



SOLDIERS AND THE LAND TO THE TILLER  
PROGRAM IN MILITARY REGION I  
OF VIETNAM

December 1971

by

Roger V. Russell  
Control Data Corporation

with the assistance of  
Henry C. Bush, Vuong Quang Loc, and Le Tin, of Control Data Corporation  
and David T. Toyryla, Economic Development Division, MR I, CORDS, MACV

Sponsored by ADLR, USAID, Vietnam  
under Contract No. AID-730-3449

This report is also available in Vietnamese from ADLR, USAID, Vietnam

## CONTENTS

Reasons for the Inquiry	1
Research Design	3
Results	7
Soldiers, Their Parents, and Farm Land	7
Soldiers Who Were Farming or Working Land, and Their Crops	8
Soldiers and Land Tenure	9
Soldiers' Parents and Land Tenure	10
Who Is Farming Soldiers' Land Now?	11
What Soldiers Think of the Land to the Tiller Program	12
Why Soldiers Feel as They Do About LTTT	23
Officers' Attitudes Compared to Privates' Attitudes	25
Soldiers, and Their Families, and What They Have Done About Their Land	27
Soldiers in MR 1 and What They Did, or Should Have Done Under LTTT	34
Soldiers in MR 1, MR 3, and MR 4 Compared	35
Conclusions	43
Appendix A: Instructions and Questionnaire	46

## TABLES

### Results:

1	Soldiers Who Farmed Land, Worked on Land, or Rented Out Land, and Their Parents	7
2	Land Tenure of Soldiers Who Were Farming	9
3	Land Tenure of Soldiers' Parents	10
4	Question: "Who is now tilling the land you once tilled?"	11
5	Soldiers' Attitudes Toward LTTT	13
6	Soldiers' Attitudes Toward LTTT: ARVN, RF, and PF Compared	14
7	Why Soldiers Are For or Against LTTT	23
8	Officers' Attitudes Toward LTTT Compared to Soldiers' Attitudes	25
9	All Soldiers, and Their Families, and What They Have Done About Their Land	28
10	All Soldiers and Their Families, Who Are For or Against LTTT, and What They Have Done About Their Land	29
11	Land Tenure of Soldiers Who Were Farmers and What They Have Done About Their Land	30

### Comparison of MR 1, MR 3, and MR 4:

1	Soldiers Who Farmed Land, Worked Land, or Rented Out Land	35
2	Land Tenure of Soldiers Who Were Farming	35
3	Land Tenure of Soldiers' Parents	36
4	Question: "Who is now tilling the land you once tilled?"	37
5	Question: "What is your opinion of the Land to the Tiller Law?"	39
6	Soldiers and Return to the Land	40

## REASONS FOR THE INQUIRY

Background: Under the Land to the Tiller Law (LTTT) farmers who are tenants, sharecroppers or squatters will receive title to the land they farm, up to 3 hectares in MR 3 and MR 4, up to 1 hectare in MR 2 and MR 1, free. They must apply for title to the land they till, at their village. Farmers who own rice land or secondary crop land may keep whatever they own and farm, up to 15 hectares. They may also keep it if their parents, spouses, children, or other legal heirs are farming it for them, or if they use hired labor to work it for them, provided they manage it themselves. In addition those owning family worship land registered before the date of the LTTT law, 26 March 1970, may retain up to 5 hectares of it. Former farmers who are in the armed forces or who are refugees and whose farm land is still out of use may retain whatever they own and formerly farmed, up to 15 hectares, for future cultivation. But they must declare the land they own and farm or once farmed. This is necessary to protect them against any risk that their farm land might be distributed to or claimed by others. Persons who own rice land or secondary crop land which they do not farm, and which is being farmed by persons other than their family (e. g. tenants, sharecroppers, squatters) must declare it. It is subject to expropriation. Title to it will be given to the tenant farmers, squatters, or sharecroppers now farming it, and the owners will be paid for it. <sup>1</sup>

---

1. For the legal requirements, see Article 5 Law No. 003/70, 26 March 1970; Article 6, Decree No. 072-SL/CCDD/PTNNN, 5 June 1970; Circular No.

Reasons for this Research: Several major agencies of the Government of Vietnam and the United States (the Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture, and Fisheries Development, the Ministry of Defense, the Office of the Associate Director for Land Reform (ADLR) of USAID, and CORDS, MACV) are concerned that the above provisions of the LTTT law might be causing military personnel who are on active duty to lose farm land they own or prevent them from applying for title to land they formerly rented or share-cropped because, being on fulltime active duty as soldiers, they are unable to farm now.

This research endeavors to learn the effects of LTTT on soldiers and officers on active duty with the regular Army of Vietnam (ARVN), the Regional Forces (RF), and the Popular Forces (PF) in MR 1,<sup>2</sup> and it endeavors to learn soldiers' attitudes toward LTTT.

- 
1. (cont'd) 7843-CCDD/HCTC3, 27 July 1970; and letters from the Minister of Land Reform, Agriculture, and Fisheries Development to Province Chiefs and Mayors, 19 June 1970 and to Province Chiefs, 25 June 1970, (available in English from ADLR, USAID in Land Reform Memos Nos. 17, 20, 22, and 23).
  - For the details of how tenants apply for title, how landowners declare their land and how land declarations are verified, see the Land to the Tiller Implementation Plan, p. 25 ff. in the English version, Annex 11 for "Form A" on which landowners must declare land to be retained, Annex 12 for "Form B" on which landowners must declare land to be transferred, and Annex 13 for Application for Title. (Available in English at ADLR, USAID.)
  2. Research has been done on the effects of LTTT on soldiers and officers of the ARVN, the RF, and the PF, and their attitudes towards LTTT in MR 4 and MR 3. These reports are available from ADLR, USAID in both English and Vietnamese.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

Respondents: 1,562 soldiers were sampled. 681 are ARVN soldiers from the 1st and 2nd ARVN Divisions and the 51st Regiment in MR 1. These are all of the major ARVN units in MR 1. 243 are RF soldiers and 638 are PF soldiers. All of the soldiers sampled were natives of MR 1 before they entered military service.

Of the 681 ARVN soldiers, 72% are enlisted men, 20% are NCO's and 8% are commissioned officers. Of the 243 RF soldiers, 3% are NCO's and 97% are enlisted men. Soldiers in the PF do not hold conventional military rank and none of them are commissioned officers.

60% of the ARVN, 79% of the RF, and 76% of the PF soldiers and officers sampled were farmers or farm laborers before military service. Of all military 69% had been farmers or farm laborers. Unlike MR 3 and MR 4, where more soldiers plan to work on farms after military service than had done so before, in MR 1, fewer soldiers plan to return to farming. 55% of the ARVN, 70% of RF and 72% of PF, or 64% of all military intend to farm or work farm land after they are demobilized.

