Gulf; Perosino (2023) on agrarian change and social differentiation in Jordan; Martiniello and Kassem (2023) on food regimes in Lebanon; and Sajadian (2024) on the gendered economy of debt among Syrian farmworkers.

Together, these contributions help make the dynamics of agrarian life in the Arab region visible by recovering the voices and experiences of farmers, traders, forced migrants, refugees, exiles, and urbanites. In so doing, they uncover a rich archive of agrarian histories – of land accumulation and rural revolts, agrarian reforms and war, agricultural self-sufficiency and food dependency, as well as enduring land and agrarian struggles. Their importance lies in moving beyond Western narratives that portray the region as exceptional, and beyond nationalist or class-based accounts that reduce the AQ in these regions to mere binaries.

Yet this archive remains incomplete without Palestine. While avoiding any forms of exceptionalism, it remains crucial to recognize the particular intensity of land and agrarian struggles in Palestine, shaped by the nature of Zionist settler colonialism – a project that simultaneously dispossesses, displaces, eliminates, and at times exploits Palestinians to sustain its own reproduction. These dynamics have produced highly uneven patterns of agrarian transformation, marked by forced depeasantization, spatial fragmentation, militarized land control, and recurrent cycles of destruction and reconstruction. Despite this, Palestinian agrarian trajectories remain marginal in critical agrarian studies. This is particularly regrettable given the richness of Palestinian agrarian history: from peasant revolts in the 1930s to popular uprisings of the 1980s and 2000s, and the growing movement for food sovereignty and ecological justice in the 2010s.

These struggles are just a glimpse into the complex dynamics of Palestinian agrarian change – encompassing shifting property relations, land use regimes, labor dynamics and rural-urban configurations, as well as their entanglements with regional and global political-economic dynamics. In fact, Palestine occupies a central place in the political economy of the Arab region and exemplifies broader patterns of resource extraction, land dispossession, and economic dependency (Hanieh 2013; Kadri 2016). Hence, sidelining Palestine in AQs debates not only distorts our understanding of regional patterns of agrarian change but also contributes to depoliticizing the Palestinian question, reducing it to a humanitarian or security issue rather than recognizing it as a site of active struggle

against settler-colonialism and capitalist exploitation, and thus erasing local societies as political subjects (Dajani and Henderson 2024).

Misrepresentations of Palestinians and Palestine have historically served to justify imperial wars, military invasions, and humanitarian interventions. As Said (1979, 8) observed long ago, 'Palestine has always played a special role in the imagination and in the political will of the West, which is whereby common agreement modern Zionism also originated'. From the 1880s onward, the Zionist movement reproduced Orientalist narratives that framed Palestine as a land to be settled, systematically erasing its indigenous population from historical and political accounts. This discursive erasure was not merely symbolic; it functioned as a strategic tool of colonial violence, justifying both past and ongoing eliminationist policies. Zionist settler-colonialism has always relied on the support of Western powers – from British backing in the establishment of Israel in 1948 to the pivotal role played by the United States since the 1970s. In turn, Israel has served as a strategic asset for Western powers, playing a central role in what Ajl (2024) describes as efforts to 'balkanize, de-develop, intimidate, and occupy the Arab region,' while advancing economic normalization and regional integration on Western terms.

This dynamic became particularly evident with the signing of the Abraham Accords between Israel and the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, and Morocco in 2020. While presented as ushering in a new era of regional peace, these accords primarily sought to realign the Arab region with Western geostrategic interests amid intensifying global rivalries. These accords positioned Israel as a central pillar in this strategy, attempting to sidestep the Palestinian question entirely (Dana 2024). However, rather than stabilizing the region, this realignment has fueled new crises – the most severe in decades.

In mainstream Western academic and political discourses, the structural factors underlying these crises are frequently ignored. Instead, decontextualized narratives reduce complex political, economic, and environmental dynamics to isolated events. This has been particularly evident in representations of October 7, which has been widely framed as an unprecedented rupture occurring in a historical vacuum, rather than part of a longer historical trajectory. This neglect extends to Western debates on AQs, where Palestine remains largely absent, despite the deep engagement of Palestinian scholars with agrarian and food sovereignty issues, both in theory and in practice (Ajl 2021). Yet, this omission risks reinforcing a broader intellectual and political trend that tends to erase Palestine or at best exceptionalize it. By treating it as a unique case, framed solely as the site of a conflict between two national projects, the lived reality of Palestinians is often obscured, despite its resonance with that of other colonized, exploited and marginalized communities around the world, past and present. This marginalization also extends to Palestinian scholars and intellectuals, whose work is frequently dismissed as overly particularistic, seen as relevant only to Palestinian studies rather than contributing to broader theoretical and comparative discussions. This epistemic exclusion, reinforced by structural barriers such as restrictions on mobility, limited access to the field, and censorship, isolates Palestine within a separate intellectual domain.

Yet, Palestine has long been an important site of knowledge production on agrarian issues. In the next section, we turn to a closer examination of agrarian debates within Palestinian studies, highlighting how Palestinian scholars have engaged with these questions and their implications for broader discussions on AQ.

3. Palestine and agrarian studies

Over the past century, Palestine has endured a process of spatial, demographic, and political fragmentation, alongside discursive erasure, as a result of protracted and on-going settler-colonial invasion. As Said (1993) argued, colonization operates both materially and discursively, turning ‘imagined geographies’ constructed by groups with territorial ambitions into physical control over land. In Palestine, this process has involved the displacement, dispossession, and disenfranchisement of Arab Palestinian land users and owners, facilitated by Orientalist and colonial narratives that denied their very existence and framed Palestinian agriculture as backward and in need of improvement. Such ideology of improvement positions local agrarian knowledge and practices as inferior and justifies appropriation through the argument of enhancing the value of the land and its people (Bhandar 2018; Kirk 2024). Studying Palestinian agriculture is therefore essential to grasping the material and ideological forces reshaping rural spaces and agrarian relations in Palestine. This section traces the evolution of agrarian studies on Palestine, examining how scholarship has addressed dispossession, economic transformation, and resistance within shifting political-economic contexts.

3.1. Studies on dispossession and transformations in agrarian Palestine

In response to Orientalist and colonial narratives, Palestinian studies emerged in the second half of the twentieth century, with early research focusing on agriculture and rural life (Doumani 1992). A first body of scholarship examined the socio-economic and political transformations that reshaped Palestinian rural spaces and society from the nineteenth century onward, first under European influence during the late Ottoman period and later under the British Mandate (1920-1947). Scholars explored dynamics of agrarian transformation through studies of rural life and the peasantry, focusing on communal organization (*hamula*), collective land tenure (*masha'a*), and subsistence economies (Doumani 1995; Scholch 1986), as well as on how capitalist relations had already expanded in the countryside before the Nakba. Contrary to the narrative that Zionist settlement alone brought ‘modernization’ to Palestine, research based on Ottoman archives demonstrated that, in the nineteenth century, Palestine was already well integrated regional and global trade networks (Doumani 1995; Owen 1981) and complex economic and land tenure systems existed (Issawi 1982; Mundy and Smith 2007). Other works have highlighted the role of rural communities in resistance movements and the increasing politicization of peasants in response to British colonial rule and Zionist colonization (Kanafani 1972; Sayigh 1979; Yazbak 2000). Much attention has been paid to colonial land tenure reforms that facilitated Zionist land acquisition, restructured agricultural production, and imposed legal and administrative frameworks that facilitated colonial extraction (El-Eini 2006; Granott 1956; Norris 1993; Zu'bi 1984).

Scholars have also examined land and water conflicts linked to early Zionist colonization in Palestine. Much attention has been paid to how the Ottoman Land Code of 1858, and its subsequent amendments, restructured property relations in rural Palestine, concentrating land in the hands of large Arab landowners and weakening the tenure security of small-scale farmers (Mundy and Smith 2007; Tamari 1999). Zionist settlers exploited these circumstances to acquire vast tracts of land during the British Mandate and later,

especially after 1948 and 1967, used these legal frameworks, in conjunction with British Mandate policies, to continue dispossessing Palestinians of their lands. At the same time, the continuity of dispossession mechanisms across Ottoman, British, and Israeli rule has been highlighted in the literature (Abu Bakr 2006; Abu Hussein and Mc Kay 2003; Fischbach 2003; Hadawi 1957; Hizmawi 1996).

This body of work on pre-Nakba agrarian Palestine is complemented by two other strands of scholarship on agrarian issues in Palestine (Kirk and Kohlbry 2024). The first focuses on the impacts of the *Nakba* on Palestinian land, livelihoods and rural life within the borders of the newly established state of Israel, and the fate of the around 150,000 Arab Palestinians who remained there after 1948 (Makhoul 1982; Rosenfeld 1978; Zureik 1976). The second strand, while influenced by earlier debates on dispossession and proletarianization of Palestinians in post-Nakba Israel (Abu Kushk 1984; Makhoul 1984; Nasr Allah 1984), is primarily concerned with the consequences of the 1967 Israeli occupation on agrarian life and landscapes in the West Bank and Gaza. We will explore this second body of work in the next section.

