

Institute of Economic Development and Research  
SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS  
University of the Philippines

Discussion Paper No. 74-17

5 October 1974

A NOTE ON THE AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE PHILIPPINES  
UNDER THE NEW SOCIETY

by

Tsutomu Takigawa

NOTE: IEDR Discussion Papers are preliminary versions  
circulated privately to elicit critical comment.  
References in publications to Discussion Papers  
should be cleared with the author(s).

A NOTE ON THE AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE PHILIPPINES  
UNDER THE NEW SOCIETY\*

by

Tsutomu Takigawa\*\*

Introduction

On September 21, 1972, President Marcos declared Martial Law upon the whole area of the Philippines by Proclamation No. 1081. Immediately after this, he proclaimed the entire country as a land reform area by Presidential Decree No. 2 of September 26. On October 21, one month after the proclamation of Martial Law, the President issued Presidential Decree No. 27, the so-called Tenants' Emancipation Act, which aimed at transforming the tenant-farmer on rice and corn lands in the whole country to owner farmers. According to President Marcos, the reasons which made him proclaim Martial Law are:

---

\* Paper completed early in November 1974, prior to LOI #227 dated November 16, 1974 ordering implementation of Operation Land Transfer on estates of 7-24 hectares (Editor's Note).

\*\* Tsutomu Takigawa was Visiting Research Associate of the School of Economics, University of the Philippines, from November 1972 to November 1974. He is a Senior Research Officer of the Institute of Developing Economies in Tokyo, Japan.

1) he wished to suppress the armed insurrections and revolts in the country; and 2) to transform "the sick society" so far to "the New Society". In connection with this, agrarian reform became a cornerstone of the New Society.<sup>1</sup>

At present, the agrarian reform program is tackling some complicated problems in a dynamic manner. I think it is reasonable to refrain from any kind of view about the future of the agrarian reform program, because it is still in progress. My chief concern is to know concretely the nature of the problems and difficulties concomitant with the implementation of agrarian reform under the Martial Law, especially in comparison with that of the post-war Japanese agrarian reform.

In my research, I received the great support and warm assistance not only from the staff and librarians of the School of Economics, University of the Philippines, but also from many staffs in the Department of Agrarian Reform and other government offices. At the same time, I received warm, generous cooperation and support from many people in the Agrarian Reform Regional Offices and

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agrarian Reform, The Philippine Agrarian Reform Program under the New Society, May, 1973, p. 10.

Agrarian Reform Team Offices in the local areas. I have a deep appreciation of their devoted efforts in implementing agrarian reform, confronted with the many troublesome problems and difficulties, working under unfavorable circumstances. I can hardly thank them enough for their assistance, cooperation and good will. I am also greatly indebted to the hospitality and warm friendship offered me by many farmers in several barrios. In all phases of this research work, I owe a lot to the great support of these people.

This report is only a tentative memorandum for the future, more complete analysis. I am, of course, solely responsible for the opinions and expressions in this report.

# I

## MAIN CONTENTS OF THE AGRARIAN REFORM PROGRAM AND THE PROCEEDINGS

The agrarian reform program under the Martial Law was formalized by PD No. 27, issued one month after the proclamation of the Martial Law. Considering the significance of PD No. 27, it will be necessary to cite the text in full:

### Presidential Decree No. 27

Decreeing the Emancipation Of Tenants From The Bondage Of The Soil Transferring To Them The Ownership Of The Land They Till And Providing The Instruments And Mechanism Therefor.