Sampling Procedure: In Vietnam, 35% of all soldiers are in ARVN, 39% are in the PF, and 26% are in the RF. In the sample 43% are in ARVN, 41% are in the PF, and 16% are in the RF. The sample is proportional to actual PF strength, slightly higher than proportional to actual ARVN strength, and it is short on respondents from the RF. The sample of commissioned officers

is proportional to actual commissioned officer strength in ARVN.<sup>3</sup>

A self-administering questionnaire and instructions were developed, pretested on 63 RF and PF soldiers in Long An Province, modified, then used. The questionnaire was administered to ARVN soldiers and officers at military bases and training centers, and to RF and PF soldiers at training centers and village outposts in MR 1. It was administered to them in groups, by Vietnamese personnel of Control Data Corporation and members of the pacification research teams of CORDS, MR 1. No one was required to accept or complete the questionnaire. The procedure was to assemble a group, pass out the questionnaires, read the instructions, explain that all respondents would remain anonymous, answer any questions, and give them as much time as was needed to complete the questionnaire. The instructions and questionnaire are given in Appendix A.

Reliability: The instructions read to each group, the use of group-administered questionnaires rather than individual interviews, and the anonymity afforded by being in a group assured that all respondents were exposed to identical conditions, equally free to give their opinions and invoke their biases.

The ARVN field work was done in July 1971, and RF and PF field work was done in August 1971.

---

3. Sources: MACV J-1 and Territorial Forces Evaluation System (C), 31 July 1971; (CORDS/RAD).

It was planned that CORDS pacification teams would sample RF and PF soldiers at randomly selected units in every province of MR 1. 70 PF were sampled in Quang Ngai. At this point, however, because of the imminence of national elections, province pacification research teams ceased to be available. The other 92% of the RF and PF soldiers who became respondents were found at various training centers in MR 1. This field work was done by personnel of Control Data Corporation.

With the exception of two armored cavalry squadrons, all ARVN sampled are in infantry units. The army mixes up persons of different income groups, different civilian skills, and different social types, rearranges them in terms of military skills taught to them, and assigns them in terms of military needs. Individual characteristics and differences likely to distort findings in this type of inquiry (such as education, rank, occupation before military service, home town or home province, and land tenure status before military service) seem likely to be distributed randomly within each military service. The reliability of a sample this size (N=1,562) from a universe which itself mixes up types of persons and in which individual respondents were selected randomly or semi-randomly on the basis of chance availability, is very great.<sup>4</sup>

---

4. The reliability of the sample is shown by the following comparison. Of the respondents, 69% were or are farming or working on farm land. Of these (N=1,055):

- 79% grow or grew rice
- 16% grow or grew secondary crops subject to LTTT
- 2% grow or grew crops exempt from LTTT (sugar cane, tobacco, vegetables)
- 3% did not say

Of all hectareage under cultivation in MR 1:

- 80% is in rice
- 17% is in secondary crops subject to LTTT
- 3% is in industrial crops exempt from LTTT

(continued)

The Analysis and this Report: Larry Newberry and Henry C. Bush developed the research design. Vietnamese personnel of Control Data Corporation and the pacification research team of CORDS, Quang Ngai, did the field work. Roger V. Russell analyzed the results and wrote this report.

- 
4. (cont'd) (Source: "Cultivated Hectarage in Vietnam by Crops and Provinces (1967)", Research and Development Branch, Office of the Associate Director for Food and Agriculture [ADFA], USAID, based on statistics of the Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture, and Fisheries Development).

## RESULTS

Table 1

SOLDIERS WHO FARMED LAND, WORKED ON LAND, OR RENTED OUT  
LAND, AND THEIR PARENTS

	<u>Were or Are Farming or Working Land</u>	<u>Neither Are Nor Were Farming or Working Land</u>	<u>Did Not Say</u>	<u>Total</u>
ARVN soldiers (N=681)	60%	37%	3%	100%
Their parents	67%	27%	6%	100%
RF soldiers (N=243)	79%	20%	1%	100%
Their parents	85%	14%	1%	100%
PF soldiers (N=638)	76%	22%	2%	100%
Their parents	86%	13%	1%	100%
All soldiers (N=1,562)	69%	29%	2%	100%

Table 1 shows that:

1. Soldiers in MR I are predominantly rural. 60% of ARVN, 79% of RF, and 76% of PF are or were farmers.
2. The greater percentages of farmers in the RF and PF indicate that they are closer to the land than ARVN, which, until recent years, concentrated its recruiting in urban areas. The similarity in the proportions of farmers in the RF and PF indicates that they are recruited from the same elements of society.

3. Soldiers tend to do the same thing as their parents with regard to farming or not farming. In each branch, however, fewer soldiers than parents are farming. This reflects a nationwide, generational shift from agricultural areas to towns and cities.

Soldiers Who Were Farming or Working Land, and Their Crops: Soldiers who were farming or working land (N=1,055) were asked about the principal crop they grew. 79% of them grew rice, while 16% of them grew secondary crops such as corn or beans which, like rice, are subject to the Land to the Tiller law. Only 2% were engaged in cultivation of crops such as vegetables, pineapples, bananas, fruits, coconuts, sugar cane, and tobacco which are exempt from the Land to the Tiller program. 3% gave no response.

Table 2

## LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMING

<u>Percentage Who:</u>	<u>ARVN</u> <u>Soldiers</u> (N=432)	<u>RF</u> <u>Soldiers</u> (N=193)	<u>PF</u> <u>Soldiers</u> (N=487)	<u>All</u> <u>Military</u> (N=1,112)
Were or are tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or squatters	60%	52%	54%	56%
Were or are farm laborers	7%	19%	4%	8%
Owned some farm land and rented some	12%	3%	12%	10%
Owned the land they farmed	19%	25%	20%	21%
Were or are landlords	2%	1%	10%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2 shows that the greatest percentage (56%) of soldier-farmers were or are tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or squatters. The second largest group were owner/operators (21%). Landlords were the smallest group, comprising 5% of all soldier-farmers.<sup>5</sup>

---

5. Other studies validate the findings that few soldiers or officers are rural landlords. See: (1) Report of the Study of Living Standards: Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces: Army (by the Social Behavioral Division of the Combat Development & Test Center of the Ministry of Defense, Vietnam) 1,042 soldiers were interviewed in 1968. 2% stated they own some kind of income-producing property. Presumably some of the 2% own urban property, so less than 2% own and rent out land. (2) Small Landlords' Dependence on Rent Income in Vietnam (report to USAID/ADLR by Control Data Corporation, October 1970). Of 594 rural landlords interviewed in coastal provinces of Central Vietnam, 3% were found to be military personnel. See Table 4, p. 22. (3) A study recently completed by the Ministry of Defense indicates there are 2,691 persons who own farm land subject to transfer to others under LTTT, among more than 1,000,000 military personnel. (Cited in memorandum of conversation, 27 September 1971, by Will C. Muller, ADLR files, USAID).

Table 3

## LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS' PARENTS

<u>Percentage Who:</u>	<u>Parents of ARVN Soldiers (N=455)</u>	<u>Parents of RF Soldiers (N=207)</u>	<u>Parents of PF Soldiers (N=545)</u>	<u>Parents of All Military (N=1,207)</u>
Are tenant farmers, share-croppers, or squatters	49%	42%	48%	47%
Are farm laborers	7%	11%	5%	7%
Own some farm land and rent some	14%	7%	10%	11%
Own the land they farm	26%	37%	24%	27%
Are landlords	<u>4%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>8%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

One can see by comparing Table 2 with Table 3 that:

1. Land tenure of the soldier-farmer closely approximates that of his parents. As was the case with soldier-sons, the largest group of parents was tenant farmers, sharecroppers or squatters, and the second largest group was owner/operators.
2. Between generations there is a 9% decrease in landlords and owner/operators, and a 9% increase in tenant farmers, sharecroppers and squatters. The sons are poorer in land than their parents.
3. Landlords comprise the smallest category among parents of ARVN and parents of RF. Among parents of PF, however, the proportion more than triples compared to ARVN and RF; 13% are landlords.