3.2. Agriculture as a Palestinian national concern in the 1970s–1980s

While a few studies on Palestinian agriculture were published in the 1970s by the *Palestinian Research Center*² (Abu Arjeely 1971, 1991; Al-Amiri 1974), interest in this subject grew in the 1980s. The journal *Šāmid al-Iqtisādī*³, for example, was established in 1979. Their publications highlighted the impact of Israeli land and water confiscation policies in the West Bank and Gaza on Palestinian agrarian life. These policies directly affected access to resources, and consequently production, while also hindering adaptation and innovation in the agricultural sector. Restrictions on land and water access became central tools of Israeli control. Nearly 50% of West Bank land was confiscated, while grazing areas were increasingly off-limits to Palestinian herders. Agricultural water extraction and usage were also restricted, reducing productivity (*Šāmid al-Iqtisādī*, issues 46, 48, 61, 76, and 84; *Shu'un Falastinya*, issue 127).

The occupation also reshaped trade networks. Palestinian products faced bureaucratic and logistical obstacles, especially for export, while local markets were flooded with Israeli goods, leading to price drops amid rising production costs. This pressure forced many farmers to seek alternative employment, particularly in Israel (Abu al-Nasr 1985; Abu Subayh 1991; Awartani 1986). In the absence of a structured institutional framework, land fragmentation and the lack of cooperative structures limited the capacity of the agricultural sector to adapt and develop. Finally, the rise of a consumer culture gradually diverted investments away from agriculture, contributing to its gradual decline (Muṣṭafā 1986).

In 1980, the *Center for Rural Studies* at An-Najah University initiated applied research on Palestinian agriculture, focusing on production and marketing (Abu Bakr 1990; Abu Salih and Abd al-Raziq 1991; Abu Umar 1991; Al-Aqtam 1991; Awartani and Juda 1991; Sawalha

²The Palestinian Research Center (PRC) is one of the organizations of the PLO, established in 1965 in Beirut. The PRC is now based in Ramallah – Occupied Palestinian Territory – from where it continues to operate.

³The *Šāmid al-Iqtisādī* journal is published by the Palestinian Martyrs Workers Society (Samed Association), which was established in 1979 in Beirut as the first production association for the Palestinian revolution. It also represented the first Palestinian economic initiative, serving as the nucleus for the Palestinian public sector.

1983, 1984, 1986). This shift reflected the growing role of agriculture as a tool of resistance and steadfastness – *sumud* in Arabic – under occupation. The study of agricultural cooperatives became central: these structures, acting as intermediaries between institutions and farmers, facilitated access to financial and technical support, notably through the *Jordanian-Palestinian Joint Committee*⁴ (Obayyidat 1982; Jarrar 1986). Their expansion was part of a broader strategy of self-sufficiency and economic independence in the face of occupation. After the forced exile of the PLO from Amman (1970) and later Beirut (1982), the Palestinian leadership redirected its efforts toward the occupied territories, implementing *sumud* programs to challenge the occupation, reduce economic dependency on Israel and promote self-reliance (Nakhleh 2004; Panosetti and Roudart 2024).

Raja Khalidi (2014) refers to this as a form of ‘Palestinian economic nationalism’, integrating development into the national struggle. Academic production increasingly centered on the West Bank and Gaza, seen as the foundation of a future Palestinian state. By the late 1980s, studies influenced by *Dependency theory* promoted economic self-sufficiency as a prerequisite for political autonomy (Dakkak 1988; Mansour 1983; Sayigh 1986). Some research also analyzed the socio-economic transformations of Palestinians from 1948, highlighting how land confiscation and forced integration into the Israeli economy reshaped production and property relations (Muṣṭafā 1986; Al Ad-Dajani 1980; Khitab 1985).

For a long time, studies on agrarian Palestine conflated rurality with agriculture, treating the rural world as a homogeneous unit. This approach obscured internal disparities, particularly class differences between small and large farmers, as well as gender dynamics and the role of child labor. Rural communities were often portrayed as a unified social force resisting the Israeli colonial project in Palestine. Centered on resisting the occupation, this framework prioritized land and resource preservation in the face of Israeli colonial strategies, while relegating internal inequalities to the ‘post-liberation’ period. This orientation reflected the PLO’s political stance, which emphasized first and foremost national unity while postponing broader debates on internal socio-economic dynamics.

A significant shift in the academic debate occurred in the mid-1980s, when two doctoral dissertations analyzing the socio-economic transformations of the agricultural sector were published. Salim Tamari (1983) examined the impact of spatial diversity on these dynamics, showing how the introduction of new technologies influenced debt, women’s and children’s labor, and family structures, particularly in the Jordan Valley and the central highlands of the West Bank. Alex Pollock (1987), on the other hand, explored the intersection of colonization and capitalism in Jordan Valley agriculture, drawing on surveys conducted by the Arab Thought Forum to analyze the economic structures imposed by Israeli occupation.

At the same time, several books published in the West Bank deepened the analysis of the agricultural sector through the lens of political economy. Samara (1990) criticized the *Arab Thought Forum’s*⁵ orientations and proposed a model of ‘development by popular

⁴The Jordanian-Palestinian Committee for Supporting the Steadfastness (Sumud) of the Palestinian People in the Occupied Territories was established in 1979 following the Ninth Arab Summit in Baghdad in 1978. The committee is responsible for managing an annual financial budget of \$150 million, which was approved during that Summit to support Palestinians in the occupied territories over a period of 10 years.

⁵The Arab Thought Forum was established by Palestinian intellectuals in 1977 in Jerusalem. It focused mainly on the issues of national development under occupation.

protection,' emphasizing agriculture as a lever for endogenous and emancipatory development. His approach sought to ensure food self-sufficiency while reducing dependence on the colonial economy. Other studies, such as those by Al-Maliki and Shalabi (1993), highlighted the 'proletarianization' of agricultural labor after 1967. Their research based on three villages demonstrated how agriculture was no longer the primary source of livelihoods for many households due to the increasing integration of Palestinian workers into other sectors of the Israeli economy.

3.3. The absence of research on agriculture and agrarian issues in the post-Oslo years

After the Oslo Accords were signed in the mid-1990s, research on Palestinian agriculture declined significantly. Scholars primarily shifted their focus to Palestinian governance and national state building in the wake of the peace process (Labadi 2023). At the same time, a 'cultural turn' in Palestinian studies redirected attention toward identities, culture, and the arts, marginalizing agrarian political economy analysis. For instance, between 1995 and 2009, no studies on rural issues and agriculture were published in the *Journal of Palestine Studies*, signaling a growing disinterest in these topics. Yet, the creation of the Palestinian Authority (PA) in 1994 did not alleviate the structural constraints affecting the agricultural sector. On the contrary, the Israeli occupation continued to restrict access to land and water, control imports and exports, and limit the movement of agricultural products, severely undermining Palestinian production and marketing capacities.

In this context, the PA, alongside the donor community, prioritized the service and trade sectors at the expense of agriculture. Its agricultural policy, oriented toward international competitiveness, favored agribusinesses and the production of high-value crops for export, weakening the position of small-scale farmers who faced both increasing competition and the restrictions imposed by the occupation. This shift was also reflected in academic research. The latter adopted a sectoral approach, focusing on agriculture's contribution to GDP and foreign trade rather than on the living conditions of farmers. Influenced by neoclassical macroeconomics, these studies often overlooked dynamics of dispossession, analyzing Palestinian agriculture through the lens of market dysfunctions rather than as a sector constrained by occupation (Cobham and Kanafani 2004; Diwan and Shaban 1999).

Between 2000 and 2010, agriculture remained marginal in research, with only few studies published by the Palestinian Economic Policy Research Institute (MAS) (Abu Qa'ud 2005; Abu Umar 1991; Al-Sarwaji 2009). Yet, as the promised economic gains of the Oslo Accords failed to materialize, research gradually shifted its focus toward the structural challenges of development under occupation. However, neoclassical macroeconomics remained dominant, continuing to frame agriculture in terms of market distortions rather than recognizing it as a strategic sector or a site of anti-colonial struggle. Within this framework, Palestinian agriculture was perceived as a neutral economic activity governed by technical and institutional factors. The sector's difficulties were attributed to administrative failures, with little consideration of colonial dynamics or the role of the PA's neoliberal policies in the growing integration of Palestinian agriculture into Israel's economy.

The 2007–2008 global crisis reignited the interest of international organizations (UN, World Bank) in Palestinian agriculture, leading to a proliferation of reports and studies.