Inasmuch as the old concept of land ownership by a few has spawned valid and legitimate grievances that gave rise to violent conflict and social tension,

The redress of such legitimate grievances being one of the fundamental objectives of the New Society,

Since Reformation must start with the emancipation of the tiller of the soil from his bondage,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief of all the Armed Forces of the Philippines, and pursuant to Proclamation No. 1081, dated September 21, 1972, and General Order No. 1 dated September 22, 1972, as amended do hereby decree and order

the emancipation of all tenant farmers as of this day, October 21, 1972;

This shall apply to tenant farmers of private agricultural lands primarily devoted to rice and corn under a system of share-crop or lease-tenancy, whether classified as landed estate or not;

The tenant farmer, whether in land classified as landed estate or not, shall be deemed owner of a portion constituting a family-size farm of five (5) hectares if not irrigated and three (3) hectares if irrigated;

In all cases, the landowner may retain an area of not more than seven (7) hectares if such landowner is cultivating such area or will now cultivate it;

For the purpose of determining the cost of the land to be transferred to the tenant-farmer pursuant to this Decree, the value of the land shall be equivalent to two and one-half ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ ) times the average harvest of three normal crop years immediately preceding the promulgation of this Decree;

The total cost of the land, including interest at the rate of six (6) per centum per annum, shall be paid by the tenant in fifteen (15) years of fifteen (15) equal annual amortizations;

In case of default, the amortizations due shall be paid by the farmers' cooperative in which the defaulting tenant-farmer is a member, with the cooperative having a right of recourse against him;

The government shall guarantee such amortizations with shares of stock in government-owned and government-controlled corporations;

No title to the land owned by the tenant-farmers under this Decree shall be actually

issued to a tenant-farmer unless and until the tenant-farmer has become a full-fledged member of a duly recognized farmers' cooperative;

Title to land acquired pursuant to this Decree or the Land Reform Program of the Government shall not be transferable except by hereditary succession or to the Government in accordance with the provisions of this Decree, the Code of Agrarian Reforms and other existing laws and regulations;

The Department of Agrarian Reform through its Secretary is hereby empowered to promulgate rules and regulations for the implementation of this Decree.

All laws, executive orders, decrees and rules and regulations, or parts thereof, inconsistent with this Decree are hereby repealed and or modified accordingly.

Done in the City of Manila, this 21st day of October, in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-two.

As I earlier stated, the fundamentals of the agrarian reform program under the New Society are primarily regulated by PD No. 27. At present, agrarian reform is being implemented along the essential line of this Presidential Decree, supplemented by newly issued presidential decrees, memoranda, letters of instructions, and DAR memorandum circulars. Some interpretation of the contents of PD No. 27 will be necessary, because it forms the framework of the agrarian reform program under the Martial Law.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to note that PD No. 27 is called the bible of agrarian reform (Annual Report FY 1973-74, DAR Regional Office, IX, p. 21).

Firstly, the prime objective of PD No. 27 is the transfer of land ownership to the tenants or the so called establishment of owner-farmers. It can be said that PD No. 27 has set a more progressive target in contrast to the Code of Agrarian Reforms, (RA 3844 as amended by RA 6389) which also had the establishment of owner cultivators as its final objective, but which, in reality ended at the first stage of policy, i.e., the conversion of sharetenants into leaseholders. Although PD No. 27 proclaimed "the emancipation of all tenant farmers", its application is limited in practice only to the rice and corn tenant-farmers on private lands. This means the exclusion of the tenant-farmers and agricultural laborers on the sugar and coconut lands etc. Also, PD No. 27 sets up 7 hectares as the land-owner's retention limit. (However, this does not mean that the landlord can retain 7 hectares. This only means that the landlord will be permitted to retain 7 hectares if, and only if, he himself will cultivate the land. Therefore, it can be said that the landlords' retention limit is zero.) As a result of this, PD No. 27, in principle, limits the coverage of its application to rice and corn tenant-farmers on private agricultural lands of more than 7 hectares. Besides this, PD No. 27 further



stipulates the size of the family farm, the formula for land valuation, payment methods for the tenant-farmers, guarantee system of payments to the landowners and the obligation of the tenant-farmer to join the farmers' cooperatives (Samahang Nayan), etc.