Table 4

Question: "Who is now tilling the land you once tilled?"

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>ARVN</u> (N=412)	<u>RF</u> (N=194)	<u>PF</u> (N=498)	<u>All Military</u> (N=1,104)	
I am still tilling it.	10%	25%	17%	15%	61%
My wife and children	26%	33%	32%	30%	
My relatives	18%	11%	16%	16%	
My friends or neighbors	4%	2%	3%	3%	6%
Tenants	1%	2%	3%	2%	
Refugees or squatters	1%	1%	1%	1%	
No one. The land is not in use.	12%	15%	16%	15%	26%
I don't know.	15%	10%	7%	11%	
Other	4%	0%	2%	2%	
No response	<u>9%</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>5%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Table 4 shows that:

1. The land of most soldier-farmers (61%) is still being tilled by themselves, or their immediate family or relatives, and thus is not likely to be lost because of LTTT.
2. 6% could lose their land if the friends, neighbors, refugees, squatters or tenants now on it apply for title under LTTT. Given the strength of Vietnamese local intra-hamlet ties and personal ties of friendship,

it appears highly unlikely that friends or neighbors would apply for title to a soldier's land; refugees might, but would be likely to return to their previous homes;<sup>6</sup> while squatters and tenants probably would apply for title. Thus, not 6%, but less than 3% of these soldiers will probably lose their land to others.

3. 26% do not know who is tilling the land they once tilled, or say that no one is tilling it. This reflects the great insecurity in MR 1 which has caused large amounts of land to be closed off from farming.

What Soldiers Think of the Land to the Tiller Program: See Tables 5 and 6.

- 
6. E. g. in 1970, in interviews of 387 refugee families in Central Vietnam, 90% of whom had been farmers, all of whom have been refugees for more than 5 years, 86% said that when security permits they plan to return to their native villages. Only 18% said they would be willing to settle in any other village permanently. (Refugee Concern About Squatters on Their Former Land, report to Pacification Studies Group, CORDS, MACV, for ADLR, USAID, by Control Data Corporation, April 1970), p. 2.

Table 5

## SOLDIERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD LTTT

Question: "What is your opinion of the Land to the Tiller law?"

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>Those Who Are or Were Farming or Working on Land</u> (N=1, 005)	<u>Those Who Have Never Farmed or Worked on Land</u> (N=557)	<u>All Military</u> (N=1, 562)
I completely approve of the law.	70%	59%	66%
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions.	11%	11%	11%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law.	13%	20%	15%
I completely disapprove of this law.	2%	2%	2%
Other	1%	4%	2%
Did not say	<u>3%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 6

## SOLDIERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD LTTT: ARVN, RF AND PF COMPARED

Question: "What is your opinion of the Land to the Tiller Law?"

		<u>Completely Approve of this Law</u>	<u>Approve of this Law in General, but Disapprove of Some Provisions</u>	<u>Neither Approve nor Disapprove of this Law</u>	<u>Completely Disapprove of this Law</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Did Not Say</u>		
<u>Those who are or were farming or working on land</u>									
ARVN	(N=351)	66%	13%	10%	3%	2%	6%	=	100%
RF	(N=185)	78%	5%	15%	1%	0%	1%	=	100%
PF	(N=469)	70%	12%	13%	2%	1%	2%	=	100%
Soldiers of all 3 services who were or are farmers	(N=1,005)	70%	11%	13%	2%	1%	3%	=	100%
<u>Those who have never farmed or worked on land</u>									
ARVN	(N=330)	58%	12%	19%	1%	4%	6%	=	100%
RF	(N=58)	55%	19%	26%	0%	0%	0%	=	100%
PF	(N=169)	61%	6%	21%	3%	5%	4%	=	100%
Soldiers of all 3 services who have never been farmers	(N=557)	59%	11%	20%	2%	4%	4%	=	100%
<u>Total: all soldiers</u>	(N=1,562)	66%	11%	15%	2%	2%	4%	=	100%

Tables 5 and 6 show that:

1. Most soldiers (66%) completely approve of LTTT.
2. A greater percentage of soldier-farmers than soldiers who were not farmers approve of LTTT.
3. Among soldiers who were or are farming or working on land, more RF than ARVN or PF owned the land they farmed. Also more RF were farm laborers. More are still farming their land, either by themselves, or their wives or relatives. RF who were or are farming show the highest percentage of complete approval of LTTT. RF who were not farming show the lowest percentage of complete approval of LTTT and among non-farmers, more RF than soldiers in other services qualify their approval (i. e. approve of LTTT but with reservations).

In MR 1 the RF are like the PF in MR 3 and MR 4 with respect to LTTT. The PF, in MR 1 as in MR 3 and MR 4, are closer to the land. A member of the PF is almost by definition a man who chose the PF because he did not want to leave his village. RF, on the other hand, are used anywhere in the province, may be based anywhere in the province, and are sometimes used to support ARVN outside the province. The PF stays in the village. This means members of the PF, in matters of land, are closer to the village government; the Village Land Reform Committee, have access to details of land transfers and rentals in the village, and can be presumed to be better informed than the RF on matters concerning land in their particular villages. The PF are closer to the land. In MR 3 and MR 4 the PF are the most land-poor of the

services, and the most pro-LTTT among military services. In MR 1 where the amount of farm land is inadequate, where most farming is sub-subsistence and where most soldiers in all military services are land-poor, the RF, not the PF, is the most land poor among the services. Apparently closeness to the village and residence constantly in the village are factors in this near zero-sum game of who gets what in farmland-starved coastal Vietnam. The following shows that the RF are poorer in land tenure than the PF in MR 1:

Stages of land tenure and land status from the lowest to the highest

	Farm Laborer	Tenant or Sharecropper	Owning some and renting some	Owner-Operator	Landlord	Total
RF	19%	52%	3%	25%	1%	100%
PF	4%	54%	12%	20%	10%	100%

In land-starved coastal Central Vietnam the really poor in money and status are landless farm laborers. Tenancy is not looked down on. Farm tenants are considered village middle class. Note that:

81% of RF were tenants, sharecroppers, farmers who owned some land and rented some, owner-operators, or landlords.

96% of the PF were.

29% of the RF owned some farm land and rented some, or were owner-operators, or landlords.

42% of the PF were.

26% of the RF owned the land they farmed, or were landlords.

30% of the PF were.

The RF among military services are the poorest in land in MR 1. And like the poorest in land in land-rich MR 3 and MR 4, more of them completely approve of the Land to the Tiller program.

Those who are poorest in land are likely to also be the poorest in other respects in a land-short region which is primarily agricultural and which does not and cannot produce enough food to feed its inhabitants, as is true of MR 1. Among the poorest in land tenure, the RF, those RF who were not farming or working on land before military service are the least likely to "make it" to land ownership, or even to tenancy from which, by LTTT, to progress to land ownership. Not surprisingly, those RF who were not farmers or working on land before military service in MR 1, like those PF who were not farmers or working on land before military service in MR 3 and MR 4, are the least pro-LTTT. More of the RF who never farmed than of PF or ARVN are indifferent to LTTT. More are for it, but disapprove of some of its provisions.

