

**CONTROL DATA**

**CORPORATION**

SOLDIERS AND THE LAND TO THE TILLER  
PROGRAM IN MILITARY REGION 3  
OF VIETNAM

November 1971

by

Gordon H. Messegee  
Control Data Corporation

with the assistance of  
Henry C. Bush, Control Data Corp., Burt F. English, Development Division,  
and J. David Foster, Chief, Pacification Studies Branch, MR 3, of CORDS, MACV

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

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

SOLDIERS AND THE LAND TO THE TILLER  
PROGRAM IN MILITARY REGION 3  
OF VIETNAM

November 1971

by

Gordon H. Messegee  
Control Data Corporation

with the assistance of

Henry C. Bush, Control Data Corp., Burt F. English, Development Division,  
and J. David Foster, Chief, Pacification Studies Branch, MR 3, of 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
Land Tenure of Soldiers	9
Land Tenure of Soldiers' Parents	10
Soldiers Who were Farming, and Their Crops	11
Who is Farming Soldiers' Land Now?	12
What Soldiers Think of the Land to the Tiller Program	14
Why Soldiers Feel as They Do about LTTT	28
Privates' Attitudes Compared to Officers' Attitudes	31
Soldiers Who Were Farmers, and What They Have Done About Their Land City Compared to Countryside	33
Comparison of MR 3 with MR 4	42
Conclusions	44
Appendix A: Instructions and Questionnaire	48

## TABLES

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	Who Is On Soldiers' Land Now?	12
5	Soldiers' Attitudes Toward LTTT	14
6	Soldiers' Attitudes Toward LTTT: ARVN, RF and PF Compared	15
7	Why Soldiers Are For or Against LTTT	29
8	Officers' Attitudes Toward LTTT Compared to Soldiers' Attitudes	31
9	Soldiers Who Were Farmers, and What They Have Done About Their Land	34
10	Soldiers Who Were Farmers, Who Are For or Against LTTT, and What They Have Done About Their Land	35
11	Land Tenure of Soldiers Who Were Farmers and What They Have Done About Their Land	36
12	RF and PF Soldiers Who Were or Are Farmers, in Rural Provinces, Compared to Those in Urban Provinces: What They Think About LTTT	40
13	RF and PF Soldiers Who Were or Are Farmers, in Rural Provinces, Compared to Those in Urban Provinces: What They Have Done About Their Land	41

## 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/GCDD/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 sharecropped 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 3<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. (The English version is available 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 re LTTT, in MR 4. The report is available from ADLR, USAID in English and Vietnamese. Research is being done now on the effects and attitudes re LTTT in MR 1. This will be available from ADLR, USAID in late November.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

Respondents: 1,201 soldiers were sampled. 399 are ARVN soldiers, from the 5th, 18th, and 25th ARVN Divisions, all of which are on duty in MR 3. 398 are RF soldiers and 404 are PF soldiers, from the 11 provinces in MR 3. No respondents were sampled within the Saigon metropolitan area.

Of the 399 ARVN soldiers, 61% are privates, 19% are noncommissioned officers, and 20% are commissioned officers. Of the 398 RF soldiers, 49% are privates, 34% are noncommissioned officers, and 17% are commissioned officers. Soldiers in the PF do not hold conventional military ranks and none of them are commissioned officers.

22% of the ARVN, 30% of the RF, and 42% of the PF soldiers and officers sampled were farmers or farm laborers before military service. Of all military 32% had been farmers or farm laborers. 32% of ARVN, 43% of the RF, and 51% of the PF sampled say they plan to farm or work on farm land after they are demobilized.

Sampling Procedure: The sample is proportional to ARVN, RF, and PF actual strength in MR 3.<sup>3</sup> The sample of commissioned officers is double the proportion of commissioned officer strength in the ARVN and the RF

---

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

in MR 3.<sup>4</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, to RF companies at their bases, and to PF platoons at village and hamlet outposts. It was administered to them in groups, by Vietnamese members of the pacification research teams of CORDS, MR 3. 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, then give them as long as they needed. 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 sample includes less RF and PF soldiers from the provinces of Binh Long, Binh Tuy, and Phuoc Long than from other provinces. Because these provinces are lightly populated compared to others of MR 3 there are less RF and PF

---

4. In ARVN 9% are officers. In the sample 20% are. In the RF 8% are officers. In the sample 17% are. We chose to exaggerate officer strength in our sample in order to have enough data to be able to compare officers' to privates' attitudes re LTTT, and in order to be able to compare the effects of LTTT on officers to those on privates. See Table 8 for results.

units, and because there is less security in much of Binh Long and Phuoc Long than other provinces, the units there were less readily available.

In Phuoc Tuy, 48 respondents sampled at the Van Kiep Training Center were given the questionnaires by the Polwar Branch of the army instead of by pacification research cadre as intended. But internal evidence (handwriting, and similarity of patterns of responses to those of other groups) does not indicate any significant distortion resulted.

A few subliterates (e.g. in Phuoc Long) were unable to write or read with ease and had to be interviewed individually.

Other than those described in the above two paragraphs, no modifications of the design had to be made in the field work.

The field work was done in July, 1971.

As anyone who has ever served many years in any country's army knows, 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 then assigns them in terms of military needs of the moment. The army randomizes its soldiers.

Interviewers selected ARVN units on the basis of their availability. They chose RF companies and PF platoons on a random basis, within each province.

In each RF company they were to sample any 10 officers or men -- more if available. In each PF platoon they were to sample any 5 men -- more if available.

The reliability of a sample stratified as this one was, in which military units were chosen randomly, from a universe which itself mixes up types of persons, in which individual respondents were chosen randomly or semi-randomly on the basis of chance availability, and which consists of 1,201 respondents, is very great.<sup>5</sup>

The Analysis and this Report: Larry Newberry and Henry C. Bush worked together on the research design. Pacification research teams of CORDS, MR 3, did the field work. Gordon H. Messegee analyzed the results and wrote this report.

---

5. The reliability of the sample is shown by another comparison. Of the respondents, 32% were or are farming or working on farm land. Of these (N=380):

- 83% grow or grew rice
- 13% grow or grew other crops (e.g. corn, beans, manioc) subject to LTTT
- 1% grow or grew crops not subject to LTTT (e.g. sugar cane, fruit, vegetables)
- 3% did not say

Of all hectareage under cultivation in MR 3:

- 81% is in rice
- 11% is in other crops subject to LTTT
- 8% is in crops not subject to LTTT

(Source: "Cultivated Hectareage 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

Soldiers, Their Parents, and Farm Land:

Table 1

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

	<u>Were or Are Farming or Working On Land</u>	<u>Neither Are Nor Were Farming or Working On Land</u>	<u>Total</u>
ARVN Soldiers (N=399)	22%	78%	100%
Their Parents	40%	60%	100%
RF Soldiers (N=398)	30%	70%	100%
Their Parents	44%	56%	100%
PF Soldiers (N=404)	42%	58%	100%
Their Parents	55%	45%	100%
All Soldiers (N=1,201)	32%	68%	100%

Table 1 shows that:

1. 22% of ARVN soldiers reported that they were or are farmers. 30% of RF soldiers said they were or are farmers, and 42% of PF soldiers reported that they were or are farmers. The percentage of farmers (32%) among all respondents reflects the high degree of urbanization and the wartime population flow from the country to the cities as a characteristic of MR 3. It is significant that considerably more

officers were sampled -- 20% from ARVN and 17% from RF -- than are the percentages of actual military strength in MR 3. This factor may contribute to the low percentage of soldier-farmers. It also should be noted that a number of respondents in this survey were young students or lower echelon government workers prior to military service. The heavily populated provinces of MR 3 form a ring around the large metropolitan area of Saigon and Cholon (which, itself, has a population of about 2,500,000). It is obvious that one of the major activities of Saigon is education and another government. Even though we did not sample within Saigon or Cholon, the sample shows that the armed forces of Vietnam contain a large percentage of soldiers recruited from there. This may also have partial bearing on the low number of soldier-farmers as well as indicating a trend toward greater education and greater employment possibilities in lower level wartime occupations. Among other urban occupations, mechanics, artisans, drivers, and construction-type laborers ran high. <sup>6</sup>

2. The percentage of soldiers who were or are farmers among the three forces reflects the greater closeness of the PF, first, and RF, secondly, to farming; and the relative remoteness of ARVN soldiers from farming since, until recent years, they were largely recruited from urban areas.

---

6. The rural to urban flow is substantiated by Land Reform in Vietnam, a report prepared for the Republic of Vietnam and the United States Agency for International Development by Stanford Research Institute, 1968, summary volume, pgs. 46; 47. "Vietnam is urbanizing at an explosive rate ... 50% of the population is estimated to reside in towns and cities."

3. The percentage of soldiers' parents who work the land is like the percentage of soldiers who farmed: the least among ARVN, the most among PF. However considerably fewer soldiers than parents were or are tilling the land. This further reflects, as do other studies, the nationwide flow from agriculture to urban centers.

Land Tenure of Soldiers:

Table 2

LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMING

<u>Percentage Who:</u>	<u>ARVN Soldiers (N=89)</u>	<u>RF Soldiers (N=121)</u>	<u>PF Soldiers (N=170)</u>	<u>All Military (N=380)</u>
Were or are tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or squatters	43%	42%	53%	47%
Were or are farm laborers	11%	14%	13%	13%
Owned some farm land and rented some	7%	11%	5%	7%
Owned the land they farmed	37%	31%	29%	32%
Were or are landlords	<u>2%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2 shows that the greatest percentage (47%) of soldier-farmers were tenant farmers, sharecroppers or squatters. They are likely to benefit from LTTT if they use the law. The next largest group were those who owned farm land and farmed it themselves (32%). A negligible percentage (1%)

were or are landlords. <sup>7</sup> No respondents were of higher rank than captain.

Land Tenure of Soldiers' Parents:

Table 3

LAND TENURE OF SOLDIERS' PARENTS

<u>Percentage Who:</u>	<u>Parents of ARVN Soldiers (N=159)</u>	<u>Parents of RF Soldiers (N=175)</u>	<u>Parents of PF Soldiers (N=223)</u>	<u>Parents of all Soldiers (N=557)</u>
Are tenant farmers, share-croppers, or squatters	25%	43%	41%	37%
Are farm laborers	11%	16%	20%	16%
Own some farm land and rent some	10%	9%	5%	8%
Own the land they farm	50%	29%	32%	36%
Are landlords	<u>4%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

7. Other studies validate the finding 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 this 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 694 rural landlords interviewed in the delta, 3% were found to be military personnel. See Table 1, pg. 12. (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).

One can see from Table 2 in comparison with Table 3 that:

1. Soldiers who were or are farmers are poorer in land than their parents. Less own the land they farmed. More are tenants. But slightly more of the parents are farm laborers.
2. Most soldiers are tenants, in all military services.
3. Among soldiers' parents, tenancy is not preponderant. 37% are tenant farmers; 36% own the land they farm.
4. A negligible percentage of soldiers and soldiers' parents are landlords.

Soldiers Who were Farming, and Their Crops: Soldiers who were farming or working on farm land (N=380) were asked about the principle crop they grew. 83% of them grew rice. 13% grew secondary crops such as beans, corn, peanuts, sweet potatoes or manioc which like rice are subject to the Land to the Tiller program. Of the remaining 4%, one percent grew crops such as sugar cane, fruit, vegetables, tobacco, or flowers, which are exempt from the Land to the Tiller program. 3% did not say.

Who is Farming Soldiers' Land Now?

Table 4

## WHO IS ON SOLDIERS' LAND NOW?

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

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>ARVN (N=89)</u>	<u>RF (N=121)</u>	<u>PF (N=170)</u>	<u>All Military (N=380)</u>	
I am still tilling it.	4%	6%	14%	9%	64%
My wife and children	41%	35%	38%	38%	
My relatives	17%	16%	17%	17%	
My friends or neighbors	0%	5%	2%	2%	7%
Tenants	4%	2%	4%	3%	
Refugees or squatters.	2%	1%	3%	2%	
No one: The land is not in use.	9%	8%	8%	8%	
I don't know.	18%	19%	5%	13%	
Other	<u>5%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>8%</u>	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Table 4 shows that:

1. 64% of soldier-farmers are still tilling their land themselves or have their immediate families or relatives tilling it for them. Due to Vietnamese family cohesiveness there is little risk of their losing their land under LTTT.
2. Among soldiers who were farmers, 7% say that friends, neighbors, tenants, or squatters are farming the land they used to farm. If these

persons apply for title, as they can do under the LTTT law, these soldiers might lose their land. Given what is known about the high value Vietnamese attach to local intra-hamlet ties and particularly to personal ties of friendship, one can foresee that tenants and squatters probably would apply for title; refugees might but would be likelier to seek to return to wherever they came from; neighbors would be unlikely to seek title to a soldier's family land because they would have to live next door to him when he returned; and friends would be very unlikely to. Probably not 7% but about 5% of these soldiers will lose their land to others.