The Department of Agrarian Reform has estimated that under the decree the land area to be transferred is around 1,767,000 ha. and about 1,000,000 tenant farmers will be benefitted. The DAR initially set the accomplishment period in three years from November 1972 to 1975, but afterwards extended the final period to 1977 as more realistic. As a result of this, the DAR set up the plan to carry out the land transfer operation in five years, as follows:

Table 1  
TARGETS OF OPERATION LAND TRANSFER

Year	Farmers	Area (Has.)
1973 (Jan.-June)	277,861	555,187
1973-74	312,047	555,740
1974-75	150,346	245,623
1975-76	149,196	213,778
1976-77	110,550	196,872
Total	1,000,000	1,767,000

Source: DAR, The Philippine Agrarian Reform Program under the New Society, May, 1973, p. 13.

To initiate an agrarian reform program, it is a condition sine qua non to know the precise facts about landownership at the very start, because an agrarian reform program is to be defined concisely as the land transfer operation from the landowners to the tenants by an administrative body. In other words, it is indispensable to know at the start certain facts like: who is the landowner, and how many hectares does he have and in what areas; and who are the real tenant-cultivators on what lands, etc. However, in the Philippines, the

survey on landownership has never been carried out so far, because of the strong opposition from the land-owning class, posing the issue of infringement of the right of private ownership.<sup>3</sup> Thus, President Marcos ordered all agricultural landowners to submit sworn statements about their landholdings to the PC Provincial Commander by Letter of Instruction No. 41 as of November 27, 1972. This LOI No. 41 was amended by LOI No. 45 on December 6, and re-amended by LOI No. 52 on January 17, 1973. According to this final instruction, the deadline for the submission of sworn statements by landowners was fixed as follows:

- 1) Landowners possessing agricultural land planted to any crop with a total area of 100 ha. or more - January 31, 1973.
- 2) Landowners possessing agricultural land planted to any crop with a total area of less than 100 has. - June 30, 1973.

According to LOI No. 41 and LOI No. 45, issued before LOI No. 52, the deadline of the filing of sworn

<sup>3</sup> When Senate Bill No. 478 was discussed, the lack of statistics on landownership in the Philippines was often pointed out. See the Congressional Record, Senate, Vol. II, No. 11, June 29, 1971, p. 226; Vol. II, No. 12, June 30, 1971, pp. 310, 348.

statements by the landowners had been fixed within January 31, 1973 regardless of the size of landholding; but according to the final LOI No. 52, the deadline for the sworn statements by the landowners of 100 ha. or less was substantially deferred until June 30, 1973.

While LOI No. 41 and No. 45 ordered the landowners to submit their sworn statements to the PC Provincial Commander, LOI No. 52 ordered the landowners to submit their sworn statements to the Municipal Mayors who shall in turn submit them to the PC Provincial Commander. The Municipal Mayors were also authorized to notarize the sworn statements from the landowners. The reason for this change is not clear, and I have some questions regarding this point. Sometimes, there would be cases of unfair and false statements from landowners, because many municipal mayors themselves are landowners or are closely related with the landowning class in the province. Strangely enough, in LOI No. 52, there is no penalty clause at all on the understatement or false statement from the landowners.<sup>4</sup> There is the possibility of secret

---

<sup>4</sup> Even under the control of Martial Law, I doubt if the mere order to submit sworn statements without the penalty clause has the power to enforce.

negotiations between the mayors and the landowners. From past experiences, we know that the forms of resistance and sabotage of the landowners are quite various, including understatement, neglect, refusal, and postponement of filing of the statement, etc. According to the pronouncement of the DAR as of July 30, (a month after the deadline) 1973, the number of sworn statements was only 77,440 (the number of landowners are 76,972) and the total area was two million hectares. I know that there might be many uncalculated figures besides these at this time. However, I am obliged to say that these figures pronounced by the DAR are too small, because the figures should be at least 6 and 7 million hectares, if we include all kinds of agricultural lands regardless of their being tenanted or not. American advisers to the agrarian reform program expressed their opinions in a memorandum as of July 20, as follows: "We would be quite surprised if as much as 50% of the tenanted rice and corn land has been correctly declared as of this date, and the figure could be as low as 25%. Clearly, many landlords are doing everything possible to slow down or sabotage the program, largely because they feel they have nothing to lose."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Roy L. Prosterman and Charles A. Taylor, Briefing Memorandum on the Current Status of the Philippine Land Reform, July 20, 1973, p. 7.