However, these works often perpetuated a neoliberal approach, prioritizing greater integration into the global market over support for local autonomy (Abu-Sada 2008). The 'Palestinian Reform and Development Plan 2008-2010' of Salam Fayyad's West Bank government reflects this shift toward agricultural liberalism. It promotes the development of an agri-food industry based on high value-added export crops, along with the creation of post-harvest (storage, quality control, processing, etc.) and other commercial infrastructures. This plan also led to the establishment of agro-industrial business parks designed to attract national, Israeli and international capital.

3.4. A renewed interest in agrarian issues after 2010

During the 2010s, critiques of Oslo's political economy intensified, denouncing the neoliberal strategies adopted by the Palestinian Authority (PA) under occupation (Labadi 2023). The economic policies of Salam Fayyad, including those related to agriculture, were analyzed through the lens of colonial power relations, highlighting a depoliticization that obscured the asymmetries imposed by the occupation (Khalidi and Samour 2011). These studies demonstrated that the development and peace policies supported by the international community and the PA had weakened Palestinian society while reinforcing the Israeli colonial regime (Nakhleh 2011; Omar and Mandy 2014). Some works placed Palestine in a global perspective by analyzing the impact of global capitalism and comparing Israeli settler colonialism to other historical experiences (Haddad 2016; Hanieh 2013). They also shed light on the effects of the PA's neoliberal policies on agriculture, particularly in the Jordan Valley, where the export-oriented approach increased dependence on the Israeli market (Hilal 2013; Dana 2013, Sharida 2013).

At the same time, comparative studies on settler colonialism deepened the analysis of dispossession dynamics and the formation of a landless peasantry – first exploited in the Jewish economy before 1948, then in the Israeli economy after the Nakba. By comparing Palestine to other colonial contexts (North America, South Africa, Australia, Algeria), these studies challenge the exceptionalism often attributed to Israel and Palestine (Salamanca et al. 2012; Veracini 2013).

Since the mid-2010s, economic resistance and food sovereignty have sparked renewed interest. New research highlights the strategic role of agriculture in land struggles and as a tool for resisting Israeli settler colonialism (Khalidi 2016; Latte 2019; Tartir 2016). Opposing neoliberal approaches, these studies advocate for alternative models, particularly agricultural cooperatives, drawing inspiration from the First Intifada as an example of building a resistance economy (Tabar 2015). In response to Israel's land and resource dispossession, these works call for an agriculture focused on self-sufficiency to strengthen land and food sovereignty and economic autonomy. They emphasize the need to reorient agricultural policies toward greater community resilience and criticize the growing dependence on export circuits integrated into the Israeli economy (Abdelnour, Tartir, and Zurayk 2012; El Zein 2017; Hanieh 2016; Zurayk et al. 2012).

Simultaneously, an emerging body of critical literature is revitalizing the field of Palestinian agrarian studies. Centering land-based social relations, these studies explore changing regimes of land use and property (Panosetti and Roudart 2022), labor and class (Ross 2019), and livelihoods and social reproduction (Panosetti and Roudart 2024; Salamanca 2024), as well as ecology (Amira 2021), and the various processes shaping the Palestinian landscape,

from urbanization to land reclamation and capital-intensive agriculture (Kohlby 2022; Trotter, Leblond, and Garb 2019). A new body of critical research is also emerging from within Israel, focusing on the devastation of Palestinian Bedouin economies in the Naqab region and how these communities have drawn on an international discourse of Indigenous rights recognition to advance their struggle for land (Nasasra 2012; Nasasra et al. 2014; Kedar, Amara, and Yiftachel 2018; Latour 2019). Kaminer's recent book examines the replacement of Palestinian agricultural workers in Israel with migrant Thai labor (Kaminer 2024), while Gutkowski (2024) explores what remains of Palestinian agriculture in Israel today. This renewed interest in agrarian issues across the varied geographies of historical Palestine not only reaffirms the centrality of land and agrarian issues to the Palestinian struggle, it also calls for a de-exceptionalization of Palestine by examining how Palestinian agrarian struggles exceed colonial-imposed boundaries and are deeply entangled in transnational dynamics, offering critical insights into global agrarian processes.

4. Critical agrarian studies and global Palestine

Building on the renewed interest in agrarian issues and political economy within Palestinian studies, this section aims to shed light on how a broader engagement with critical agrarian studies can bring renewed attention to agrarian spaces, activities and questions within both Palestine and the field of Palestinian studies. Rather than viewing it as solely determined by settler colonial structures of power – and resistance against them – a global Palestine approach illuminates the multiple and often contradictory processes and forces shaping agrarian relations. Then it focuses on what Palestine could bring to global agrarian debates and current discussions on AQs.

4.1. Critical agrarian studies and Palestine

Agrarian studies have long been attuned to 'working from and for the margins' (Edelman and Wolford 2017, 967), recognizing how rural and indigenous subjects have been theoretically and historically excluded from the making of their own histories. Centering the margins is, in this sense, a matter of epistemological justice. At the same time, the margins are often not peripheral to the working of colonial capitalism; rather, they are often located right in the middle of the belly of the beast.

Recentring the margins – foregrounding 'the people, processes and powers at play in the rural and peri-urban spaces' (Akram-Lodhi et al. 2021) – is particularly urgent for understanding both the drivers and consequences of the current situation in Palestine, their intersection with global political-economic transformations, and the possible alternative futures emerging from current crises. As Martiniello has recently observed in a panel on Food Crisis and Agrarian Questions in the MENA region, while it is probably the most difficult time to attempt to do so, 'there has never been a more important time to discuss agrarian transformation' in the region. Agrarian studies offers important tools for undertaking this endeavor.

First, it brings renewed attention to agrarian life, land, livelihoods and their processes of change, both historical and contemporary, in Palestine. This serves as a necessary corrective to, on the one hand, the abandonment of class analysis and the decline of attention to issues of labor, property, trees and seeds in the wake of the 'cultural turn' in

Palestinian studies and more broadly the social sciences over the last decades. And on the other hand, it counters the largely widespread ‘peasant essentialism’ that prevails in accounts of the Palestinian anti-colonial struggles. Too often, Palestinians are depicted as a homogeneous social group, either succumbing to or fiercely resisting state and market forces. Critical agrarian studies complicates these reductive narratives by highlighting the diversity of agrarian struggles over land, livelihoods and territory and how agrarian politics interact with processes of production, accumulation and differentiation driven by colonial-capitalist structures of accumulation in a context of denied statehood and lack of territorial sovereignty.

This raises a range of critical questions on agrarian life in Palestine and how it differs across colonially imposed geographies – namely the West Bank, Jerusalem, Gaza, and 1948 Palestine: what types of agricultural production systems predominate – family farming, small-holder models, collective forms, or agro-industrial operations – and to which markets are these agricultures connected: local markets, subcontracted markets serving the Israeli economy, or constrained export markets? How can we understand the uncertain future of small-scale farmers in the face of water scarcity, territorial fragmentation, and neoliberal policies that prioritize agribusiness expansion while favoring structural dependence on imports? To what extent are we witnessing processes of land financialization, rural urbanization, crop specialization, or landholding concentration? And what forms of labor reallocation away from agricultural work – or conversely, what patterns of forced return to farming amid shrinking employment opportunities in the Israeli economy – are emerging? These questions call for situated, differentiated, and empirically grounded analysis – something critical agrarian studies is particularly well equipped to support and reinvigorate.

Second, agrarian studies offers an historical materialist approach that situates the current moment within longer-term trajectories of agrarian change and struggle over the means of production and reproduction, while also shedding light on the materiality of these transformations. In so doing, it challenges linear, structuralist and unidirectional interpretations of agrarian changes, as well as the rhetoric of novelty and exceptionality surrounding the latest assault on Palestinian lands and lives. Meanwhile, as Edelman and Wolford (2017) argue, ‘we cannot simply look to agrarian studies to better understand our past, or even just the present’ – but also to get an idea of the future. Examining the diverse imaginaries and aspirations that emerge from the ashes of the present, including practices of return and reconstruction that connect the rural and the urban in new ways, is crucial to understand the making of agrarian futures on the ruins of colonial-capitalism.

Third, agrarian studies can integrate Palestine into a global framework that helps move ‘beyond national frames’ (Salih and Richter-Devroe 2018), shedding light on the transnational forces shaping Palestine and being shaped by it. In this sense, the concept of *Global Palestine* offers a valuable perspective, positioning Palestine as both a localized site of struggle and an integral part of globalized power dynamics (Collins 2011, 15). This framing enables us to shed light, on the one hand, on the series of global and globalizing processes shaping the Palestinian economy and the ways in which different Palestinian social – and political – groups make a living and struggle for land and freedom. On the other hand, it contributes to making visible how Palestine’s struggle for land resonates with other indigenous and agrarian movements around the globe. Understanding Palestine through this lens challenges its exceptionalization and instead situates it within broader global struggles for land and justice. As argued by Kohlbray (2022): ‘Palestine is

not unique. Instead, it is a place that can help scholars and activists understand connections between the seemingly disparate struggles for land that are unfolding across the rural world today’.