3. The majority of the 30 soldiers who responded in the "other" category, (only 8% of all soldiers who were either farming or working on land) were ex-farm laborers, former farm tenants who returned land to the landlord when they entered military service, or had previously lost land which had been abandoned. Recipients of abandoned land redistributed by the Viet Cong are legally entitled to file for title as present tillers if the area has been recovered and come again under GVN control. Consequently soldiers in the "other" category cannot file for title to the land they once farmed. A number of soldiers both in this category and in the relatively large percentage of those entitled to file who did not, reflect optimistic faith that the GVN will distribute land to them when they leave military service. <sup>8</sup>

---

8. This optimism may be based on (1) the Vietnamese tradition of making underdeveloped land available to soldiers after major wars and major  
(continued)

What Soldiers Think of the Land to the Tiller program:

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=356)	<u>Those Who Have Never Farmed or Worked on Land</u> (N=845)	<u>All Military</u> (N=1,201)
I completely approve of the law.	69%	63%	65%
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions.	16%	12%	13%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law.	11%	21%	17%
I completely disapprove of this law.	1%	1%	1%
Other	2%	3%	3%
Did not say	<u>1%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

8. (cont'd) demobilizations. 31 March 1971 the Government of Vietnam created a Directorate-General of Land Development and Hamlet Building which may endeavor to organize demobilized soldiers in traditional soldier-farmer settlements. (See Brian Jenkins, "People's Army, Part III: Don Dien," April, 1971, a draft working paper, CORDS, for a description of such settlements. See Decree 022-SL/QVK, 31 March 1971, Office of the Prime Minister, for the responsibilities of the Directorate-General. Available in English in Public Administration Bulletin: Vietnam, No. 56, from ADPA, USAID). Or also on (2) the fact that settlers on unused national land may obtain up to 10 hectares under national domain law, and that (3) procedures for obtaining title to such land have been simplified for soldiers and civil servants. (See Circular 161-TT/Th. T/PC. 2, 21 September 1970, Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture, and Fisheries Development. Available in English at ADLR, USAID). And also (4) disabled soldiers, after demobilization, have, if they request it, first priority after present tillers for any

(continued)

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= 99)	65%	17%	13%	0%	1%	4%	= 100%
RF	(N=114)	67%	19%	9%	1%	4%	0%	= 100%
PF	(N=143)	75%	12%	9%	3%	1%	0%	= 100%
Soldiers of All 3 Ser- vices Who Were or Are Farmers	(N=356)	69%	16%	11%	1%	2%	1%	= 100%
<u>Those Who Have Never Farmed or Worked on Land</u>								
ARVN	(N=317)	65%	11%	19%	2%	3%	0%	= 100%
RF	(N=277)	62%	14%	17%	2%	5%	0%	= 100%
PF	(N=251)	60%	11%	26%	1%	2%	0%	= 100%
Soldiers of All 3 Ser- vices Who Have Never Been Farmers	(N=845)	63%	12%	21%	1%	3%	0%	= 100%
<u>Total: All Soldiers</u>	(N=1, 201)	65%	13%	17%	1%	3%	1%	= 100%

Tables 5 and 6 show that:

1. Most soldiers, 65%, completely approve of LTTT. More farmers approve completely of LTTT than do non-farmers. Among non-farmers (N=845), more ARVN completely approve (65%), than do RF (62%), or PF (60%). Among soldiers who were farmers (N=356) more PF approve completely (75%) than do RF (67%), or ARVN (65%).
2. 13% of the soldiers approve of the law in general, but disapprove of some of its provisions. Among those who approved with reservations, a wide spectrum of complaints is apparent. Most common are:
  - \* the LTTT law discriminates against the military
  - \* LTTT is slow in compensating landlords and is unfair to the landlords
  - \* the law will cause conflicts within the villages
  - \* corruption and favoritism among local authorities and faulty and slow implementation at the village level.
3. 17% of the soldiers neither approve nor disapprove of LTTT.
4. Almost no soldiers - 1% - completely disapprove of the law.
5. In all three services out of 1,201 respondents only 19 opposed LTTT.

The soldiers were asked why they are pro or anti LTTT. Examples of their reasons follow.

- 
8. (cont'd) land distributed under LTTT. (Article 15, Law 008/70, 9 July 1970, Office of the Prime Minister. Available in English in Public Administration Bulletin: Vietnam, No. 54, from ADPA, USAID. Article 32 of the basic LTTT implementing circular makes this explicit in the administration of LTTT. Circular No. 7843, 27 July 1970, Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture and Fisheries Development. Available as Land Reform Memo No. 23, ADLR, USAID).

Complete Approval of LTTT:

by ARVN

I am a serviceman, but I recognize that "The Land to the Tiller Law" will bring more happiness to the tenant farmers' life (there are 80% tenant farmers in VN), and the level of production will be higher.

Thanks to the LTTT law there are no more the differences between landlords and tenant farmers, because each one will be a small landowner.

Because it fattens the farmer class specifically and the Vietnamese people in general. Furthermore, Vietnam is a farming country so it is necessary to push strongly the farmer tendency.

95% of the Vietnamese people are farmers, but farming lands were concentrated into a minority of landlords, the majority of farmers had no land. They were hired and sweated by landlords. Now the farmers have land, they will be happy with their ownership, they will try to increase the farming productivity and our country will be more prosperous.

It's impossible to concentrate farming lands into a minority of landlords and encourage farmers, "work at nothing, but get everything" makes it socially unfair and poorly done.

The people need to have farming land to increase the productivity. It raises the people's living level. The people will be more rich, the country will be stronger.

The LTTT law is very suitable to the Vietnamese people because the majority of VN subsists by farming. Suppressing tenancy, each family will be owner of their farming land. It differs with the old regime.

Because this law helps the poor people who have no ability to have farming land, now they own it and work for themselves. This law causes good feeling, it proves the close relation between servicemen, cadre, government employees and the people to unite for developing the country.

I approve of the LTTT law because it helps the refugees and the poor farmers who will not have to rent land for cultivation.

This law helps the poor tenant farmers very much. Before they worked hard in the land but received not much. And sometimes they had trouble with the landlords. Now because of this law their life will be better.

I always agree with this law because it encourages the tenant-farmer in cultivation. And the uncultivated land will be put to use, so the level of rice production will be better.

This law brings happiness and beliefs to the poor farmers - that they will own land for cultivation!! No more troubles caused by land owners as before. I agree with this law because it will equalize the justice in society.

According to this law the level of rice production will be better so we won't need to import rice from foreign countries.

Because if the LTTT law is implemented in the right way, I think that this law can bring partial justice between the farmer class - almost all the southwest (delta) farmers.

I approve of the LTTT law because the government supports the proletariat.

I fully agree with the LTTT law even though I am not in the farmer class. I hope the government will finish the implementation program as soon as possible to give the poor farmers land to cultivate.

Because the LTTT law will help the poor farmer class have cultivated land to subsist. They will not be treated ruthlessly by the rich landlords standing in the high class society.

Thanks to this law the landlords can not continue to plunder the tenant farmer class.

Thanks to the leadership of current President Nguyen van Thieu, he has a best way to help the poor people to see a good future.

The President promulgated the LTTT law to provide the tenants a plot of land of which they become owners. After the crop they have a larger income which instigates them to increase the crops. This is a great resource they give to the country.

Because the LTTT law gives land to tenants to become landowners and render entirely unworkable the Communist policy of destituting the people.

The reason I have the above idea is that by the LTTT law most of farmers who were tenants are equally allocated land for cultivation. Therefore, the standard of living of farmers is promoted and under this law, each person can possess land from now, and he certainly will exploit strictly the plot of land of his own. Sooner or later, our agricultural production will be restored as has been previously. This doesn't mean the landlord class is forgotten. They are damaged in their interests and they will be fairly compensated. In this sense the LTTT law will produce good results.

The promulgation of this law proves that the GVN is very concerned about the people, and that it does want to save the country from being seriously dependent on foreign aid, so that we may be self-sufficient on every aspect in the future as a result. I very much agree with this law.

by RF

I approve because: the farmers get more jobs. It increases the national revenue. There will be no more abandoned land which landlords do not farm. It will increase productivity.