After September 1973, DAR stopped publishing the total declared land areas, but the number of sworn statements reached 431,565 on December 24, 1973, and 794,662 on August 5, 1974.

✓ The land transfer operation involves five processes.

- (1) ✓ Identification of actual tenant-farmers and their respective landowners and a production survey: Statistics and other data are obtained by DAR field staffs through personal interviews
- (2) ✓ Parcelary mapping and sketching of individual tenant's farmlots: Identified tenants' farm parcels are sketched by the Bureau of Lands survey teams
- (3) ✓ Issuance of land transfer certificates to the tenant-farmers
- (4) ✓ Determination of land values
- (5) ✓ Compensation to landowners

Operation (1) and (2) are very difficult and time-consuming work in such a country as the Philippines where there are not complete cadastral surveys. Some of the tenants do not even know the name of their landlords.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>"Agrarian Reform: Touchstone for RP Progress," Daily Express, June 9, 1973.

The staffs of the Agrarian Reform Team Office have the responsibility for Operation (1), and they can get assistance from the Barrio Action Group (BAG), for gathering the basic data. BAG members are composed of Farm Management Technician of DAR, BAE, and BPI, the PTA President, the barrio school head teacher, the AFP, the barrio captain or barrio councilman, the representative of the tenants, landowners, and Civic Organizations and the President of the Barrio Association. The Bureau of Lands Survey Teams have the responsibility for Operation (2), and they use aerial photographs. As of June 30, 1973, the Bureau of Lands has organized 57 Survey Teams all over the country.

After Operations (1) and (2) are completed, the land transfer certificates (LTC) will be issued to the tenant-farmers. Then, the land valuation procedure will begin. After the determination of land value, both the compensation for the landowner and amortization payments of the tenant-farmers begin. If a tenant-farmer is able to pay in full the amortization payment of 15 years' installments, he will get the land title, and become an owner-farmer. Needless to say, the LTC itself is not the land title. It is only the promissory certificate that a tenant-farmer will be given the land title when he

has completed the amortization payments in the future.<sup>7</sup>

The landowners are compensated for their land under any of the following modes of settlement under PD No. 251 of July 21, 1973:

- (1) Cash payment of 10% and balance in 25-year tax-free 6% Land Bank bonds;
- (2) Payments of 30% in preferred shares of stocks and the balance in 25-year tax-free 6% Land Bank bonds;
- (3) Full guarantee on the payment of fifteen annual amortizations to be made by the tenant-farmers;
- (4) Payment through the establishment of annuities or pensions with insurance;
- (5) Exchange arrangement for government stocks in government-owned or -controlled corporations or private corporations where the government has holdings;
- (6) Such other modes of settlement as may be further adopted by the Board of Directors and approved by the President of the Philippines.

---

<sup>7</sup>The newspapers in this country seldom make a distinction between a land title and a land transfer certificate.