4. In all branches, a negligible percentage (2%) completely disapprove of LTTT.

The soldiers were asked why they approve or disapprove of LTTT. Examples of their reasons follow:

Complete Approval of LTTT:

by ARVN'

This law is very just and suitable to the poor people's aspiration. We welcome President Thieu, for declaring this law.

This law is a social revolution in Vietnam.

I see that the farming is a main profession of Central Vietnamese people, therefore I decided to practice it. I fully approve of this law.

I agree with the LTTT law because:

\* I am a farmer.

\* I am a proletarian, this law will bring in a better life to me.

Because the tenants will own the land which they are tilling. For landlords who can not directly cultivate they will be paid satisfactorily by the GVN; with that money they can do trading.

I approve of it because I'm poor, I'm a refugee and I was oppressed by landowners.

This law is considered as an agricultural revolution of RVN II.

Because of the war, I don't farm, but I've heard that the LTTT law is suitable to farmers.

The LTTT law brings in a better life to farmers, simultaneously the expropriated landlords will not lose their interest as under the Land Reform policy of the Communists, or the land reform program ordinance #57 in which the tiller paid for the land distributed.

I have the above idea because under this law the government supports farmers on both the spiritual and material side.

The LTTT law is very suitable to the majority of Vietnamese farmers. 75% of Vietnam is poor, was dominated from many years ago by foreigners, thus the landowners class got all farming land, consequently the majority of farmers had to work as tenant farmers only.

The LTTT law makes farmers own farming land and landowners will receive some money paid by the government for the land compensation. This law is against the land reform policy of communism, it lets the farmers obtain everything of which they were exploited, no more paying to landowners!!

I have the above opinion because:

- \* The LTTT law helps farmers own farming land, preventing them from being sweated by landowners.
- \* Normalize the life of poor farmers.
- \* Help farmers to increase the productivity ...
- \* No more abandoned land.

by RF

By instruction of the agrarian cadre I understand well this law. I believe and approve of this law, because it helps farmers have land for tilling.

This law is very reasonable, it flattens all injustice, there is no discrimination between the rich and the poor, we will have a better life and our country will be more prosperous.

I completely approve of the LTTT law because it makes sharecroppers formerly now own farming land. Also I hope the government will provide me with a plot of land to grow some secondary crops after discharge from the military service.

by PF

Under the LTTT law, the Vietnamese people will have a new, better life, suppressing the bully problem from many years ago:

I approve of the LTTT law and I hope the government will provide a tractor such as Kubota to every farmer. That's the thing I would like.

I see the law may help the poor people, while the landowners may exploit industry.

I think the law brings prosperity to many farmers who so far must work as tenants. The institution of this law is a concern of the government with regard to the farmers. It is regrettable that this space is too narrow which doesn't allow me to say all I know about the LTTT law.

I approve of the LTTT law because it helps the poor people, but in my opinion I worked in fishing, I like the government to help the fishing worker buy some boat engines.

I approve of the law because giving land to the poor people is also profitable a great deal to the society - on the contrary, the plantation cannot be preserved if handed down to descendants of the landlords.

Approval of the LTTT Law in General, but Disapproval of Some of its Parts:

by ARVN.

The law is helpful in general, but it's not suitable with some regions as in Central Vietnam, e. g. there is a little land with many people and the compensation of the government to landowners paid by bonds is not adequate.

Because LTTT is lacking good will, (and this is a general deficiency in the society), thus one pays attention only to the exterior form.

I approve but in my village, lands are distributed to those who already have it and not to landless people? This makes the wealthy people richer!!

I don't agree with the law implementation, it isn't applied seriously, there is some corruption among village chiefs and district chiefs. I approve because it helps a little the tenant farmers.

I approve of this law because it is equalizing the land among farmers and landlords. But I disapprove of the GVN dispossessing land of the landlords who have little land, but cannot cultivate because of security.

Because I see many cases of claims addressed to the government in newspapers everyday. Besides it is the first step, deficiencies cannot be avoided, but in general the LTTT law is a progressive accomplishment.

I approve very much of the law. In my village the process is different from the government policy. I have 10 hectares of land which will not be lost if I have a sum of money. This is a form of bribery.

I have the above idea because I see that the LTTT law is appropriate to South Vietnam, but in Central Vietnam the farmers don't profit much from it.

My family doesn't possess land and I have to rent land from landowners, I view that the LTTT law is to help the landless families, but it also causes damages to landowners whose land is expropriated.

According to this law, the landowners who have to join the army, will lose their land. I am expecting that the GVN will have a program for helping these people.

Land to the Tiller law is already promulgated, but in Quang Ngai farmers are not provided land yet!!

I have a little land, I cannot cultivate it directly because I have to join the army. According to this law, I lose my land. I don't want to receive money. I would like to ask "shall I get back my land when I am released from the army?"

by RF

Thanks to the promulgation of the LTTT law, some tenant farmers have a better life because they get some more land, but simultaneously, at some places there are some disagreements between landlords and tenant farmers because they didn't understand the LTTT law. But in my case, I understood the law.

I approve of the law in general, but disapprove of some of its sections as:

- \* The expropriation of heritage land when the son has to serve in the army.
- \* The case of old men who can't farm so they hire some farmers to cultivate their land for subsistence, now that land is expropriated, they're very unhappy.

The law is very helpful to the poor and landless people. It is a fair law. But some authorities have taken advantage of this law by providing good land to their relatives, and some landowners are not satisfactorily compensated.

by PF

I approve of the LTTT law because it makes poor people own farming land, but I disapprove of it because that law has not been applied yet at the Central Vietnam.

I approve of the law in the sense that the government buys the land of rich owners to distribute to the poor people. But I don't agree with the point that the land inherited from their ancestors by the soldiers who cannot till it, and must give to a sharecropper, is bought by the government and allocated to the latter.

The question #13 has some points I don't agree with. The law says that only those who till the land directly can have it. As to soldiers and civil servants they will not be allocated any land; if so, how can their wives and children live in their village?

I need the LTTT law, but at my native village, I don't see any implementation of the law. I request the government take care of the implementation of this law at my village.

I agree with some points of the law, others I don't. As a military man, I have heard of it, but have not studied it yet, or been instructed by anyone. I only know this law, but not its policy and details. For example, does the government expropriate my land? If documents were available, I would study them further.

I've a question, that is, my family with three sons went to the army (myself and two brothers). My mother is old, my father is dead. Now can I rent my land out or will the government expropriate it?

Disapproval of LTTT:

by ARVN

I have the above idea because my parents are fishermen. In the past time, they had land and permitted another to live on it for a certain period. Now he uses the LTTT law to refuse to turn back this land to my parents.

I don't approve because the government has promulgated the LTTT law, but actually in my native village its implementation is not what the radio and press have said.

Before I entered the Army, my wife and I had 4 hectares of land, just enough to make a living, and during the time I served in the Army, the LTTT law was published by the government. Now only my wife tills this land, as if it was given to a tenant, it would be lost under this law. Hence, my wife endeavors to cultivate all the land to retain it, and the result obtained is quite small.