The LTTT law brings equality of opportunities to every farmer class to go forward, avoiding the difference between two social classes: landowners and tenant-farmers. It creates a relative justice for the people, and the most important thing is it makes the country more prosperous.

Because I see that the LTTT law brings in justice and the farmers will have a better life with enough food and clothing.

The LTTT law appears, then a lot of farmers have land to cultivate -- they won't have to worry about unemployment.

I hear clearly about the LTTT law by radio and I see clearly the President's policy is bringing in the justice to the farmers and helping them have a better life with enough food and clothing.

I fully approve the LTTT law because the government distributed farming land to my family.

Thanks to the LTTT law, the tenant farmers' life will become better and better -- spiritually and physically.

I welcome and approve the LTTT law instituted by the GVN to assist the poor people who so far have no piece of land as a means of subsistence.

Because of the "war accident" there is land abandoned and, of course, some people have no land. Now the government protects and takes care of the people and gives them land titles. The people will support the government warmly.

The sole reason is that a great number of Vietnamese lived on farming, but under French colonialism, almost all land hectarage was owned by French or their friends so that the tenants who tilled land directly had not any plot of land for their own.

According to my relatives' opinion -- this law is fair!

Because this law is intended to bring in social justice. Honestly, to the best of my knowledge I would say almost all government policies are good.

Because each farmer will be a small landowner and he will, of course, devote himself to farming his own land to increase the production and if every farmer does the same way, the yearly production will increase considerably. They may then increase more by growing multiple-crop "miracle rice". If so, there will be no shortage of rice and the price will be lowered to help the poor get it easily and no starving will take place!!!"

by PF

Thanks to the LTTT law the tenant farmer will become small landowner.

I agree with the LTTT law because it helped our compatriots become landowners.

The LTTT law encouraged the farmer class; although I am not a farmer. Actually, poor farmers need not to work for anybody, they are owner of their lands. They're happy and they will try to increase the agricultural productivity for their families and the country.

In a democratic country, the farmer must have farming land to cultivate to develop the economy and bring prosperity to the Vietnamese people.

I approve this law because it removes the differences and troubles between landlords and tenant farmers. It helps them to prosper.

I fully approve the LTTT law because it helps the poor farmers own the farming land, so they will try harder and produce more. In the future, the country will be more prosperous.

In war-time, Vietnam is an underdeveloped country. If the government doesn't help us and we do not cultivate ourselves, I think the economy of the country will be decreased. The LTTT law will bring prosperity and wealth to the nation and people.

The majority of Vietnamese subsist by farming. The government observes that there are many landlords owning a lot of farming lands, while there were many others who have no land to cultivate. Thus the government implements the LTTT law. It is very useful.

I agree with the LTTT law because it changed the share-cropper status. They will own farm land to cultivate. They will not depend on the landlord anymore. We have land and farming by ourselves.

I think this law is beneficial to all poor people that, from many years ago, until now, they had to suffer the tenant life because they had no land - same as everybody has to be hired for a living. Now, thanks to the LTTT law, of course, even sooner or later, my family and myself will be benefited by this law.

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

by ARVN

Because the government policy is not applied by the lower subordinate officials, thus it creates some unfairness toward the farmer class.

The 15 hectares farming land of my family is the inheritance from my grandfather. We were cultivating that land until the appearance of the LTTT. Now we still have 5 hectares, but we don't know when we can receive satisfactorily the compensation of the expropriation.

I think that this law will be better if it is modified some items as the case of soldiers serving in the army. They can't farm land and their parents have to do that job, now the government expropriated that land. So it is unfair. In the future, if the soldiers should be discharged from the army, who will return to them their former land? Or suppose they can receive compensatory land in the same region, but at another place - impossible to farm (rock, sand, clay, etc.) how can they subsist by farming? I have the above idea because I like farming very much.

I agree with the LTTT law on the point of distribution of land to the poor people. But I don't agree about my friends' case, formerly they were land-owners. Then entered the army. Their farming land was expropriated. If in the future peacetime, they want to farm again, do they get their former land?

The LTTT law makes similiarity between landlord and tenant farmer. Each will be a small land owner, but it has some disadvantages for the landlords.

I approve making farmers own the land, but I don't agree with the expropriation of servicemen's farming land.

I agree with the law because it helps the poor farmers have land for cultivation. But I also request that the government provide land to North Vietnamese refugees for cultivation.

In the non-communist countries, ownership is one of the highest sacred rights after the other basic democratic rights. So, the government can establish a just society to raise up the living level of the majority of people. This can refute the propoganda of the communists. But the government and the National Assembly have seen one side among many sides of the problem. In being willing to do justice to the farmers, the government forgot the other unfairness, especially that by the urban rich men.

In general I approve the LTTT law, but it still has some details to which I don't agree, such as the expropriation of soldier's farming lands when they have to serve in the army. That's a damage to RVN soldiers.

The land of soldiers should be exempted from LTTT.

There are some points I don't approve because my father has a number of plots of land expropriated and the compensation procedure is very slow to be effected.

I approve because it gives assistance to those who like to till, but have no land, or are oppressed by others. I don't agree on some points that a number of people take advantage of this law to take illegally the land of others: they cultivate rice after the promulgation of the law to expropriate the landowners.

I don't agree on some points: (1) my family follows the national government, and under the LTTT law all my land has been expropriated and I have nothing. (2) The compensation is effected very slowly.

Because the sum given by the government to landlords as compensation is not equivalent to the income they can obtain in a long period.

We approve the LTTT law and agree that it is a national policy; however, because it is implemented on a nationwide scale, it is difficult to the Central Government to control efficiently so that some deficiencies are observed in lower echelons in the implementation of this law. We recommend to establish an inspection team comprising of honest men for exercising control.

The theory of implementation of the LTTT of the government is very good, but in realizing it there are two problems: (1) government employees work as slow as tortoises! (2) there was some government employees' corruption, so it created unhappy results to both landlords and tenant farmers.

The old people can not directly cultivate their land, according to this law, they will lose their land. I hope that LTTT law will give the old people a right to rent their land.

My neighbors and I have complained that in principle the LTTT is all right, but it is not implemented correctly at village/hamlet level.

Some inequities have been observed during the implementation of this law by the local authority.

Many powerful landlords own each one more than 30 ha., and their lands are still remaining unexpropriated. But the owner-tenants who farm more or less than 10 ha. each are subject to expropriation.

by RF

The compensation is inadequate --too late!

I have the above idea for two reasons: (1) The social reform problem, the government showed some worrying, but the LTTT has effected only in one region - the Mekong Delta. (2) The government directed reform only towards the landlords, in the LTTT law. But in the cities the government has not yet any solution to make a minimum equality between employers and employees (especially businessmen, industrialists are the high income classes.) Thus social reform has not good results yet.

I acknowledge the LTTT law is a very good revolutionary policy, but it has exceeded the limit because it created an unhappiness toward the landlords. In my opinion, the government should establish a criteria for the landlords and let them keep a same land area as their ancestors exploited before.