4.2. Global Palestine and agrarian questions

As Palestine gains increasing attention within social movements and academic circles worldwide, this growing traction creates new openings for exploring the insights that Palestine can offer to debates on AQs.

An important aspect of this is that Palestine demands AQs account for the continuous role that (settler) colonialism, imperial wars and de-development play in shaping agrarian landscapes and rural livelihoods. (Settler)colonialism has been pushed for too long to the margins of agrarian analysis, often appearing – if at all – only in historical comparative frameworks. For example, within the land grabbing literature, there has been a tendency to draw parallels between contemporary forms of dispossession and histories of colonial plunder. Yet, Palestine reveals that (settler)colonialism was not only foundational to the emergence and development of capitalism, but it also remains integral to its operations in the present. In other words, it calls for foregrounding colonialism not as an historical event but as a structure of domination and oppression that continues to shape agrarian relations and the uneven distribution of climate change effects, as well as the impacts of food and financial crises in the present. In this regard, it is not surprising that Palestine was one of the most affected countries by the sharp rise in the cost of food staples after the start of the war in Ukraine. Decades of settler colonial land and economic policies, recurrent wars, along with the neoliberal restructuring of the Palestinian economy, has in fact contributed to destroy local food systems, making the region dependent on food imports, and thus more vulnerable to global food price volatility.

Moreover, Palestine shows that imperial wars and military violence are not ‘a radical form of action’ (Grajales 2021) or exceptional events in the history of colonial capitalism but rather quite normal mechanisms of colonial plunder and capital accumulation that violently reshape agrarian land, labor, livelihoods and ecologies. From the destruction of olive groves and agricultural fields in Gaza to the militarized seizure of land and water resources, war has repeatedly been used by the Israeli settler state and its imperial allies as tools for territorial expansion, political power, and accumulation by de-development. De-development doesn’t simply mean a lack of development but rather a distorted form of development, often bent toward colonial and capitalist interests that benefit from it. While contributing to de-development, imperial wars and military violence devastate agrarian landscapes and the lives of millions of people who are forced into migrant labor or displacement. Consider the vicious cycle of loss in which Palestinian communities have been enshrined over the last century: land dispossession before and during the Nakba⁶, displacement and/or exploitation within the Israeli economy and further dispossession as a consequence of leaving their lands uncultivated. Meanwhile, these very lands

⁶The control of land – particularly farmland – has been central to the Zionist settler-colonial project in Palestine since its inception. Dispossession and territorial expansion have been carried out through a range of methods, including land purchases, state appropriation, violence, and ethnic cleansing. For an historical account of the Nakba see: Pappé (2007, 2004); Khalidi (1992); Abdo-Zubi and Masalha (2018). On more recent events, and the concept of on-going Nakba, see: Bontemps and Latte Abdallah (2025).

have been repurposed for Israeli settlements and real estate projects, businesses and national parks for tourism by the Israeli state and international corporations. Wars, then, are tools of accumulation, and de-development is not an anomaly but rather an essential feature of colonial capitalism. In this sense, Palestine makes clear that AQ debates must incorporate imperial wars and de-development in their theorization of the world-system and recognize them as critical forces shaping agrarian transformations in the present.

At the same time, Palestine illustrates that underdevelopment is not always motivated by immediate economic profit but can be driven, first and foremost, by geopolitical, imperialist and supremacists' projects aimed at territorial control and resource plundering. As a matter of fact, the destruction of Palestinian productive and reproductive capacities is part of a settler-colonial logic dating back to the late nineteenth century, when Zionism conceived economic conquest as a tool for territorial control (Labadi 2024). After 1948 and then 1967, the exclusion of Palestinians became increasingly systematic through state policies designed to undermine their economic autonomy. This is a systematic strategy that the Israeli state has adopted, alongside other forms of 'slow violence', to destroy territorial relations and make life increasingly untenable, and thereby facilitate the forced displacement of Palestinians from the land while consolidating Israeli colonial rule over it (Amira 2021).

This systematic destruction of territorial relations is what Tramel (2025) defines as 'territory grabbing'. Described as 'a place-specific, collective, and violent process intended to seize control of a nation state, nation within a state, subnational state, or other form of territory belonging to Indigenous peoples', territory grabbing targets not only land as a resource but also political collectivities, often seeking their elimination through varying degrees of violence. This concept pushes us to integrate land as territory into AQ debates while also reconsidering the territorial dimension of the AQ itself. Historically, classic agrarian questions have been closely tied to the state, and subsequently, to struggles for national liberation. Today, discussions on national liberation and political sovereignty seem to be settled within AQ debates. However, Palestine demands renewed attention to these critical issues.

For instance, what does it mean to establish land markets in the absence of territorial sovereignty? Or to advocate for food sovereignty in a context in which political collectives are denied national sovereignty and control over their territory and resources? As Palestinian social movements put it: 'Food sovereignty means a step towards liberation' (Dalia Association 2023). By placing liberation at the heart of their struggle for food sovereignty, Palestine demands attention to questions of territory, national liberation and political sovereignty. Cultivating land with local seeds and without pesticides – whether next to Israeli settlements and the separation wall in the West Bank or near the fence in Gaza – becomes a powerful act of 're-territorializing sovereignty' (Delaney 2005). Through their practices, farmers struggle for territorial sovereignty while imagining alternative futures on the land. The struggles unfolding in Palestine resonate with the struggles of many other indigenous, peasant and rural communities around the globe, underscoring the need for agrarian studies to engage more deeply with questions of territory and political sovereignty.

This does not mean that Palestinian contributions to agrarian studies are limited to a critique of settler colonialism alone. Framing them as such would risk perpetuating what

Barakat calls ‘a Zionist-centered reading’ of Palestinian history (Barakat 2017). On the contrary, advancing a Palestinian narrative means foregrounding the life and agency of ordinary people in Palestine, and across the diaspora, while also attending to the situated and transnational dynamics that shape their relationships with land, markets, and the state. It entails examining how agrarian Palestine and the shifting dynamics of Palestinian agrarian relations have not only been marked by the dispossession and ethnic cleansing but also by transformations in property relations and peasant revolts, patterns of labor mobility and labor strikes, changing rural-urban configurations, and the transnational circulation of commodities and seeds; this also requires close attention to the emergence of post-agrarian landscapes, as well as to both forced or voluntary returns to farming, and to Palestinian engagements with global agro-ecological and food sovereignty movements (see for example: Kirk and Kohlbray 2024; Meneley 2021; Moors 1995; Nadine and Albarghouthi 2022; Trottier, Leblond, and Garb 2019). These global connections and political entanglements are central to Palestinian AQs and focusing on them can offer valuable insights for agrarian studies more broadly – especially when the concrete articulation between these questions and territorial struggles is taken seriously. In fact, Palestine can be seen as a privileged site from which to observe the complexity of agrarian reconfigurations on a global scale and the dystopian futures that may arise from them.

In conclusion, rethinking the AQ in and with Palestine is not just about filling a gap in academic literature – it is about challenging the ways in which power, knowledge, and struggle are framed in both agrarian and Palestinian studies. By engaging with Palestine not as a mere case study but as a site for theorizing AQs, we can move toward a more just, inclusive, and politically engaged approach to agrarian research – one that places land, labor, and sovereignty at the center of both Palestinian and global struggles.

Integrating Palestine into critical agrarian studies also strengthens connections with other struggles: Indigenous land sovereignty, rural resistance to extractivism, and the fight against capitalism. At the same time, reconnecting Palestinian studies to agrarian studies allows for an understanding of agrarian change in Palestine that complicates structuralist approaches without romanticising resistance. This becomes both an intellectual and political imperative as efforts to suppress and silence Palestinian voices and solidarity intensify across the globe, reflecting a broader authoritarian shift worldwide.

5. Conclusion

This article has shown that agrarian Palestine remains largely marginalized in critical debates on agrarian issues, whether on land, labor, food sovereignty or climate change. This exclusion stems largely from a misperception of Palestine as a historical anomaly – an exception rather than a space where interlocked structures of colonial-capitalist accumulation operate in full force. These structures generate forms of dispossession, exploitation, and resistance that shape agrarian relations, which are deeply embedded in global dynamics.

It brings Palestinian studies in dialogue with critical agrarian studies and re-situates Palestine not only as a site of struggle against injustices rooted in colonial and imperial histories but also as a critical space for rethinking AQs on a global scale. As such, Palestine is positioned not merely as an object of study but as a crucial site for theorizing contemporary transformations in land tenure, agricultural production, and development policies. It demonstrates

how Palestine can offer a vital perspective on questions of land, territory, and social justice, shedding light on the multiple uneven forces shaping today's agrarian world.