I don't approve of the LTTT law because actually I don't have the manpower to cultivate it. I must wait for my son to grow up to keep on tilling. I have an old mother! If I sell to the government as land expropriated for allocation to tenants, the price is so cheap that it cannot constitute a sufficient amount of funds for change of profession. Alas!! Some years later, when my son grows up, and I will be discharged from the Army, what can I do with such small money while I have to bring up many children? My situation will be made critical by poverty, and this would be avoidable if my land were not expropriated.

I disapprove because the LTTT law creates many contradictions between landowners and tenants. If I agree with the law, I will lose my land.

by RF

I approve of the LTTT law, but I've a question, i. e. do I lose my rented out land, because I have to serve in the army? (My wife and children have not enough ability to cultivate that land.)

I have 2 hectares of land, I cannot cultivate it, so I rent it to somebody else. It is not fair if the GVN buys and gives it to poor people.

by PF

Even though I am not a farmer, I don't approve of the LTTT law because the effect of this law is dispossessing the ownership of landlords and an inadequate compensation will make the economic structure become bad.

Only the farmers profit by this law, but the landowners suffer much loss.

Table 7

## WHY SOLDIERS ARE FOR OR AGAINST LTTT

<u>Reasons:</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Approving</u>		
LTTT helps the poor.	286	26%
LTTT helps the farmers.	259	23%
LTTT promotes social justice and equality.	203	18%
LTTT benefits the respondent.	70	6%
LTTT brings prosperity to the people.	64	6%
LTTT will make South Vietnam economically and politically strong.	53	5%
Total	<u>935</u>	<u>84%</u>
<u>Disapproving of all or part</u>		
LTTT implementation is slow or corrupt.	43	4%
LTTT discriminates against soldiers.	42	4%
LTTT is harmful to respondent.	40	4%
LTTT is slow to compensate and unfair to landlords.	22	2%
LTTT discriminates against landless laborers and refugees.	21	2%
Total	<u>168</u>	<u>16%</u>
<u>Total Approvals and Disapprovals</u>	<u>1,103</u>	<u>100%</u>

As Table 7 shows, 84% of the soldiers' responses were in favor of LTTT, while 16% were opposed -- exactly the same as in MR 3.<sup>7</sup> Most favor LTTT because it will help the poor, will better the farmers as a class, or will promote social justice. Many also say that it will benefit them personally, or will help to make Vietnam strong. Of those who disapprove of all or part of LTTT, the most common reasons were that LTTT implementation is slow or corrupt, that LTTT discriminates against soldiers, or that LTTT harms the respondent. Some also pointed out that LTTT gives land to those who already have it, but does nothing to help the large class of poor landless laborers in Central Vietnam. Most based their opinions of LTTT on notions of fairness or on pragmatic assessment of its effect on them or their social class. Although very few show awareness of the political or ideological effects that LTTT might have in the struggle against the Viet Cong, most say it will help the poor and will reduce social injustices and inequality. These are, ideologically, what the war is about to the little man.

---

7. See Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 3 of Vietnam, (report to ADLR/USAID by Control Data Corporation, November 1971) Table 7.

Table 8

## OFFICERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD LTTT COMPARED TO SOLDIERS' ATTITUDES

Question: "What is your opinion of the Land to the Tiller law?"

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>ARVN &amp; RF Commissioned Officers (N=52)</u>	<u>ARVN &amp; RF Privates (N=725)</u>
I completely approve of the law.	54%	64%
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions.	27%	9%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law.	13%	17%
I completely disapprove of this law.	0%	3%
Other	6%	2%
Did not say	<u>0%</u>	<u>5%</u>
Total	100%	100%

The reader is reminded that the sample includes privates, noncommissioned officers, and commissioned officers. The reader is also reminded that up to this point we have used the word "soldiers" to mean all military personnel. In this table and in the following conclusions, we contrast commissioned officers' attitudes toward LTTT to those of ordinary soldiers (from Privates up to Corporal 1) and exclude noncommissioned officers (sergeants and senior sergeants). We do this for two reasons: (1) it enables us to contrast military personnel at the extremes of military and social rank, education, and work. Also (2) noncommissioned officers in the armed forces of Vietnam are usually persons who have served 8 or more years in the military. Unlike most

commissioned officers of company rank and most privates, most of them are career soldiers ("lifers"), rather than civilians serving in uniform. The respondents represented in this table were taken only from ARVN and the RF. None of the PF are commissioned officers. All of the officers are of company grade.

It is evident from Table 8 that:

1. Most military personnel, officers and soldiers, completely approve of the Land to the Tiller program.
2. Three times as many officers as enlisted men (as percentages of different wholes) disapprove of certain provisions of the law.
3. 10% more enlisted men than officers (i. e. more of those from the lower strata of society) approve completely of LTTT.
4. Almost all of the officers found in the sample are of the rank of captain or lower, and thus, like almost all privates, are poor. However, 70% of the officers are urban, while 30% are rural. Among the enlisted men, the percentages are reversed; 30% are urban and 70% rural.
5. The other main differences between officers and enlisted men are found in education (secondary schooling or more for officers compared to primary schooling or less for enlisted men); and in occupation (white collar work, desk work, and supervisory work for officers, compared to labor or manual work for privates).

Given the makeup of the sample and the data in Table 8, it may be inferred that:

1. LTTT does not divide officers and ordinary soldiers within the military services.
2. LTTT does not divide city people from farmers.
3. Most persons, regardless of class, occupation, education or location, are for LTTT.

Soldiers, and Their Families, and What They Have Done About Their Land:

See Tables 9, 10, and 11.

Table 9

## ALL SOLDIERS, AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ABOUT THEIR LAND

<u>What they Think of LTTT:</u>	<u>Filed for Title</u>	<u>Filed Form A to Retain Land</u>	<u>Filed Form B for Comp- ensation</u>	<u>LTTT Has Had No Effect</u>	<u>Other Responses (Ex-tenants, Ex- Farm Laborers)</u>	<u>Total</u>	
I completely approve of this law. (N=1,201)	6%	13%	3%	65%	13%	100%	92% of the soldiers
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions. (N=167)	8%	24%	4%	41%	23%	100%	
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law. (N=249)	5%	10%	2%	75%	8%	100%	
I completely disapprove of this law. (N=34)	18%	18%	3%	38%	23%	100%	8% of the soldiers
Other (N=30)	0%	3%	3%	30%	64%	100%	
Did not say (N=61)	5%	3%	0%	31%	61%	100%	
All soldiers of all categories of approval or disapproval (N=1,562)	7%	13%	3%	61%	16%	100%	
<u>Percentage in each military service:</u>							
ARVN (N=681)	5%	11%	3%	56%	25%	100%	
RF (N=243)	6%	19%	2%	67%	6%	100%	
PF (N=638)	8%	13%	4%	64%	11%	100%	
All soldiers (N=1,562)							

Table 10

ALL SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES, WHO ARE FOR OR AGAINST LTTT,  
AND WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ABOUT THEIR LAND

<u>Effects of LTTT:</u>	<u>Completely Approve of this Law</u>	<u>Approve of this Law in General, but Disapprove of Some Provisions</u>	<u>Neither Approve nor Disapprove of this Law</u>	<u>Completely Disapprove of this Law</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Did Not Say</u>	<u>Total</u>
LTTT has had no effect on him. (N=957)	69%	7%	20%	1%	1%	2%	100%
Filed for title. (N=100)	66%	13%	12%	6%	0%	3%	100%
Filed Form A to retain land. (N=204)	64%	19%	12%	3%	1%	1%	100%
Filed Form B for compensation for land. (N=46)	72%	15%	9%	2%	2%	0%	100%
Other responses (ex-tenants, ex-farm laborers) (N=255)	51%	15%	8%	3%	8%	15%	100%
All soldiers of all categories of effect (N=1,562)	66%	11%	15%	2%	2%	4%	100%