The LTTT law is very good because the government buys farming land of landlords and distributes it to the poor farmers. However, this law should apply only to the great or medium landlords and should exempt from LTTT the small landowner or soldiers because they are busy by official business or serving in the army, so they rent out their lands temporarily.

Supposing a family has a small plot, when the son enters the army, the land will not be cultivated. Then it is expropriated. When their son returns to do farming, he has no land to farm anymore.

I agree because the Communists can not use the class struggle policy method in the South Vietnam. About balancing the living level for the people, there are some points that I don't agree as: the compensation must be realized as soon as possible and equivalent to the value of the land expropriated.

The law represents a social justice reform and to the best of my knowledge almost all the government policies are good and ideal. However, when implementing such policies the executive officials not only prove a disfunction, but also make the people suffer hardships, because what they do merely benefits the minority (the local officials).

A number of farmers have taken advantage of this law to receive land then sell it out to others to get profit.

We're afraid that our land will no longer be available for us to farm when peace is really restored in this country, i. e. when we return home to continue doing our parents' farm work. It should be noted that our ancestors' graves are traditionally very meaningful to us, and that it is our home village where we were born and brought up. Therefore, it would be regrettable if we could not live near there to take care of our ancestors' graves although we understand the government would provide us with some land each somewhere else to farm if we wanted to. This will compel us to lose what we call "sacred significance" (our home neighbors will be separated from one another), a thing that we can never regain. Also, as Vietnamese our sentiment is not the same as that of the other peoples (nomadic shepherds) in Europe. How can our families survive when we have to lose our land on which we were born and grew up? We can never forget it for sure and don't want to leave it either even though the land

in another place is better and more fertile. As we often say, "our home land is better than any elsewhere!"

The LTTT law is promulgated to create an equal improvement of living for farmers, an increase of national production. However, it dissatisfied a little the expropriated owners because the land inherited from ancestors are distributed to others. The compensation given by the government is insufficient in comparison with expropriated land, and that is done too tardily. Therefore, the expropriated owners are not content with the government.

I approve this law because our people are poor, the laborers usually are sweated too much because they have no farming land. But, I don't approve this law because the people couldn't cultivate in the unpacified areas. They had to live in exile, went to the army, now that land is pacified, it is distributed to the others (it's possible that some among them have once farmed to supply the VC). The government, indifferently, expropriated from the merit people, but no rich. If the government said that servicemen will receive again their former land, e.g. once, their farm is at Nha Trang, now give them land at Pleiku, how they can be satisfied? The family is at Tan Chau (Chau Doc) and farm at Hue, it's very disadvantageous.

The LTTT law is promulgated to help the poor farmers own the land to cultivate and bring social justice. However, the owner-operator will lose a lot of farming land which they can give to their descendants later on. Now the compensation for the expropriation is not accomplished.

In war time, my villagers (tenant farmers) are cultivating my farming land because I couldn't do it. After discharge from the army, that land was distributed to the others so how does the law help the serviceman? I suggest to add a special item into the LTTT law providing a certain amount of farming land (example: 10 hectares in MR 4, etc.) can be retained for each serviceman, no distribution to any other although these servicemen farm or not.

Because the owner operator had to enter the army indefinitely in the war time, they abandoned their land. When they come back, they lose it. (The others farmed already on that land. If the government gives them another land, maybe at the bad place, how can they cultivate it as previously done?)

by PF

It's my observation that since the promulgation of this law, no one has been distributed land as yet and that we, the poor ones, are still renting land from the village for cultivation. We therefore hope that the government will take this problem into consideration so we may enjoy the same profits as those granted to our neighbors.

Although this law has brought in a better life to the majority of tenants, it still seems that servicemen have to suffer losses as they now have to serve the army. The land inherited from their ancestors is located in the contested area where the VC have taken it to distribute to their relatives. It should be noted that the above land was intended to reserve for us to farm when we're released from the military service later, as our parents are getting older. Now under this law, it is the VC relatives who have been made owners of such land. It is therefore strongly requested that the foregoing case be taken into consideration.

Because under this law those servicemen who can't till themselves will be remaining landless after they're released from their military service because their land is subject to expropriation. Furthermore, they may feel dissatisfied because their hard labor contributed to the country has been forgotten by the authority -- their land is expropriated to distribute to the others.

The LTTT law helps poor farmers own farming lands, but if the government expropriates the land of servicemen - formerly they're farmers, after discharge, where is the land to cultivate? If it's possible, I request give them back their former land.

In general I agree with the LTTT law, but there are some points that I don't accept.

I don't want to be an owner of anyone else's land.

My family has had 20 hectares, now 2/3's is expropriated. When the war ends, my family is very crowded, my parents are too old. How can we subsist with the remainder of 1/3 land? The 20 hectares of land was my family's interest for a long time. After the war, does the government give us back the 20 hectares? Presently, does the expropriated land get compensated by cash immediately or pay in a long time?

The LTTT law supercedes the land tenure, but it makes the farmers who have to enter the army become destitute. Request the government return the land to them who were farmers before, or distribute to them the family land close with their family's location.

#### Neutral or "No Opinion" Responses

The LTTT law has provided no assistance to me and has no effect on my daily living.

Because I am not a farmer. I am a laborer in a plantation.

The LTTT law brings in some benefits and some damages:

- \* profitable for tenant farmers
- \* damage to landowners

Disapproval of LTTT:

by ARVN

Because the LTTT law violates the individual property rights.

The LTTT law has violated the property rights of individuals and creates frictions between tenants and landowners.

Although we're from a landlord's family, our four brothers are all serving the army to fulfill our duty towards the country. Our parents are therefore having to rent out all our land because they're incapable of tilling the land themselves. Now under this law our land has to be divided with others, thus displeasing us very much.

This law doesn't coincide with the people's feelings.

by RF

Because (1) it's unjust to expropriate servicemen's land while they're still on active duty and can't till the land themselves, and (2) also, specified in the law all expropriated lands are compensated satisfactorily with 25% in cash, and the remainder in bonds. This is not correctly carried out by the local authorities in accordance with the law, and (3) cession of one's land to the other is unacceptable, pending other land to be distributed later by the government.

People having authority do not carry out this law well, in the places far from the Central Office.

Injustice!! It is nearly the same land tenure legalization of the Communist. If the government said that it is a help towards the poor people, that is not true because the government has a lot of other methods (different from the LTTT law). It needs not to expropriate from someone to give to the other for keeping the people. The compensation is not just as in the law.

Because my family has a small plot, my parents are too olds (more than 60 years old now) to do anything. All my children are actively serving in the army and one of them was killed. Now we have to largely rely on our land income as a means of subsistence, but the land we're tilling exceeds the retention limit.

It's not useful because we live far away from my land and we couldn't cultivate it by ourselves and then that land was expropriated.

Because the government dispossess the land of my father and my brother.

Unfair because (1) it doesn't suit the people's or servicemen's aspirations. (2) creates more troubles. This law can't be applied to Vietnam as the other countries (Taiwan, Korea).

