I promised you my thoughts on the above subject last fall in October, but on reflection at the time, it seemed more appropriate to wait until we knew if the Phase III program was going to be extended and the character of the extension which we would be dealing with.

Now that we have an extension which is national in scope and for a six months period, I have briefly set out my views below.

1. Landlord Profile Survey. We still have a major gap in our knowledge of the implementation reality facing FINATA on the landlord side. I am particularly concerned in this regard with the small landlords—the small property holders of roughly ten to fifteen hectares and under who have traditionally rented part or all of their land to primary producers who are now eligible beneficiaries of the Phase III program. This group has never been quantitatively or geographically defined, at least not with any precision.

However, we do know from the PERA eviction study, from FINATA figures on landlord oppositions and the geographic breakdown by departments of beneficiaries who have not as yet applied, that these small property owners have been a major source of resistance, intimidation and violence in the implementation of Phase III.

As FINATA and the campesino organizations now move forward on the promotion and implementation of Phase III in those departments where there are substantial numbers of tenant-farmed small holdings, e.g. Morazán, La Unión, San Miguel, Cabañas, Chalatenango, Cuscatlán and San Vicente, I believe it is imperative that we have a better information "fix" on the problems which are going to be involved. Obviously there is not the time to have PERA do a full scale landlord profile in the field. What I would propose as a modest surrogate is to have PERA and/or FINATA
staff develop a fair distributional sample from the affected property files, supplemented by definitive or provisional title data so as to elaborate a profile of the characteristic small landlord, e.g. size of holdings, geographic location, etc. This could likely be done quickly and would be most useful over the next six months.

2. A Quality of Land Survey. I don't mean to hector you on this subject, but I repeat the point I have made many times before: this is the first agrarian reform program that I know of since World War II, where a systematic survey of the agronomic quality of the land being transferred has not been carried out. Such a survey is absolutely essential to the long-term viability and development of the Phase III program. Without this survey, a lot of mistakes, particularly at the farm level, are going to be made in the unfolding of what in effect is a radically different minifundia land reform program, the economic soundness of which remains to be proved.

(NOTE: I am going to list without further discussion three (3) others subjects which I believe are amenable to operational research projects. We have discussed these items before, and noting them now is all that is necessary).

3. A Survey of the Characteristics of New Definitive Title Holders.

4. A Field Study of Phase III Oppositions.

5. A Field Study of the Social and Political Impact of Phase III (tricky and sensitive, but feasible—at least indirectly—and needed).
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