Table 11

LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMERS AND  
WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ABOUT THEIR LAND \*

<u>Percentage who:</u>	<u>LTTT Has Had No Effect</u>	<u>Filed Form A to Retain Land</u>	<u>Filed Form B for Compensation</u>	<u>Filed for Title</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>No Response</u>		
Owned the land they farmed (N=235)	57%	22%	3%	5%	5%	8%	=	100%
Owned some farm land and rented some (N=115)	52%	21%	10%	4%	3%	10%	=	100%
Were tenants, sharecroppers, or squatters (N=585)	61%	13%	2%	11%	4%	9%	=	100%
Were or are landlords (N=59)	58%	25%	7%	5%	2%	3%	=	100%
<u>Total</u> (N=994)								

\* Please note that soldiers who were former farm laborers and are not entitled to file have been excluded from this table.

Tables 9, 10, and 11 show that:

1. More than half of all soldiers in MR 1 say that they are not affected by LTTT. Only 7% of the sample report they filed for title even though 40% are tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or squatters. More than half of the owner-operators, owner-tenants, and landlords did nothing, although technically every owner of rice or secondary crop land is required to register his land.
2. 61% of the soldiers who were or are tenants, sharecroppers or squatters did nothing. Only 11% of them filed for title. This contrasts markedly with soldiers in MR 3, where three times the percentage filed for title.<sup>8</sup> Among those few who did file for title, (N=100), a majority (66%) approve completely of LTTT. Nevertheless, this is strikingly low compared to MR 4, where 95% of those who filed for title approve completely of LTTT, and MR 3, where 86% do.<sup>9</sup>

In addition, 6% of those who filed for title disapprove completely of LTTT. In MR 3 and MR 4 no one who has filed for title disapproves of the program. This suggests that many of those who have tried to

---

8. Source: Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 3 of Vietnam, (report to USAID/ADLR by Control Data Corporation, November 1971) p. 36.

9. See Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 4 of Vietnam, (report to USAID/ADLR by Control Data Corporation, August 1971) Table 7, and Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 3 of Vietnam, (the same source, November 1971) Table 10.

obtain title in MR 1 have not succeeded. This reflects a consensus from a variety of sources that LTTT in MR 1, so far, is very limited or merely token. A total of 40 reports on provinces and villages in Central Vietnam, consisting of surveys of villages by research cadre, field reports by land reform advisors, discussions with province and village officials, and conferences of advisors to MR 1 and coastal MR 2, show that in most villages in Central Vietnam LTTT is not being implemented because much land is closed off to farming by insecurity, landlords oppose it, many tenants and sharecroppers are unwilling or afraid to apply for title, and most village officials are unwilling or unable to enforce the law, encourage applicants, and distribute tenanted or sharecropped land. The statistics of the Directorate-General of Land Affairs also show that LTTT implementation in Central Vietnam is thus far small in scale.<sup>10</sup> District senior advisors report that it is going well in only about 13-15% of the villages in MR 1.<sup>11</sup>

In addition, as shown in Table 7, the most frequent reason for disapproval given by soldiers is that LTTT implementation is slow or corrupt.

3. The percentage of approval is the lowest (51%) in the "Other" category. This comprises primarily ex-tenants, ex-farm laborers, and refugees: in other words, those who stand to gain nothing under LTTT.

---

10. The reports are on file in CDC, P&R, ADLR/USAID and also in ADLR/USAID central files.

11. "LTTT Implementation, Land Disputes, and Land Out of Use, as Indicated by HES Village Quarterly Updates, 31 March, 30 June and 30 September, 1971", (report to ADLR/USAID by Control Data Corp, Nov. 1971) Tables 3, 4 & p. 10.

4. 25% of the landlords filed Form A's to retain their land. A Form A can be filed only by someone who is still working his land, i. e. an owner-operator, not a landlord. However, the distinctions between landlord, tenant and owner-operator are not so well defined in MR 1 as they are in MR 3 and MR 4. In practice, sharecropper or tenant status sometimes shades into farm laborer status, and the landlords' functions sometimes include actual management. Nevertheless, probably many of these Form A's are illegal or in error.

Soldiers in MR 1 and What they Did, or Should have Done under LTTT:

1. 44% of the sample did, or should have done, something under LTTT.

Of this number (N=684):

10% filed Form A's.

3% filed Form B's.

7% filed for title.

11% filed Form A's most of which are probably false.

0% filed false Form B's.

2% filed falsely for title.

18% were tenants who should have filed for title, but did not.

16% were squatters or sharecroppers who should have filed for title, but did not.

5% were landlords who should have filed Form B's, but did not.

28% were owner-operators or owner-tenants who should have filed Form A's, but did not.

---

100%

2. 56% of the sample correctly did nothing under LTTT.

12

SOLDIERS IN MR 1, MR 3, AND MR 4 COMPARED

Table 1

## SOLDIERS WHO FARMED LAND, WORKED LAND, OR RENTED OUT LAND

	<u>Were or Are Farming or Working Land</u>	<u>Neither Are nor Were Farming or Working Land</u>	<u>Did Not Say</u>	<u>Total</u>
All soldiers in MR 1 (N=1,562)	69%	29%	2%	100%
All soldiers in MR 3 (N=1,201)	32%	68%	0%	100%
All soldiers in MR 4 (N=1,003)	62%	36%	2%	100%

Table 1 shows that both MR 1 and MR 4 are preponderantly rural, while MR 3 is heavily urban.

Table 2

## LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMING

<u>Percentage Who:</u>	<u>All Soldiers in MR 1 (N=1,112)</u>	<u>All Soldiers in MR 3 (N=380)</u>	<u>All Soldiers in MR 4 (N=622)</u>
Were or are tenant farmers, sharecroppers or squatters.	65%	47%	59%
Were or are farm laborers.	8%	13%	11%
Owned some farm land and rented some.	10%	7%	5%
Owned the land they farmed.	21%	32%	22%
Were or are landlords.	<u>5%</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 3

## LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS' PARENTS

<u>Percentage who:</u>	Parents of All Military in MR 1 (N=1,207)	Parents of All Military in MR 3 (N=557)	Parents of All Military in MR 4 (N=664)
Are tenant farmers, share-croppers, or squatters.	47%	37%	53%
Are farm laborers.	7%	16%	10%
Own some farm land and rent some.	11%	8%	10%
Own the land they farm.	27%	36%	24%
Are landlords.	<u>8%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

Comparing Table 2 with Table 3, it is evident that more parents are landlords or own the land they farm than are sons, and more sons are tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or squatters than are parents. Thus, in MR's 1, 3, and 4 soldier-sons are poorer in land than are their parents.

- 
12. Source for the above comparisons: Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 4 of Vietnam, and Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 3 of Vietnam, (reports to USAID/ADLR by Control Data Corporation, August and November 1971 respectively).

Table 4

Question: "Who is now tilling the land you once tilled?"