Usually, most of the farmers have been working hard from the ancestors until now, to get the actual property -- in contrast, the lazy people, now they can get the land of the others without pay; by submitting the land request!!

by PF

I have no farm, but I think that my ancestor began with nothing, they had to work hard for exploiting the waste land to get the current farm. But now all my land will be distributed to others, so I don't agree with the LTTT law.

Many things done are not logical.

I think that the LTTT law is unjust because the government has given to the tenants the land of the landowners without compensating them for the loss.

I don't like this law at all!!

I own one hectare of land and I could farm it when I was serving near my native village. Then when I was serving far from my native village, I had to rent it out. Now that the government takes it away to distribute to the others, and this affects my fighting spirit very much because I'm now fighting for the common interest of the country and there is no reason that my land should be expropriated to distribute to the others!!

Responses Indicating Misunderstanding of LTTT:

I agree with the LTTT law because it ensures my interest - a landless farmer.

The LTTT law makes poor farmers own farming land to cultivate. They need not rent the land anymore, and the government will distribute farming to some servicemen after discharge from the army.

It is my observation that this law is intended to provide equal opportunities for servicemen to get ahead, no matter how poor or rich they are.

This law as yet hasn't been correctly implemented - my wife's father hasn't received any single piece of land as of now.

Because I understand by this law the government plans to distribute some land to each of the servicemen when they're released from military service and want to apply for it.

Why Soldiers Feel as They Do about LTTT: Over and over soldiers said that they are for the Land to the Tiller Program because it will help the poor. Many are for it because it makes it possible for poor farmers to become the social equals of others -- because it makes equality possible. Some are for it because it will make the nation stronger.

Among those who qualified their approval of the program, who object to some parts or some possible effects of the law and among those few who are against it, the most frequent form of objection to the program is that it discriminates against the military. A few assert that compensation is slow and is unfair to landlords. A very few assert that there is corruption, favoritism, and faulty implementation of the program by local officials. A very few contend that LTTT will cause conflict in the villages.

See Table 7.

Table 7

## WHY SOLDIERS ARE FOR OR AGAINST LTTT

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Approving:</u>		
LTTT will help the poor.	572	55%
LTTT will help bring about social equality.	218	21%
LTTT will help make South Vietnam economically and politically strong.	74	7%
LTTT will help soldiers who are farmers.	7	1%
<u>Disapproving of all or part:</u>		
LTTT discriminates against soldiers.	61	6%
LTTT is slow to compensate landlords and is unfair to landlords.	44	4%
LTTT will cause conflicts among farmers; it should be left to local authorities to decide whether and how to implement it.	23	2%
Village and other local officials are corrupt, guilty of favoritism, or slow, in implementing LTTT.	21	2%
LTTT is unfair to small owner-operators and to tenant farmers.	9	1%
LTTT aids former Viet Cong or Viet Cong sympathizers.	6	1%
<u>Totals</u>	1,035	100%

Inferences: What the quotations show in soldiers' own words, Table 7 shows in quantities. Consider what most soldiers say and their personal circumstances. The Land to the Tiller program helps the poor. Most soldiers are very poor. The Land to the Tiller program will help bring about social equality. Despite the social levelling and social mixing by the war and urbanization, most soldiers come from villages in which they were rated low on the local scale of respect and importance. Most soldiers want more equality than they have. Some say the Land to the Tiller program will help make South Vietnam strong. All soldiers are soldiering because South Vietnam must be strong. It is clear that most soldiers think of the Land to the Tiller program (quite aside from the prospects of land ownership for tenant farmers) as something which will bring about or help bring about changes in Vietnamese society which they want.

On the negative side, about 7% seem conservative, against change. They like what was before LTTT, and it, according to them, is unfair to landlords and to those who own the land they farm, and will cause conflicts in the villages. So much for the theory, still heard; occasionally, that most ordinary Vietnamese are merely transplanted village folk, conservative, largely changeless in their ways, who follow traditional social and economic leaders and oppose any measures to change villagers' ways. Insofar as South Vietnam's mass-based armed forces of more than 1,000,000 men are representative of South Vietnam as a whole (and it seems probable that they are), allegedly changeless Vietnamese seem to be no more than about 7% of the population in MR 3.

Privates' Attitudes Compared to Officers' Attitudes: 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 the following table and in the conclusions just following it (pgs. 32-33), however, we contrast commissioned officers' attitudes toward LTTT to those of ordinary soldiers (from Privates up to Corporal I) and exclude noncommissioned officers (sergeants and senior sergeants). The respondents represented in this table were taken only from ARVN and the RF. None of the PF are commissioned officers.

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</u> (N=156)	<u>ARVN &amp; RF Privates</u> (N=441)
I completely approve of the law.	56%	68%
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions.	24%	8%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law.	10%	20%
I completely disapprove of this law.	2%	1%
Other	<u>8%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	100%	100%

It is evident from Table 8 that at the two social extremes of rank and importance in the army of South Vietnam:

1. Most military personnel, soldiers and officers, completely approve

of the Land to the Tiller program.

2. Almost none, whether privates or commissioned officers, disapprove of the program.
3. More of those of low rank than of high (which is to say more of those from lower strata of society) approve completely of LTTT.
4. More officers than privates qualify their approval, and disapprove of some parts of the LTTT program, and less officers than privates are neutral, indifferent to the program -- probably because they are better educated and able to comprehend, weigh, and judge the program.
5. More privates than officers are indifferent to the program -- doubtless because, in MR 3, 70-78% of ARVN and the RF were never farmers (See Table 1) and have no personal stake in LTTT.

What inferences can one draw from ARVN and the RF commissioned officers compared to ARVN and RF privates? In MR 3, most of both were urban, persons who were not farming or working on farm land before military service. All officers found in the sample are of the rank of captain or lower, which is to say that they, like almost all privates, are poor. The main difference is that far more officers than privates are certain to be middle class and most privates are likely to be working class. The principle difference would seem to be primary schooling or less, compared to secondary schooling or more. The other main difference would be occupational: ~~white~~

collar work, university studies, desk work, and supervisory work for officers, compared to labor or manual work for privates, before military service.

Insofar as this preponderantly non-farming sample from MR 3 can be generalized from, the inferences for the Land to the Tiller program are that:

1. LTTT does not divide officers and ordinary soldiers within the military services.
2. LTTT does not divide city people (urban working class, or urban white collar groups) from farmers.
3. Most persons, urban or rural, farmers, ex-farmers, or those who have never farmed, well or ill educated, middle class or working class, are for LTTT.
4. The middle class has reservations about the program (i. e. approves of it, but not of all of its details) to the extent of about one in every four persons (24%). The working class does not, but one in every five (20%) is indifferent to it because it does not affect him or his.

Soldiers Who Were Farmers, and What They Have Done About Their Land:

Please see Tables 9, 10 and 11.