Moreover, it offers a long-term, multi-scalar, and transnational approach that not only sharpens our understanding of local dynamics but also expands our grasp of land and agrarian struggles worldwide. This is not just about filling an academic gap; it is about advancing a more accurate, inclusive, and politically engaged reading that recenters land, labor, and sovereignty in both Palestinian and global struggles.

In Palestine, as in many other agrarian contexts, land dispossession is deeply intertwined with food dependency, economic exploitation, and political subjugation – at times culminating in physical elimination. Conversely, reclaiming land is not only a struggle for subsistence but also for food sovereignty, economic dignity, and self-determination. Planting becomes an act of defiance, a way to reclaim both land and the future. Situating the Palestinian experience within broader agrarian struggles highlights that these dynamics are neither exceptional nor isolated. Rather, they expose how control over land and agriculture remains a central battleground in global struggles for sovereignty and justice.

To further explore these topics, we invite contributions to a forum in the *Journal of Peasant Studies* on Palestine: *Agrarian Questions Unsettled*. We welcome scholars working on Palestine, agrarian political economy, and global peasant movements to engage in this collective reflection. This forum aims to deepen debates on the intersections of colonialism, capitalism, and agrarian struggles while strengthening connections between critical research and movements for land and food justice on an international scale.

We hope this initiative will provide a space for dialogue between scholars from different disciplines and, eventually, between academics and agrarian movements. In so doing, this forum aims not only to fill a gap in existing literature and scholarly conversations but also make agrarian politics in the region visible and relevant to broader debates on land and social justice and collective liberation. In other words, we hope this forum can become a space for establishing and connecting what Indigenous scholar Simpson (2016, 27) calls, 'constellations of co-resistance' in the agrarian world and opening new perspectives for understanding and confronting contemporary agrarian challenges both within and beyond agrarian Palestine.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this article. We are also grateful to the French Institute of the Near East (IFPO) and the Margaret Anstee Centre for Global Studies at the University of Cambridge for their support in bringing this project to fruition.

Disclosure

AI assistance (ChatGPT, OpenAI) was used to transliterate some Arabic-language references; all outputs were reviewed and edited by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by Fondation Philippe Wiener - Maurice Anspach.

Notes on contributors

Fadia Panosetti is a Wiener-Anspach Postdoctoral Fellow at the Margaret Anstee Centre for Global Studies, Newnham College, University of Cambridge. She is also a lecturer in Agricultural Development and Global Food Security at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, where she obtained her PhD in Political and Social Sciences in 2023. Her research explores the histories, practices and theories of land and agrarian change in the Middle East, with a particular focus on Palestine.

Taher Labadi is a researcher at the French Institute for the Near East (IFPO) in Jerusalem. His work in political economy examines the entanglements of capitalism, colonialism, and resistance in Palestine and the Near East. Through the study of labor governance, agrarian policies, and special economic zones, he highlights how economic structures are shaped by power relations and historical contingencies. More broadly, his research critically investigates the ways economic discourses, institutions, and practices emerge, circulate, and are contested, offering a reflection on the power dynamics that shape economic thought and action in contexts of domination and struggle.

Ahmad Heneiti is a doctoral student in anthropology at the University of Paris-8. His PhD thesis looks at Bedouins in the West Bank: Socio-economic transformations between colonial and global contexts. He holds a master's degree in Sociology from Birzeit University, with a focus on Palestinian agriculture and Bedouin communities. He has published two books in Arabic with the Institute of Palestine Studies, entitled 'The case of Bedouin Communities in the Central West Bank' (2018), and 'Israeli Policy towards the Jordan Valley and Its Prospects' (2016).

ORCID

Fadia Panosetti  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6491-1944>

References

- Abdelnour, Samer, Alaa Tartir, et Rami Zurayk. 2012. "Farming Palestine for Freedom." *Al-Shabaka Policy Brief*.
- Abdo-Zubi, Nahla, and Nur Masalha, eds. 2018. *An Oral History of the Palestinian Nakba*. London: Zed Books.
- Abu-Sada, Caroline. 2008. "La sécurité alimentaire en Palestine : acteurs locaux et internationaux pendant la seconde Intifada." *A contrario* 1: 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.3917/aco.052.0184>
- Abu al-Nasr, Bassām. 1985. "Ahamīyat zira'at al-ḥamḍīyyāt fī iqtisād al-Diffa al-Gharbiyya" [The Importance of Citrus Cultivation in the Economy of the West Bank]. *Jāmi'at Qaṭar, Ḥawliyat Kulliyat al-Insāniyyāt wa-al-'Ulūm al-Ijtīmā'iyya*, al-'Adad 8.
- Abu Arjilah, Khalil. 1971. *Al-Tharwa al-Ḥayawāniyah fī Filasṭīn al-Muḥtallah* [The Livestock in Occupied Palestine]. Bayrūt: Markaz al-Abḥāth al-Filasṭīniyah.
- Abu Arjilah, Khalil. 1991. *Al-Ḥumḍīyyāt fī Filasṭīn al-Muḥtallah* [Citrus in Occupied Palestine]. Bayrūt: Markaz al-Abḥāth al-Filasṭīnī.
- Abu Bakr, Bahā'. 1990. *al-Jadwā al-iqtisādiyya wa-l-fanniyya li-inshā' maṣna' li-l-'albān fī minṭaqat Nāblus* [The Economic and Technical Feasibility of Establishing a Dairy Factory in the Nablus Area]. Nāblus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifīyya.
- Abu Bakr, Amin. 2006. *Milkiyat Āl 'Abd al-Hādī fī Filasṭīn, 1804–1967* [The 'Abd al-Hādī Family's Land Ownership in Palestine, 1804–1967]. *Majallat Jāmi'at al-Najāḥ (al-'Ulūm al-Ijtīmā'iyya)*, al-Mujallad 2, 'adad 20.
- Abu Hussein, Hussein, and Fiona Mc Kay. 2003. *Access Denied: Palestinian Land Rights in Israel*. London: Zed Books.
- Abu Kushk, Bakr. 1984. *Al-Zirā'a al-'Arabiyya fī Filasṭīn al-Muḥtalla*. [Arab Agriculture in Occupied Palestine.] *Majallat Ṣamid al-Iqtisādī*, al-'Adadān 60–51.
- Abu Qa'ud, Hassan. 2005. *Iqtisādiyyāt al-Zirā'a fī Muḥāfaẓatā Ṭulkarm wa-Qalqiliyya: Asālib Taḥsīn Rabḥiyyat al-Muzārī'in al-Mutaththirīn bi-l-Jidār* [Economic Aspects of Agriculture in the Tulkarm