The DAR selected 9 pilot municipalities in 6 provinces to initiate the Operation Land Transfer, with the objective of utilizing the experiences and resultant reactions as guidelines for improving the operation and for further policy decision. The nine municipalities were as follows: San Mateo (Isabela), Guimba and Zaragoza (Nueva Ecija), Plaridel (Bulacan), Calamba and Biñan (Laguna), Tigaon (Camarines Sur) and Pototan and Dingle (Iloilo). According to the DAR, the reasons for selecting these municipalities are: the presence of large agricultural landholdings, existence of prevalent social unrest, tenancy density, type of primary crop (rice and corn), and location of area.<sup>8</sup>

\* The first launching of Operation Land Transfer was started on November 13, 1972 in Nueva Ecija with the Secretary of DAR initiating the project. On January 1973, the pilot areas expanded to 17, including 8 additional pilot municipalities as follows: Bongabon (Nueva Ecija), Calumpit (Bulacan), Minalin and Mabalacat (Pampanga), Concepcion and Capas (Tarlac), Carcar (Cebu), and Kananga (Leyte). As a result of the experiences gained in the 17 municipalities, priority of the Operation Land Transfer

---

<sup>8</sup> Report: DAR, Planning Service, June 30, 1973, p. 4.

was directed at landed estates of 100 ha. and above, then brought down to 50 ha. in the latter part of March, 1973. On October 22, estates of 24 ha. and above were also covered.

Let us look at the results of the first phase of Operation Land Transfer up to June 30, 1973. As of this time, the number of farmers interviewed and identified represents 51% of the total estimated number of tenant-farmers in the country (Table 2). Progress of the identification work was remarkable in Region II, but it was minimal in Western and Northern Mindanao regions, due to the serious peace and order problems there. The total number of tenant-recipients of Land Transfer Certificates as of June 30, 1973 stands at 30,805. This represents 6% of the number of tenants identified and 3% of the estimated number of tenant-tillers. At the same time, interesting facts about landownership all over the country became clear through the efforts of the DAR field units. According to Table 3, the number of landowners with 100 ha. and above rice and corn tenanted lands is 1,374, and total area is 375,654 ha. It is notable that the big landowners of 100 ha. and above are concentrated in Region III, that is, the area of Central Luzon. The number of landowners with 50 to 99.9 ha. is 1,608 and the

Table 2

NUMBER OF TENANT-TILLERS INTERVIEWED AND IDENTIFIED  
AND NUMBER OF TENANT-RECIPIENTS OF LTC BY REGION  
(June 30, 1973)

(Self-Identified)

Region	Estimated total number (A) of tenants	Number (B) identified	<del>Number of</del> Number of Tenants-Recipients of LTC (C)	C/B (%)
I	66,631	24,850	0	-
II	69,718	87,111	2,845	3
III	218,910	149,851	15,336	10
IV	108,245	44,565	1,134	2
V	87,729	70,295	1,140	2
VI	126,075	53,348	4,152	8
VII	93,445	21,131	610	2
VIII	68,324	26,537	5,360	20
IX	26,429	4,212	0	-
X	53,756	6,303	0	-
XI	66,444	16,882	228	1
All Regions	985,706	505,085	30,805	6

Source: DAR, Planning Service, Report, June 30, 1973, pp. 7, 15.

Note: Region I - Ilocos Region, Region II - Cagayan Valley, Region III - Central Luzon, Region IV -  
Southern Tagalog Region, Region V - Bicol Region, Region VI - Western Visayas, Region VII -  
Central Visayas, Region VIII - Eastern Visayas, Region IX - Western Mindanao, Region X -  
Northern Mindanao, Region XI - Southern Mindanao.

Table 3

NUMBER OF LANDOWNERS WITH TENANTED RICE AND CORN FARMS OF 100 HA.  
AND ABOVE, 50 HA. TO 99.9 HA.

Region	No. of 100 ha. and above	Total area (ha.)	No. of 50-99.9 ha. Landowners	Total Area (ha.)
I	51	15,917	20	1,402
II	94	29,351	117	7,628
III	524	132,618	543	37,623
IV	191	74,900	208	14,403
V	137	26,577	184	12,355
VI	54	9,440	144	9,834
VII	81	17,185	17	1,031
VIII	43	16,894	105	7,013
IX	10	1,965	20	1,358
X	131	35,451	232	15,127
XI	58	15,358	18	1,330
All Regions	1,374	375,654	1,608	109,104

Source: DAR, Planning Service, pp. 19-20.

total area is 109,104 ha. It is also noteworthy that the landowners of this size of land are concentrated in Region III.