Table 9

## SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMERS, AND WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ABOUT THEIR LAND

<u>What they Think of LTTT:</u>	<u>LTTT Has Had No Effect</u>	<u>Filed Form A to Retain Land</u>	<u>Filed Form B for Compensation for Land</u>	<u>Filed For Title</u>	<u>Other Responses (Ex-tenants, Ex Farm Laborers)</u>	
I completely approve of this law. (N=273)	41%	13%	1%	23%	22%	= 100%
I approve of this law in general, but disapprove of some provisions. (N=37)	35%	8%	8%	16%	33%	= 100%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law. (N=29)	52%	7%	3%	14%	24%	= 100%
I completely disapprove of this law. (N=7)	29%	29%	0%	0%	42%	= 100%
Other (N=10)	70%	0%	0%	0%	30%	= 100%
All soldiers, all categories of approval or disapproval. (N=356)	42%	12%	2%	20%	24%	= 100%
Percentage in each Military Service of all categories of approval or disapproval						
ARVN (N= 84)	38%	17%	5%	20%	20%	= 100%
RF (N=114)	48%	8%	1%	15%	28%	= 100%
PF (N=158)	39%	12%	1%	24%	24%	= 100%

95%  
of the  
soldiers5%  
of the  
soldiers

Table 10

SOLDIERS WHO WERE FARMERS, 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>	
LTTT has had no effect on him. (N=149)	75%	9%	10%	1%	5%	= 100%
Filed Form A to Retain Land (N=42)	83%	7%	5%	5%	0%	= 100%
Filed Form B for Compensation for Land (N=6)	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	= 100%
Filed for Title (N=72)	86%	8%	6%	0%	0%	= 100%
Other Responses (Ex-tenants, Ex-farm laborers) (N=87)	72%	14%	8%	3%	3%	= 100%
All Soldiers Who Were Farming (N=356)	69%	16%	11%	1%	3%	= 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 on him</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=120)	50%	29%	5%	3%	12%	1%	= 100%
Owned some farm land and rented some (N=26)	27%	35%	0%	27%	11%	0%	= 100%
Were tenants, sharecroppers, or squatters (N=179)	42%	6%	0%	34%	17%	1%	= 100%
Were or are landlords (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	= 100%

\* Please note that soldiers who were farm laborers have been excluded from this table.

These tables and the data from which they were derived show that:

1. Half of the owner-operators who by the law are obligated and/or entitled to file Form A to retain land, say that LTTT did not effect them and did nothing. Another 12% of the soldier owner-operators filed nothing and chose to check the "Other" category of the questionnaire where some gave explanations of their failure to act. To sum up 62% of soldiers who should have filed Form A's have not done so.

Although landowners must declare holdings on Form A<sup>9</sup>, it should be noted that in actual practice owner-operators whose land is still being tilled by themselves or by their immediate families and who have reasonable evidence of ownership frequently do not file Form A. Failure to file Form A means that those who fail to file within a 90 day period will forfeit their rights to complain in the event of any cadastral or title controversy.

2. 42% of soldier-farmers who were or are tenants, squatters, or sharecroppers say that LTTT has no effect upon them. Another 17% responded in the "Other" category, but did not apply for title to their land.
3. Only 34% of soldiers who were or are tenants, refugee squatters, or sharecroppers did file for title and only 29% of those who were or are owner-operators filed Form A to retain land they own.
4. Among those few (N=4) who were or are landlords, none filed Form B to transfer land to tenant tillers and receive compensation.

---

9. Please see: Decree 072 SL/CDDD/PTNNN, 5 June 1970, Article 17, pg. 6; Law No. 003/70, 26 March 1970, Article No. 5; also available in English in Land Reform Memo, No. 21, 27 July 1970, Case II, pt. 2, pg. 6 (USAID/ADLR files).

Of all soldiers who are qualified by land tenure status to apply for title to the land they or their families farm, or who are obligated under LTTT to declare their land (N=310):

58% neither applied for title nor declared their land

23% applied for title

12% filed Forms A to retain their land

2% filed Forms B to permit transfer of their land and to be paid for it

5% apparently filed false claims (2% filed falsely for title, 2% filed false Forms A, and 1% filed false Forms B)

100%

Of those soldiers who are not qualified to obtain title or to retain farm land (because they were farm laborers, or former tenants who had to vacate their rented land, or those whose former farm land was abandoned and is now being farmed by squatters, or those who subleased to other tenants land they had rented: N=70):

79% neither applied for title nor declared their land -- the correct action.

13% did not say what, if anything, they or their families have done re land they used to farm.

8% apparently filed false claims (4% filed false Forms A to obtain title to land which even if owned by them they cannot again take possession of and farm. 3% applied for title to land they are not entitled to again take possession of. 1% filed Forms B to be paid for land they do not own.)

100%

Among all soldiers (those who were or are farming or working land, and those who were not: N=1,201,) 40 (which is 3%) filed false claims -- no great

percentage compared to soldiers' and civilians' efforts to take advantage of LTTT elsewhere.<sup>10</sup>

Although the percentage of PF who were entitled to file yet did not file was less than that of RF, it is of particular interest that so large a percentage as 56% did nothing. This lack of action has particular significance because the PF are not only closer to the land they tilled, but are presumably closer to the Village Land Reform Committee, have access to knowledge about the LTTT law and program, and can be assumed to be better informed regarding the action of officials in implementing LTTT in their particular villages.

51% of ARVN soldier-farmers and 68% of RF eligible to apply for title or required to declare their land, filed nothing. These percentages indicate a pattern of a general lack of knowledge of the LTTT law or other reasons for not taking action.

City Compared to Countryside: As the reader knows, or can see in Table 1, most soldiers in complex MR 3 (68%) were not farmers before military service. In an effort to compare soldiers from very rural areas in MR 3 to those from very urban areas, we compared RF and PF respondents who were or are farming or working farm land in MR 3's most rural provinces

---

10. Other research indicates that, of all Forms A filed by civilians, about 8% filed in MR 1 are probably false, about 18% filed in selected provinces of MR 3 are probably false, and that in MR 4, a high percentage of soldier tillers or ex-tillers have probably filed false Forms A. See Henry C. Bush and Larry Newberry, Farmers Who Own Their Land and the Land to the Tiller Program (report to the Ministry of Land Reform, Agriculture and Fisheries Development and ADLR, USAID, May, 1971, by Control Data Corp.) Table 1, and Larry Newberry and others, Soldiers and the Land to the Tiller Program in Military Region 4 of Vietnam, (the same source) pg.24

(Binh Long, Long Khanh, and Phuoc Long) to those who were or are farming or working land in MR 3's most urban provinces (Gia Dinh, Bien Hoa, and Phuoc Tuy - the last including urban Vung Tau). See Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12

RF AND PF SOLDIERS WHO WERE OR ARE FARMERS IN RURAL PROVINCES,  
 COMPARED TO THOSE IN URBAN PROVINCES:  
 WHAT THEY THINK ABOUT LTTT.