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>All Military in MR 1 (N=1,104)</u>	<u>All Military in MR 3 (N=380)</u>	<u>All Military in MR 4 (N=622)</u>
I am still tilling it.	15%	9%	35%
My wife and children	30% 61%	38% 64%	22% 66%
My relatives	16%	17%	9%
My friends or neighbors	3%	2%	4%
Tenants	2% 6%	3% 7%	8% 13%
Refugees or squatters	1%	2%	1%
No one. The land is not in use.	15% 26%	8% 21%	3% 11%
I don't know.	11%	13%	8%
Other	2%	8%	7%
No response	5%	0%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 4 shows that:

1. The land of most soldier-farmers (61% in MR 1, 64% in MR 3, and 66% in MR 4) is still being tilled by themselves, or their immediate family or relatives, and thus is not likely to be lost because of LTTT.
2. It is unlikely that friends or neighbors would apply for title to a soldier's land; refugees might, but would be more likely to return

to their previous homes<sup>13</sup>, while squatters and tenants probably would apply for title. Thus, 3% in MR 1, 5% in MR 3, and 9% in MR 4 will probably lose their land.

3. 26% in MR 1 say their land is not in use, or they don't know who is tilling it. This is considerably higher than MR 3 (21%), or MR 4 (11%) and reflects the greater insecurity in MR 1, where large amounts of land have been abandoned because of lack of security.

---

13. Source: Refugee Concern About Squatters on Their Former Land, (report to Pacification Studies Group, CORDS, MACV, for ADLR/USAID by Control Data Corporation, April 1970) p. 2.



Table 5 shows that:

1. A majority in all three military regions completely approve of LTTT. Approval is greatest in MR 4, where implementation of the law is most extensive.
2. A majority of farmers and non-farmers in all three regions approve completely of LTTT. In all three regions, more farmers than non-farmers completely approve of LTTT, while more non-farmers are neutral toward LTTT than are farmers. This indicates that LTTT is thought to be beneficial by those whom it affects.
3. A negligible percentage in all three regions are completely opposed to LTTT.

Table 6

SOLDIERS AND RETURN TO THE LAND

	<u>MR 1</u> (N=1,562)	<u>MR 3</u> (N=1,201)	<u>MR 4</u> (N=1,003)
Soldiers who were farmers before entering military service.	69%	32%	62%
Soldiers who intend to farm after release from military service.	64%	40%	67%

Table 6 shows that in the two regions of Southern Vietnam, more soldiers want to be farmers after they are released from military service than were farmers before entering military service. In Central Vietnam the opposite is the case; fewer soldiers intend to return to the land than were farmers before entering military service.

Most soldiers are poor. Most soldiers were poor before they became soldiers. The following differences in regional characteristics probably explain why in MR 1 less want to return to farming after the war than came from it, and in MR 3 and MR 4, more want to farm after the war than were farming before military service:

In MR 3 and MR 4:

Farm land is relatively abundant and fertile. The regions are relatively secure. Land to the Tiller is working well, and thousands of tenant farmers in both regions have become owners of their farm land. There are visible possibilities of economic success in farming. There is also, particularly in MR 3, disillusionment with urbanization and urban life.<sup>14</sup>

In MR 1:

Farm land is poor, and scarce. There are too many farming too little land. The region is relatively insecure. Land to the Tiller is not yet working well; as yet it has only transferred title to farm land to a small number of tenants or sharecroppers in a few villages. Farming is a sub-subsistence activity on tiny plots and there are few possibilities of economic success by means of farming. Local urban areas (Da Nang, Tam Ky, Qui Nhon of northern MR 2 --

---

14. Interviews with urban Vietnamese workers at Long Binh and Bien Hoa show that Vietnamese workers for American firms are disillusioned by (1) the high costs of food, housing and other goods and services in highly urban areas, (2) the impersonality of work for fixed salaries, and (3) the lack of personal relationship with their employers. They are unhappy, they think they are underpaid, and they save nothing. (Local Survey Detachment Report, "The Problems of the Vietnamese Workers at Long Binh Post and Bien Hoa," 28 November 1969, CORDS. FOUO.)

to which the lower provinces of MR 1 are economically linked) have probably provided some, perhaps many, with limited experience with urban work and incomes without the apparently disillusioning experience of migration to the great metropolitan area of Saigon-Cholon-urban Gia Dinh-urban Bien Hoa.<sup>15</sup>

Also migration of the poor to the urban areas of Southern Vietnam, particularly to Saigon-Cholon-urban Gia Dinh, has for some time been a habit of Central Vietnamese.<sup>16</sup>

---

15. V. L. Elliott, "The Economics of Central Vietnam", April 1970 (ADEPP, USAID files).

16. It is remarked by urban Vietnamese families that since 1960 or so almost all domestic servants for hire at Vietnamese wages are from Central Vietnam. It is remarked by some labor union leaders that since the beginning of the war boom in about 1965 a large influx of apprentices, would-be apprentices, and laborers is mainly from Central Vietnam.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. A majority of soldiers in MR 1, 66%, completely approve of the Land to the Tiller program. 11% more approve of LTTT in general, but disapprove of some parts of the program.

Among soldiers who were or are farmers, 70% completely approve.

Among soldiers who were not farmers before military service and thus have no expectation of benefits, 59% completely approve of the program.

Most soldiers (69%) were farmers before entering the military.

Most favor LTTT because it will help the poor, will better the farmers as a class, or will promote social justice. Many also say that it will benefit them personally, or will make Vietnam strong. Of those who disapprove of all or part of LTTT, the most common reasons are that LTTT implementation is slow or corrupt, that LTTT discriminates against soldiers, or that LTTT harms the respondent personally.

Only 2% completely disapprove of LTTT.

2. Of the 69% of the soldiers who are or were farmers, some 56% were or are tenant farmers, sharecroppers or squatters, and thus stand to benefit from LTTT.

3. 61% of those who were farming are still tilling their land, either themselves or via their wives and children or close relatives, and thus will not lose their land due to LTTT. Only 3% of soldiers who were farmers say that their land is now being tilled by tenants, refugees, or squatters, and of this number many refugees will eventually return to their home villages; therefore, somewhat less than 3% of soldier-farmers will lose their land under LTTT.
4. LTTT has failed to affect a majority of those who come under the law. 66% of those entitled to apply for or obliged to declare their land have not done so. Most do not say why they have done nothing about their land under LTTT. Some indicate that LTTT is not being properly implemented at the local level. A few indicate fear of possible landlord reaction if they do apply. Others state they think the law is fine for Southern Vietnam, but that it is not suitable to Central Vietnam. The inference is that until more official emphasis is placed on LTTT so that it can become an effective, operating program in Central Vietnam, landlords, tenants and sharecroppers will be unwilling to act on it.
5. The soldier sons who were or are farming or working on land are poorer in land than their parents.
6. Few soldiers who are or were farmers (5%) or their parents (8%) are landlords; nevertheless this percentage is higher than in Southern Vietnam, where only 1% of soldiers and 3% of their parents are landlords.
7. 66% of the soldiers who will benefit or who have benefited from LTTT

(i. e. those who or whose families have filed for title to land they farm)

approve completely of LTTT. This figure is strikingly lower than in MR 4 where 95% of those who filed for title approve completely of LTTT; and in MR 3 where 86% do. This indicates serious doubts about LTTT on the part of those who would be expected to be enthusiastic supporters.