- and Qalqilya Governorates: Methods to Improve the Profitability of Farmers Affected by the Wall]. Ramallah: Ma'had Dirāsāt al-Siyāsāt al-Iqtisādiyya (MAS).
- Abu Salih, Mahir, wa Umar Abd al-Raziq. 1991. *Al-Burak al-Zirā'iyya fi Minṭaqat al-Aghwār* [Agricultural Ponds in the Jordan Valley Region]. Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Abu Subayh, Imran. 1991. "Ḥamdiyyāt Qiṭā' Ghazzah Taḥt al-Iḥtilāl." [Citrus of the Gaza Strip under Occupation]. *Ṣamid al-Iqtisādi*, 'Adad 84.
- Abu Umar, Jamāl. 1991. *Al-aghānām wa-al-ma'āz fi al-Ḍiffa al-Gharbiyya wa-Qaṭā' Ghazza* [Sheep and Goats in the West Bank and Gaza Strip]. Nāblus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Ad-Dajani, Hisham. 1980. "Al-Taḥawwulāt al-Iqtisādiyya - al-Ijtimā'iyya fi al-Manāṭiq al-Muḥtalla taḥt al-Iḥtilāl al-Isrā'īlī." [Economic and Social Transformations in the Occupied Territories under Israeli Occupation].
- Ajl, Max. 2021. "Does the Arab Region Have an Agrarian Question?" *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 48 (5): 955–983. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2020.1753706>
- Ajl, Max. 2024. "Palestine's Great Flood: Part I." *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy: A Triannual Journal of Agrarian South Network and CARES* 13 (1): 62–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22779760241228157>.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon, Kristina Dietz, Bettina Engels, and Ben M McKay. 2021. *Handbook of Critical Agrarian Studies*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon, and Cristóbal Kay. 2010. "Surveying the Agrarian Question (Part 1): Unearthing Foundations, Exploring Diversity." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (1): 177–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150903498838>.
- Al-Amiri, Anan. 1974. *Al-Taṭawwur al-Zirā'i wa-al-Ṣinā'i al-Filasṭīnī 1900-1970, Baḥth Ihṣā'i* [Palestinian Agricultural and Industrial Development 1900–1970: A Statistical Study]. Beirut: Markaz al-Abḥāth al-Filasṭīnī.
- Al-Aqtam, Musa. 1991. *Taqniyat naql al-ajhnah fi al-māshiyya wa-taṭbiqātihā al-'amaliyya* [Embryo Transfer Technology in Livestock and Its Practical Applications]. Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Al-Maliki, Majdi, wa Yasir Shalabi. 1993. "Al-Taḥawwulāt al-Iqtisādiyya - al-Ijtimā'iyya fi Thalāth Qurā Filasṭīniyya: Zurūf l'adat al-Intāj lil-Ā'ila al-Filasṭīniyya al-Rifiyya taḥt al-Iḥtilāl: al-Mazra'a al-Sharqiyya wa Kafr Mālik wa Kharbatha." [Economic and Social Transformations in Three Palestinian Villages: Conditions of Reproduction of the Palestinian Rural Family under Occupation: al-Mazra'a al-Sharqiyya, Kafr Malik, and Kharbatha]. Ramallah: Markaz Bīsān lil-Buḥūth wa al-Inmā' / Bisan Centre for Research and Development.
- Al-Sarwaji, Fathi. 2009. "Al-Zirā'a al-Marwiyya ka Munsha'at A'māl fi Filasṭīn." [Irrigated Agriculture as Business Enterprises in Palestine]. Ramallah: Ma'had Abḥāth al-Siyāsāt al-Iqtisādiyya al-Filasṭīniyya (MAS).
- Amira, Saad. 2021. "The Slow Violence of Israeli Settler-Colonialism and the Political Ecology of Ethnic Cleansing in the West Bank." *Settler Colonial Studies* 11 (4): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2021.2007747>.
- Awartani, Hisham. 1986. "Anmāt Istikhdām al-Arḍ wa-al-Miyāh lil-Aghraḍ al-Zirā'iyya fi al-Ḍiffa al-Gharbiyya." [Patterns of Land and Water Use for Agricultural Purposes in the West Bank]. *Ṣamid al-Iqtisādi*, al-'Adad 61.
- Awartani, Hisham, wa Shakir Juda. 1991. "Al-Zirā'a al-Marwiyya fi al-Manāṭiq al-Filasṭīniyya al-Muḥtalla." [Irrigated Agriculture in the Occupied Palestinian Territories]. Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Barakat, Rana. 2017. "Writing/Righting Palestine Studies: Settler Colonialism, Indigenous Sovereignty and Resisting the Ghost(s) of History." *Settler Colonial Studies* March:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2017.1300048>.
- Basha, Zaid Ali. 2022. "The Agrarian Question in Yemen: The National Imperative of Reclaiming and Revalorizing Indigenous Agroecological Food Production." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 50 (3): 879–930. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.2002849>.
- Bernstein, Henry. 2006. "Is There an Agrarian Question in the 21st Century?" *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue Canadienne d'études Du Développement* 27 (4): 449–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2006.9669166>.

- Bernstein, Henry. 2009. "V.I. Lenin and A.V. Chayanov: Looking Back, Looking Forward." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36 (1): 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150902820289>.
- Bernstein, Henry. 2025. "Classes of Labour." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. June, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2025.2511326>.
- Bhandar, Brenna. 2018. *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*. Global and Insurgent Legalities. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bontemps, Véronique, and Stéphanie Latte Abdallah, eds. 2025. *Gaza, Une Guerre Coloniale*. Beirut, Lebanon: Actes Sud; Institut des études Palestiniennes.
- Borras, Saturnino M., and Jennifer C. Franco. 2024. "Land Rush." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, March, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2024.2317961>.
- Borras, Saturnino M., Ruth Hall, Ian Scoones, Ben White, and Wendy Wolford. 2011. "Towards a Better Understanding of Global Land Grabbing: An Editorial Introduction." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 209–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.559005>.
- Cobham, David, et Nu'man Kanafani (dir.). 2004. *The Economics of Palestine: Economic Policy and Institutional Reform for a Viable Palestinian State*. Routledge.
- Collins, John. 2011. *Global Palestine*. London: Hurst and Company.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Indigenous Americas. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cousins, Ben. 2022. "Land, Social Reproduction, and Agrarian Change." In *The Oxford Handbook of Land Politics*, edited by Saturnino M. Borras, and Jennifer C. Franco, 1st ed. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197618646.013.32>.
- Dajani, Muna, and Christian Henderson. 2024. "Special Section: "Circuits of Production, Crisis and Revolt: The Environment and Capital in the Middle East and North Africa"." *Middle East Critique* 33 (4): 517–527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2024.2427465>.
- Dakkak, Ibrahim. 1988. "Development from Within: A Strategy for Survival." In *The Palestinian Economy: Studies in Development under Prolonged Occupation*, edited by George T. Abed, 287–310. London: Routledge.
- Dalia Association. 2023. *Agroecology and Food Sovereignty in Palestine: A Way To Self-Determination?* <https://ps.boell.org/en/2023/02/14/agroecology-and-food-sovereignty-palestine-way-self-determination#:~:text=For%20me%2C%20Food%20Sovereignty%20means,rebuild%20our%20connection%20with%20it>.
- Dana, Tariq. 2013. *The Productivity alternative for model of industry zones in Jerico and Jordan Valley*. Ramallah: Bisan Centre for Research and Development.
- Dana, Tariq. 2024. "Notes on the "Exceptionalism" of the Israeli Settler-Colonial Project." *Middle East Critique* 33 (2): 165–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2024.2342733>.
- Delaney, David. 2005. *Territory: A Short Introduction*. 1st ed. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Diwan, Ishac, et Radwan A. Shaban. 1999. *Development under Adversity: The Palestinian Economy in Transition*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Doumani, Beshara. 1992. "Rediscovering Ottoman Palestine: Writing Palestinians into History." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 21 (2): 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2537216>.
- Doumani, Beshara. 1995. *Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Edelman, Marc, and Wendy Wolford. 2017. "Introduction: Critical Agrarian Studies in Theory and Practice: Symposium: Agrarianism in Theory and Practice Organisers: Jennifer Baka, Aaron Jakes, Greta Marchesi and Sara Safransky." *Antipode* 49 (4): 959–976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12326>.
- El-Eini, Roza I. M. 2006. *Mandated Landscape: British Imperial Rule in Palestine, 1929–1948*. New York: Routledge.
- El Zein, Rayya. 2017. "Developing a Palestinian Resistance Economy through Agricultural Labor." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 46 (3): 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2017.46.3.7>.
- Fairbairn, Madeleine, Jonathan Fox, S. Ryan Isakson, Michael Levien, Nancy Peluso, Shahra Razavi, Ian Scoones, and K. Sivaramakrishnan. 2014. "Introduction: New Directions in Agrarian Political Economy." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41 (5): 653–666. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.953490>.