Then, let us glance at the accomplishments of Operation Land Transfer after its first launching in Nueva Ecija on November 13, 1972. Table 4 indicates the comparative pictures of accomplishments of November 5, 1973 after one year of launching and that of the present. Looking at this, we are bothered by the comparatively slow accomplishments between these periods. If we consider the fact that the Operation Land Transfer on July 1, 1974 includes lands of 24 ha. and above, it is safe to say that the progress of the Operation is almost stagnant. The interview and identification of tenant-farmers have almost stopped. The number of the LTC recipients increased from 133,000 to 175,000, and the number of the LTC issued increased from 190,000 to 247,000 between these periods. It should be noted, however, that the accomplishment figures of July 1, 1974 are still less than 20% of the targets. According to the yearly targets of DAR indicated in Table 1, the accomplishments of the work on June 30, 1974 should cover about 600,000 tenant-farmers and 1,100,000 ha., as against the real accomplishments of 175,000 tenant-farmers and 310,000 ha.

Table 4

## COMPARISON OF STATUS OPERATION LAND TRANSFER

	Total Scope (A)	November 5, 1973		July 1, 1974	
		Accomplishment (B)	B/A (%)	Accomplishment (C)	C/A (%)
<b>Data Gathering<sup>1</sup></b>					
1. No. of Tenants interviewed and identified	1,000,000	600,000	60.0	635,190	63.5
2. Corresponding No. of Parcels	1,348,855	740,000	54.9	851,451	63.0
3. Corresponding ha. <sup>2</sup>	1,767,000	950,000	53.8	1,041,348	58.9
<b>Parcellary Map Sketching</b>					
1. No. of lots sketched	1,348,855	250,000	18.5	310,128	23.0
2. Corresponding ha.	1,767,000	350,000	19.8	429,466	24.2
3. No. of Tenant-Tillers involved	1,000,000	190,000	19.0	230,466	23.0
<b>No. of LTC issued</b>					
1. No. of recipients	1,000,000	133,000	13.3	174,296	17.4
2. No. of certificates	1,348,855	190,000	14.1	247,149	18.4
3. Ha. involved	1,767,000	240,000	13.6	310,436	17.6
4. No. of Provinces involved	68	51	75.0	61	89.9

<sup>1</sup> Refers to all tenanted rice and corn areas of all sizes.

<sup>2</sup> Figures of November 5, 1973 refers only to 50 ha. and above. Figures of July 1, 1974 refers to 24 ha. and above.

Sources: DAR, The Philippine Agrarian Reform Before and After the Declaration of Martial Law, November 10, 1973, p. 11; calculated from DAR, Planning Service, Summary Operation Land Transfer (Weekly Report).

Table 5 shows the number of the Land Transfer Certificates issued, the number of LTC recipients and the hectarages by month. According to this, it will be clear that the pace of the Operation Land Transfer was fairly fast during 1973, but became sluggish early this year. This sluggishness is mainly due to three reasons. One is the strong resistance from the landowners. The second is the reluctance of receiving LTC on the part of some tenant-farmers, due to various reasons. The third is that Operation Land Transfer at present is limited to lands of 24 ha. and above. Table 6 indicates the number of the LTC issued by regions. According to this, the issuance of LTC has been concentrated in the Central Luzon area (Region III), and reached 31% of the final target. However, the issuance of the LTC has been very slow in the other regions; for example, Regions IV, VI, VII, X and XI. The slowness of Operation Land Transfer is conspicuous, especially in the Mindanao area, due to the seriousness of the peace and order situation there.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup>"The Province of Sulu, Tawi-Tawi and Basilan have acute disturbance of peace and order due to the outbreak of insurgency which the government is trying hard to quell. Likewise, in the Province of Zamboanga del Sur, especially in the Baganian Peninsula and along the coastal towns, insurgency has been and still is very active, and