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

<u>Responses:</u>	<u>Rural</u> (N=49)	<u>Urban</u> (N=68)
I completely approve of the law.	82%	71%
I approve of this law in general, but I disapprove of some of its provisions.	14%	9%
I neither approve nor disapprove of this law.	2%	9%
I completely disapprove of this law.	0%	4%
Other	<u>2%</u>	<u>7%</u>
Total	100%	100%

Table 13

RF AND PF SOLDIERS WHO WERE OR ARE FARMERS IN RURAL PROVINCES  
 COMPARED TO THOSE IN URBAN PROVINCES:  
 WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ABOUT THEIR LAND

<u>Effects of LTTT:</u>	<u>Rural</u> (N=44)	<u>Urban</u> (N=54)
LTTT has had no effect on him.	53%	52%
Filed Form A to retain land	18%	17%
Filed apparently false Form B for Compensation	2%	15%
Filed for title	25%	13%
Other	<u>2%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Total	100%	100%

Tables 12 and 13 suggest that:

1. Most soldiers of urban background as well as soldiers of rural background completely approve of LTTT. LTTT does not divide the city and the countryside. This inference was also derived from our comparison of attitudes toward LTTT of commissioned officers and privates. See Table 8 and pgs. 32 and 33.
2. More soldiers who are in rural areas than those in urban areas are likely to be direct beneficiaries of LTTT. More file for title to their land.
3. Most soldiers, both in rural and in urban provinces of MR 3, say that LTTT has no effect on them.

COMPARISON OF MR 3 WITH MR 4<sup>11</sup>

1. In both MR 3 and MR 4 an overwhelming majority of both soldier-farmers and non farmers are in favor of LTTT largely because it will assist the poor and reduce economic and social inequities. In MR 3 less approved completely than in MR 4, more were neutral and less disapproved. However, in both regions an insignificant minority oppose LTTT.
2. Aside from what they may expect from LTTT there is in both regions some optimistic expectation that the GVN will ultimately provide land to the soldier when the war is over.
3. In both MR 3 and MR 4 an insignificant number -- only eight out of 2,204 -- oppose LTTT because it might distribute some farm land to ex-Viet Cong, families having some members in the Viet Cong, or those who may be favorably inclined to the Viet Cong.
4. Unlike MR 4, a sizeable percentage of soldier-farmers in MR 3 who were either entitled or obligated to file Form A, Form B, or file for title, filed nothing. In short a distinct lack of urgency is apparent in MR 3 as compared with MR 4 in conforming to or benefiting from the law.
5. Respondents in MR 3 were considerably less informed about LTTT than respondents in MR 4.

---

11. See footnote 2.

6. Many less respondents in MR 3 filed false Form A's, Form B's, or filed falsely for title than in MR 4.
7. The percentage of those who are or were farmers is much greater in MR 4 than in MR 3; although the pattern between branches (more farmers in PF than RF, and more farmers in RF than ARVN) is the same.
8. In MR 3 as in MR 4, more of the parents of sons in the PF than in the RF, and more of the parents of sons in the RF than in ARVN were farmers.
9. More soldier-farmers were owner/operators in MR 3 than in MR 4.
10. More soldiers' parents in MR 3 were owner/operators than in MR 4.
11. A higher percentage of soldier-farmers raised secondary crops in MR 3 than in MR 4.
12. In both MR 3 and MR 4 more soldier-farmers were tenants, squatters, or sharecroppers than were their parents. In both military regions more parents owned the land they farmed than did their sons. In short, in both regions the sons were poorer in land than were their parents.
13. In MR 3 less soldiers and less parents were tenants than in MR 4.
14. In MR 3 more parents were farm laborers than were their sons. In MR 4 more sons were farm laborers than were their parents.
15. With the exception of Long An province, which closely resembles the pattern of MR 4, MR 3 soldiers reflect a greater awareness than do respondents of MR 4 of over-all benefits to the nation from LTTT.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. A great majority of soldiers in MR 3, 78%, approve of the Land to the Tiller program. 65% approve of it without reservation. Another 13% approve of it, but disapprove of some parts of the program.

Most say it will help the poor. Many say it will reduce social inequality. Of those who approve of LTTT, but disapprove of parts of it, or of some of its possible effects, and those few who disapprove of it, the most frequent reason given is that it discriminates against the military. A few say it is unfair to landlords and compensation is slow. A very few say village officials and other local authorities are distorting the law locally, or are slow to implement it, and a very few say that it will cause conflicts in the villages.

Among soldiers who were or are farmers, 85% are in favor of it.

Among soldiers who were not farmers before military service, and thus have no reason to expect to benefit from LTTT, 75% approve of the program. Most soldiers in MR 3 were not farmers before military service. Only 32% were.

A negligible percentage (1%) completely disapprove of the law.

2. There are many soldiers in MR 3 whom LTTT implementation (the necessity to apply or declare land if one or one's immediate family rents or owns land) has failed to reach. More than half (58%) of those entitled to apply 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 say they do not understand what they must do. Others say they will get around to it later. Some say that LTTT is not being implemented promptly or properly at the local level. No soldier indicated any military, landlord, or other pressure as reason for his failure to apply for title or to declare land. One may be sure that among 1,201, each assured anonymity, if there were such pressure some would have said so. The inference is not that the program is being deliberately delayed, but that no command information or emphasis and no or almost no word from their villages telling them that it is necessary to declare their land in order to be certain to retain it has reached military personnel in MR 3. These factors probably account for the lack of urgency among soldier-farmers in MR 3 re their land and LTTT.

3. Almost no soldiers (only 6 of 1,201) oppose LTTT because it distributes farm land to present tillers some of whom might be ex-Viet Cong or might have members of their family still with the Viet Cong. LTTT does not divide soldiers from civilians on ideological grounds.
4. Of the 32% of all soldiers in MR 3 who used to farm or work on farm land, most, in all three military services (ARVN, RF, and PF) were tenant farmers. 47% were tenants, and another 7% used to own some farm land and rent some - 54%. They are likely to benefit from LTTT. 32% owned the land they farmed, and are likely to neither gain nor lose land by LTTT.

5. Among the parents of soldiers, 37% are tenant farmers and 8% own some of the land they farm and rent some from others - 45%. 36% own the land they farm.

The soldier sons who farm or work on farm land or used to, are poorer in land than their parents.

6. Almost no soldiers (1%) and almost none of their parents (3%) are landlords.
7. Most soldiers who were farmers still retain the land they used to farm. 64% have their wife and children or other relatives farming it or are still farming it themselves. 7% have friends, neighbors, tenants, squatters, or refugees on their land. 5% might lose it to them under LTTT.

8. LTTT does not divide officers from ordinary soldiers (privates). Most officers, like most low-ranking military personnel, approve of the Land to the Tiller program completely.
9. LTTT does not divide city people (urban working class whose work and skills are manual, and those who do "white collar" work at desks and whose skills are clerical) from farmers. Most soldiers, whether urban or rural, former farmers or those who have never farmed, well educated or lacking education, middle class or working class, are for the Land to the Tiller program. Middle class persons, however, have more reservations than do working class persons, more questions and doubts about

its implementation and about details of the program's probable or possible effects on Vietnamese society.

10. 75% of the soldiers not affected by LTTT, among all who were or are farmers, are completely in favor of the program.
11. 94% 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 of LTTT.
12. 90% 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.

## 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 question, 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 principal 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 principal 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 principal 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 principal 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:

---



---