- Fischbach, Michael. 2003. *Records of Dispossession: Palestinian Refugee Property and the Arab Israeli Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Forensic Architecture. 2024. *A Spatial Analysis of the Israeli Military's Conduct in Gaza since October 2023*. London: Goldsmiths, University of London. https://content.forensic-architecture.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/FA_A-Spatial-Analysis-of-the-Israeli-militarys-conduct-in-Gaza-since-October-2023.pdf.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2017. "Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism." In *Critical Theory in Critical Times*, edited by Penelope Deutscher, and Cristina Lafont, 141–159. New York: Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/deut18150-009>.
- Gago, Verónica, and Sandro Mezzadra. 2017. "A Critique of the Extractive Operations of Capital: Toward an Expanded Concept of Extractivism." *Rethinking Marxism* 29 (4): 574–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2017.1417087>.
- Grajales, Jacobo. 2021. *Agrarian Capitalism, War and Peace in Colombia beyond Dispossession*. Abingdon: Routledge Studies in Global Land Resource Grabbing.
- Granott, Avraham. 1956. *The Land System in Palestine*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.
- Guldi, Jo. 2022. *The Long Land War: The Global Struggle for Occupancy Rights*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2c3k1rt>.
- Gutkowski, Natalia. 2024. *Struggling for Time: Environmental Governance and Agrarian Resistance in Israel/Palestine*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hadawi, Sami. 1957. *Land Ownership in Palestine*. New York: Palestine Arab Refugee Office.
- Haddad, Toufic. 2016. *Palestine Ltd.: Neoliberalism and Nationalism in the Occupied Territory*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Hanieh, Adam. 2013. *Lineages of Revolt: Issues of Contemporary Capitalism in the Middle East*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Hanieh, Adam. 2016. "Development as Struggle: Confronting the Reality of Power in Palestine." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 45 (4): 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2016.45.4.32>
- Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2009. "The "New" Imperialism: Accumulation by Dispossession." *Socialist Register* 40 (40): 63–87. <http://www.socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/download/5811>.
- Hecht, Susanna B. 2014. "Forests Lost and Found in Tropical Latin America: The Woodland "Green Revolution"." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 41 (5): 877–909. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.917371>.
- Henderson, Christian. 2021. "The Rise of Arab Gulf Agro-Capital: Continuity and Change in the Corporate Food Regime." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 49 (5): 1079–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1888723>.
- Hilal, Mustafa. 2013. *Farmers Situations in Jordan Valley and the Expected Impacts of Agricultural-Industry Zone*. Ramallah: Bisan Centre for Research and Development.
- Hizmawi, Muhammad. 1996. *Milkiyat al-arḍ fi Filasṭīn, 1018–1948*. [Land Ownership in Palestine, 1018–1948.] 'Akkā: Dār al-Aswār.
- Issawi, Charles. 1982. *An Economic History of the Middle East and North Africa*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jacobs, Ricardo. 2018. "An Urban Proletariat with Peasant Characteristics: Land Occupations and Livestock Raising in South Africa." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 45 (5-6): 884–903. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1312354>.
- Jacobs, Ricardo. 2024. "Land for Livelihoods: Urban Agriculture and the Agrarian Question in the Twenty-First Century." In *The Oxford Handbook of Land Politics*, edited by Saturnino M. Borrás, and Jennifer C. Franco, 1st ed (online). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197618646.013.1>.
- Jamaluddine, Zeina, Hanan Abukmail, Sarah Aly, Oona MR Campbell, and Francesco Checchi. 2025. "Traumatic Injury Mortality in the Gaza Strip from Oct 7, 2023, to June 30, 2024: A Capture–Recapture Analysis." *The Lancet* 405 (10477): 469–477. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(24\)02678-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)02678-3).
- Jarrar, Ghassan. 1986. *Mulāḥaẓāt ḥawl al-mashākil al-rifīyya fi al-manātiq al-muḥtalla*. [Notes on Rural Problems in the occupied territories]. Ṣāmid al-Iqtisādī, Al-'Adad 6.

- Kadri, Ali. 2016. *The Unmaking of Arab Socialism*. London: Anthem Press.
- Kaminer, Matan. 2024. *Capitalist Colonial: Thai Migrant Workers in Israeli Agriculture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kanafani, Ghassan. 1972. *The 1936-39 Revolt in Palestine*. Committee for the Defence of Palestinian Rights.
- Kedar, Alexander, Ahmad Amara, and Oren Yiftachel. 2018. *Emtied Lands: A Legal Geography of Bedouin Rights in the Negev*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Khalidi, Walid, ed. 1992. *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Khalidi, Raja. 2014. "The Rise and Decline of Palestinian Economic Thought and Practice in the Age of National Liberation." *Assafir Al-Arabi*, online.
- Khalidi, Raja. 2016. "Twenty-First Century Palestinian Development Studies." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 45 (4): 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2016.45.4.7>
- Khalidi, Raja, et Sobhi Samour. 2011. "Neoliberalism as Liberation: The Statehood Program and the Remaking of the Palestinian National Movement." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 40 (2): 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2011.XL.2.6>
- Khitab, Sultan. 1985. *Ẓurūf al-'Umāl fī al-Diffah al-Gharbiyyah wa Qiṭā' Ghazzah* [Conditions of Workers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip]. Šāmid al-Iqtisādī, al-'Adad 55.
- Kirk, Gabi. 2024. "'A Fairly Good Crop for White Men:' the Political Ecology of Agricultural Science and Settler Colonialism between the US and Palestine." *Journal of Political Ecology* 31 (1): 888–908. <https://doi.org/10.2458/jpe.6132>.
- Kirk, Gabi, and Paul Kohlbry. 2024. "Situating the Transnational in Agrarian Palestine." In *Resisting Domination in Palestine*, edited by Tartir Alaa, Seidel Timothy, and Dana Tariq, 143–160. London: I.B. Tauris, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Kohlbry, Paul. 2022. "To Cover the Land in Green: Rain-Fed Agriculture and Anti-colonial Land Reclamation in Palestine." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 50 (7): 2666–2684. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2022.2120807>.
- Labadi, Taher. 2023. "Al-Istī'mār wa-al-ma'rifa al-iqtisādiyya fī Filasṭīn: Muqārabāt wa-uṭur taḥlīliyya min ḥiqbat al-intidāb al-Britānī ilā ḥiqbat mā ba'da Ōslū." [Colonialism and Economic Knowledge in Palestine: Approaches and Analytical Frameworks from the British Mandate Era to the Post-Oslo Period.] *Al-Mustaḥbal al-'Arabī*, al-'Adad 530: 74–92.
- Labadi, Taher. 2024. "How Israel Dominates the Palestinian Economy", *Jacobin*, 13 janvier. [Online] <https://jacobin.com/2024/01/israel-palestine-settler-colonialism-labor-economy>.
- Latour, L. 2019. "The Culturalisation of Indigeneity: The Palestinian-Bedouin of the Naqab and Indigenous Rights." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 23 (10): 1569–1593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2019.1609454>.
- Latte, Stéphanie. 2019. "L'économie de la résistance: un engagement holiste contre l'occupation en Palestine?" in *Où est passée la justice sociale? De l'égalité aux tâtonnements*, Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 225-238.
- La via Campesina. 2024. "Palestine: Statement from a Solidarity Visit by La Via Campesina's Delegation." 20 December 2024. <https://viacampesina.org/en/2024/12/palestine-statement-from-solidarity-visit-by-la-via-campesinas-delegation/>.
- Levien, Michael, Michael Watts, and Hairong Yan. 2018. "Agrarian Marxism." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 45 (5-6): 853–883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2018.1534101>.
- Li, Tania Murray. 2011. "Centering Labor in the Land Grab Debate." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 281–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.559009>.
- Makhoul, Najwa. 1982. "Changes in the Employment Structure of Arabs in Israel." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 11 (3): 77–102. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2536074>
- Makhul, Najwa. 1984. *Taghayyurāt fī al-Bunyah al-Tashghiliyya li-l-'Arab fī Filasṭīn al-Muḥtalla*. [Changes in the Employment Structure of Arabs in Occupied Palestine.] *Majallat Šāmid al-Iqtisādī*, al-'Adadān 60–51.
- Mansour, Antoine. 1983. *Palestine: une économie de résistance en Cisjordanie et à Gaza*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

- Martiniello, Giuliano, and Julia Kassem. 2023. "The Corporate Food Regime and Lebanon: Machgara and Adverse Incorporation." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 51 (5): 1120–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2023.2273849>.
- McMichael, Philip. 1997. "Rethinking Globalization: The Agrarian Question Revisited." *Review of International Political Economy* 4 (4): 630–662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09672299708565786>.
- Meneley, A. 2020. "Hope in the Ruins: Seeds, Plants, and Possibilities of Regeneration." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 4 (1): 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848620917516>.
- Mezzadri, Alessandra, Sara Stevano, Lyn Ossome, and Hannah Bargawi. 2024. "The Social Reproduction of Agrarian Change: Feminist Political Economy and Rural Transformations in the Global South. An Introduction." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 24 (3): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12595>.
- Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books.
- Moore, Jason W. 2015. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. London: Verso.
- Moors, Annelies. 1995. *Women, Property, and Islam. Palestinian Experiences 1920-1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mundy, Martha, et Richard Saumarez Smith. 2007. *Governing Property, Making the Modern State: Law, Administration and Production in Ottoman Syria*. I.B. Tauris.
- Muṣṭafā, Walid. *Aylūl – Tishrīn al-ʿAwal* 1986. "Al-Ḍiffa al-Gharbiyya wa Qitā' Ghazzah tahta al-Iḥlāl al-Isrā'īlī." [The West Bank and Gaza Strip under Israeli Occupation.] *Shu'ūn Filasṭīniyya*, al-ʿAdad 162-163.
- Nadine, Fattaleh, and Adam Albarghouthi. (Tran./Ed.). 2022. "Agroecology, from Palestine to the Diaspora." *Science for the People* 25 (1).
- Nakhleh, Khalil. 2004. *The Myth of Palestinian Development: Political Aid and Sustainable Deceit*. Jerusalem.: PASSIA.
- Nakhleh, Khalil. 2011. *Filas ṭ īn: Wa ṭ an li-l-bayʿ* [Palestine: Homeland for Sale]. Ramallah: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation.
- Nasasra, Mansour. 2012. "The Ongoing Judaisation of the Naqab and the Struggle for Recognising the Indigenous Rights of the Arab Bedouin People." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 81–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648827>
- Nasasra, Mansour, Sophie Richter-Devroe, Sarab Abu-Rabia-Queder, and Richard Ratcliffe. 2014. *The Naqab Bedouin and Colonialism New Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Nasr Allah, Nadir. 1984. *Al-Awdāʿ al-Ijtīmāʿiyya wa-al-Iqtisādiyya li-ʿArab al-Jalīl*. [The Social and Economic Conditions of the Galilee Arabs.] *Majallat Šāmid al-Iqtisādi*, al-ʿAdadān 60–51.
- Neimark, Benjamin, Frederick Otu-Larbi, Patrick Bigger, Linsey Cottrell, and Reuben Larbi. 2024. "A Multitemporal Snapshot of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Israel-Gaza Conflict." <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4855947>.
- Norris, Jacob. 1993. *Land of Progress: Palestine in the Age of Colonial Development, 1905–1948*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Obayyidat, Adnan. 1982. *Al-Taʾāwuniyyāt al-Zirāʿiyyah fī al-Ḍiffah al-Gharbiyyah al-Muḥtallah* [Agricultural Cooperatives in the Occupied West Bank]. *Shu'ūn Filasṭīniyyah*, ʿAdad 127.
- Omar, Shweiki, et Turner Mandy (dir.). 2014. *Decolonizing Palestinian Political Economy: De-development and Beyond*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Owen, Roger. 1981. *The Middle East in the World Economy, 1800-1914*. London, New York: Methuen.
- Panosetti, Fadia, and Laurence Roudart. 2022. "Evolving Regimes of Land Use and Property in the West Bank: Dispossession, Resistance, and Neoliberalism." *Jerusalem Quarterly*, Special Issue: Who Owns Palestine? (Part 2), No. 89 (Spring), 10–31. <https://doi.org/10.70190/jq.i89.p10>
- Panosetti, Fadia, and Laurence Roudart. 2024. "Land Struggle and Palestinian Farmers' Livelihoods in the West Bank: Between de-agrarianization and Anti-colonial Resistance." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 51 (5): 1079–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2023.2277748>.
- Pappé, Ilan. 2004. *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pappé, Ilan. 2007. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Paperback ed. London: Oneworld.