8. 69% of the soldiers not affected by LTTT approve completely of the law.
9. 64% of soldiers who own the land they used to farm and who have or whose families have filed Form A's to retain it approve of LTTT.
10. Almost no soldiers (only 2 out of 1,562) oppose LTTT because it might distribute farm land to ex Viet Cong or Viet Cong sympathizers at the expense of citizens loyal to the GVN.
11. LTTT does not divide officers from enlisted men. A majority of both officers and enlisted men approve completely of LTTT. The same was found true of officers and enlisted men in MR 3.

In sum, LTTT does not divide soldiers from civilians nor antagonize soldiers in MR 1. Most soldiers approve of the law and the program. It has symbolic appeal. However, few who are entitled to benefit from LTTT are taking advantage of it. Consequently it is not yet affecting land tenure much among the soldiers in MR 1, just as it is not effecting much change in land tenure among civilians in MR 1.

## APPENDIX A

## INSTRUCTIONS TO BE READ TO THE ASSEMBLED RESPONDENTS

The Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture, and Fisheries Development has begun a study to find out what Vietnamese soldiers like or dislike about the Land to the Tiller Law. To get this information, we are asking soldiers to answer 14 questions on a questionnaire we will give to you. You do not have to answer these questions, and, if you do not wish to answer, you may be excused. If you do agree to help us by answering these questions, we would be grateful for your cooperation.

If you agree to complete the questionnaire, your answers will be anonymous. Please do not write your name on the questionnaire. After you complete the questionnaire, and return it to us, it will be placed in a stack with many others. Then no one will know which man wrote which questionnaire. Since no one will be able to identify you, you should feel free to give your honest opinions and answers. Only your own personal opinions are important. There are no "right answers" or "wrong answers" -- only your answers.

The Government of Vietnam needs to know what the people like or dislike so laws can be made that meet the needs and wishes of the people. You can assist your government by answering the questions we are going to give to you.

(PASS OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRES AT THIS POINT.)

When you receive your questionnaire, please look it over. You will see the questions are not very difficult to answer. For most questions, all you have to do is write an "X" in front of the answer that is closest to your personal opinion. For a few questions, you will need to write only one or two words. Only one question requires more than a few words to answer. However, anytime you feel like saying more than is contained in the answers that are provided, please feel free to write your opinions next to that questions, or on the back of the questionnaire.

All you have to do is read the question, then either write down your answer, or find the answer that comes the closest to the way you feel and write an "X" in front of it. If you have any difficulty, you may ask questions at any time. You may take all the time you need to answer the questions. The questions will be easier to answer if you start with question number one, then answer every succeeding question as it appears on each page. When you have finished, please look over each page to make sure you did not forget to answer any of the questions. Then bring it up here and put the completed questionnaire right here.

(SHOW THEM WHERE TO PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES.)

## APPENDIX A (cont'd)

As soon as you have answered all the questions and have returned the questionnaire, you are free to leave. Anyone who does not wish to complete the questionnaire may leave at this time. Please do not take the blank questionnaires with you.

(WAIT UNTIL THESE PEOPLE HAVE LEFT, THEN ASK THE REMAINING PEOPLE TO BEGIN ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS. AS EACH MAN RETURNS THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE, THANK HIM POLITELY FOR HIS COOPERATION.)

## APPENDIX A (cont'd.)

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

1. Where is your military unit stationed now? (To answer this question, you are merely to write down in the space provided below the name of the province in which your unit is now stationed.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Province

2. In what province is your home located? (To answer this question, you are merely to write down in the space provided below the name of the province you consider to be your home province.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Your home province

3. What branch of armed forces are you serving now? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that indicates correctly the branch of service you are now serving.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a) ARVN  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b) Regional Forces  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c) Popular Forces

4. What is your present rank? (Same as question 3 above, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that indicates correctly your present rank. NOTE: In case you are a member of the Popular Forces, please write down in "d" below the name of your present position title.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a) Enlisted man (from Private up to Corporal I)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b) Noncommissioned officer (from Sergeant up to Senior Sergeant I)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c) Officer (from Aspirant and higher)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d) PF position title: \_\_\_\_\_

5. What was your occupation before you entered military service? (To answer this question, please write down in the space provided below the name of the occupation you had done before you entered military service.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Pre-service occupation

6. What occupation do you intend to do after you are released from the military service? (Same as question 5 above, please write down in the space provided below the name of the occupation you intend to do after you are released from military service.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Post-service occupation

## APPENDIX A (cont'd.) ..

7. If you had performed farm work before you entered military service, were you one of the following? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that best describes the circle you belong to.)
- a) Owner-operator
  - b) Owner-tenant
  - c) Tenant
  - d) Refugee squatter
  - e) Sharecropper
  - f) Farm laborer
  - g) Landlord
  - h) I had never farmed before I entered military service.
8. If you had performed farm work before you entered military service, please indicate what principle crop you had grown? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that indicates correctly the principle crop you had grown.)
- a) Rice (all kinds of rice, including miracle rice)
  - b) Secondary crops (all crops other than rice and industrial plants)
  - c) I had never farmed before I entered military service.
9. If you had performed farm work before you entered military service, who is now tilling the land you had once tilled? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that best describes your idea.)
- a) I had never farmed before I entered military service.
  - b) I am still tilling the land myself.
  - c) My wife and children are tilling the land.
  - d) My relatives are tilling the land.
  - e) My friends or neighbors are tilling the land.
  - f) The land is being tilled by a tenant.
  - g) The refugees are tilling the land.
  - h) The land is being left abandoned and no one is tilling it.
  - i) I don't know who is tilling the land.
  - j) Other, please write it down here: \_\_\_\_\_
10. If your parents are doing farm work, are they one of the following? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that indicates correctly the circle your parents belong to.)
- a) Owner-operator
  - b) Owner-tenant
  - c) Tenant

- d) Refugee squatter
- e) Sharecropper
- f) Farm laborer
- g) Landlord
- h) My parents are not farmers.

11. If your parents are doing farm work, please indicate what principle crop they are growing. (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that indicates correctly the principle crop your parents are growing.)

- a) Rice (all kinds of rice, including miracle rice)
- b) Secondary crops (all crops other than rice and industrial plants)
- c) My parents are not farmers.

12. What is your own opinion about the Land to the Tiller Law? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that best describes your idea.)

- a) I completely approve of this Law.
- b) In general I approve of this Law, but there are some sections of it I'm not very much agreed with.
- c) I neither approve nor disapprove of this Law.
- d) I completely disapprove of this Law.
- e) Other, please write it down in the space provided below:

---



---

13. Why do you feel as above expressed about the Land to the Tiller Law? (To answer this question, please write down completely your idea in the space provided below.)

---



---

14. Has the Land to the Tiller Law had any effect on you or your family? (To answer this question, you are merely to put an "X" in front of one of the responses provided below that best describes your idea.

- a) No, our family has not been affected in any way by this law.
- b) Yes, because I've filed a landowner's declaration to retain the land I till.
- c) Yes, because I've filed a landowner's declaration to receive payment for the land that was expropriated and distributed to the others.
- d) Yes, because I've filed an application to obtain title to the land I'm presently tilling.
- e) Other, please write it down in the space provided below:

---



---