- Perosino, Livia. 2023. "Deconstructing the Market: Agrarian Change and Social Differentiation in Jordan." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 51 (5): 1102–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2023.2287093>.
- Pollock, Alex. 1987. "Realist Methodology and the Articulation of Modes of Production: An Analysis of Palestinian Peasant Household Production in the North Jordan Valley of the Occupied West Bank/the Central Highlands of Palestine." University of Strathclyde. <https://doi.org/10.48730/CBRT-Y384>
- Riachi, Roland, and Giuliano Martiniello. 2023. "Manufactured Regional Crises: The Middle East and North Africa under Global Food Regimes." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 23 (4): 792–810. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12547>.
- Rosenfeld, Henry. 1978. "The Class Situation of the Arab National Minority in Israel." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 20 (3): 374–407. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500009051>
- Ross, Andrew. 2019. *Stone Men: The Palestinians Who Built Israel*. London: Verso.
- Said, Edward W. 1979. *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Sajadian, China. 2024. "Reproductive Binds: The Gendered Economy of Debt in a Syrian Refugee Farmworker Camp." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 24 (3): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12577>.
- Salamanca, Omar Jabary. 2024. "'Because of the Land' Insurgent Infrastructures of Social Reproduction in Palestine." In *Insurgent Ecologies: Between Environmental Struggles and Postcapitalist Transformations* Edited by *Undisciplined Environments Collective*, edited by Undisciplined Environments Collective, 25–37. Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing Halifax & Winnipeg.
- Salamanca, Omar Jabary, Qato Mezna, Rabie Kareem, and Samour Sobhi, eds. 2012. "Past Is Present: Settler Colonialism in Palestine." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648823>
- Salih, Ruba, and Sophie Richter-Devroe. 2018. "Palestine beyond National Frames." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117 (1): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-4282019>.
- Samara, 'Adil. 1990. *Al-Tanmiya bi-al-ḥimāya al-sha'biyya*. [Development through Popular Protection.] Al-Quds: Al-Zahrā' li-al-Dirāsāt wa-al-Abḥāth.
- Sawalha, Firas. 1983. *Zirā'at wa-intāḥ al-ḥamḍiyyāt fi Qitā' Ghazza*. [Citrus Cultivation and Production in the Gaza Strip.] Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Sawalha, Firas. 1984. *Taḥlīl li-mashākil taswīq khudrūwāt al-Aghwār khilāl mawsim 'ām 1984*. [An Analysis of the Marketing Problems of Jordan Valley Vegetables during the 1984 Season.] Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Sawalha, Firas. 1986. *Mashātīl al-ashjār al-muthmīra fi al-Ḍiffa al-Gharbiyya*. [Fruit Tree Nurseries in the West Bank.] Nablus: Markaz al-Dirāsāt al-Rifiyya.
- Sayigh, Rosemary. 1979. *The Palestinians: From Peasants to Revolutionaries*. London: Zed Books.
- Sayigh, Yusif A. 1986. "The Palestinian Economy under Occupation: Dependency and Pauperization." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 15 (4): 46–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2536611>
- Scholch, Alexander. 1986. *Palestine in Transformation, 1856–1882*. Ramallah: Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Sharida, Abd al-Sattar. 2013. *Al-Siyāsāt al-Iqtisādīyah fi al-Aghwār wa Atharuhā 'alā al-Muzār'īn* [Economic Policies in the Jordan Valley and Their Impact on Farmers]. Ramallah: Markaz Bayān lil-Buḥūth wa al-Inmā.
- Shattuck, Annie, Jacobo Grajales, Ricardo Jacobs, Sergio Sauer, Shaila Seshia Galvin, and Ruth Hall. 2023. "Life on the Land: New Lives for Agrarian Questions." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 50 (2): 490–518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2023.2174859>
- Shivji, I. G. 2017. "The Concept of 'Working People'." *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 6 (1): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2277976017721318>.
- Sikor, Thomas, and Christian Lund. 2010. "Access and Property: A Question of Power and Authority." In *The Politics of Possession*, edited by Thomas Sikor, and Christian Lund, 1–22. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2016. 'Indigenous Resurgence and Co-resistance' 2 (2): 19–34.
- Tabar, Linda, and Omar Jabary Salamanca 2015. *Critical Readings of Development under Colonialism: Towards a Political Economy for Liberation in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. Ramallah: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation/Centre for Development Studies.

- Tamari, Salim. 1983. *The Dislocation and Re-constitution of a Peasantry: The Social Economy of Agrarian Palestine in the Central Highlands and the Jordan Valley 1960-1980*. A thesis submitted in support of an application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Manchester in the faculty of economic and social studies.
- Tamari, Salim. 1999. "Ottoman Modernity, Colonialism, and the Palestinian Peasantry." *Middle East Report* 210:8–15.
- Tartir, Alaa. 2016. "Naḥwa ru'ya tanmawiyya Filasṭīniyya." [Towards a Palestinian Development Vision.] *Majallat al-Dirāsāt al-Filasṭīniyya*, al-ʿAdad 105.
- Tramel, Salena Fay. 2025. "Territory Grabbing: Agrarian Perspectives on the Unmaking and Reclaiming of Palestinian Sovereignty." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*: 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2025.2452388>
- Trottier, J., N. Leblond, and Y. Garb. 2019. "The Political Role of Date Palm Trees in the Jordan Valley: The Transformation of Palestinian Land and Water Tenure in Agriculture Made Invisible by Epistemic Violence." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 3 (1): 114–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619876546>.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. 2013. "The Other Shift: Settler Colonialism, Israel, and the Occupation." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 42 (2): 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jps.2013.42.2.26>
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2012. "Purchase by Other Means: The Palestine Nakba and Zionism's Conquest of Economics." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 133–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648830>
- Wolford, Wendy W., Ben White, Ian Scoones, Ruth Hall, Marc Edelman, and Saturnino M. Borrás. 2024. "Global Land Deals: What Has Been Done, What Has Changed, and What's Next?" *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. March, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2024.2325685>
- Yazbak, Mahmoud. 2000. "From Poverty to Revolt: Economic Factors in the Outbreak of the 1936 Rebellion in Palestine." *Middle Eastern Studies* 36 (4): 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200008701334>
- Zu'bi, Nahla. 1984. "The Development of Capitalism in Palestine: The Expropriation of the Palestinian Direct Producers." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 13 (4): 88–109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2536992>
- Zurayk, Rami, Gough Anne, Sourani Ahmad, et Al Jaajaa Mariam. 2012. *Food Security Challenges and Innovation: The Case of Gaza*. FAO.
- Zureik, Elia T. 1976. "Transformation of Class Structure among the Arabs in Israel: From Peasantry to Proletariat." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 6 (1): 39–66. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2535718>