Table 5

NUMBER OF LAND TRANSFER CERTIFICATES ISSUED

	Number of Tenant Recipients	Number of Certi- ficates	Hectares Involved	Number of Provinces Involved
<u>1973</u>				
Feb. 26		1,584		
March 26		7,545		
April 23	9,064	11,457	15,111	
May 28	18,296	24,354	30,697	
June 25	28,535	38,762	50,592	
July 23	33,878	46,357	59,546	24
Aug. 27	57,756	79,216	98,106	38
Sept. 24	87,510	121,855	149,665	46
Oct. 22	106,807	150,822	189,973	50
Nov. 26	137,751	196,102	247,066	51
Dec. 24	144,424	207,287	259,082	54
<u>1974</u>				
Jan. 21	142,573	205,061	254,517	54
Feb. 25	152,333	220,559	273,198	55
March 25	153,806	222,414	275,662	55
April 29	166,332	237,817	297,864	57
May 27	170,557	243,034	304,146	60
June 24	173,669	246,492	309,548	61
July 22	175,967	248,788	312,420	61
August 26	176,248	247,027	312,304	63
Sept. 23	182,333	254,198	321,845	64

Source: DAR, Planning Service, Summary Operation Land Transfer (Weekly Report).

Note: We notice some adjustments of the figures.



Table 6

NUMBER OF LTC ISSUED BY REGIONS AS OF JUNE 30, 1974

Region	Estimated total No. of tenants (A)	Number of tenants- recipients (B)	B/A (%) (C)	No. of Parcels (Number of LTC)	Ha.
I	66,631	12,578	18.9	21,657	14,125
II	69,718	17,446	25.0	25,282	32,612
III	218,910	68,625	31.4	98,859	148,709
IV	108,245	11,052	10.2	14,113	17,567
V	87,729	17,879	20.2	22,415	25,063
VI	126,075	16,067	12.7	20,732	25,918
VII	93,445	7,566	8.1	11,091	7,819
VIII	68,324	13,170	19.3	20,822	18,749
IX	26,429	446	1.7	585	702
X	53,756	4,422	8.2	5,630	9,243
XI	66,444	4,418	6.7	5,306	9,042
Total	985,706	173,669	17.6	246,492	309,548

<sup>1</sup>Figures (A) are taken from DAR, Planning Service, Report, June 30, 1973, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Others are taken from DAR, PS, Summary of Tenants issued LTC as of June 30, 1974

<sup>3</sup>(C) is calculated by the author.

According to the reports on the LTC recipients as of June 30, 1974 by provinces, the highest record was attained by Nueva Ecija with 40,413, and Camarines Sur with 12,078, Leyte: 11,599, Tarlac: 11,581, Pangasinan: 11,013, Pampanga: 10,199, Iloilo: 10,005, Isabela: 8,197 and Cagayan: 8,090, in descending order. Judging from these records, we can easily say that Operation Land Transfer at present, is concentrating at the areas of prevalent agrarian unrest.

The next problem is how to determine the value of the land. It involves considerable difficulties because land valuation bears a close connection with the right of private property especially for the landed interests. According to PD No. 27, the value of the land shall be equivalent to two and one half (2½) times

(Continuation of Footnote #9)

most frequently, we witness sporadic ambushes of both civilian and military personnel. It has thus become normally academic that the situation in the field is always tense, with the farmers occasionally evacuating and the atmosphere is thereby rendered impregnable to the normal prosecution of our duties." (DAR Regional Office, IX, Annual Report, FY 1973-1974, pp. 3-4). The situation in Region XI including the Province of Cotabato is almost similar. "The peace and order situation has greatly affected the program. Public utility vehicles have decreased their plights [sic] because of the risk which automatically increased the fare." (DAR Regional Office XI, Annual Performance Report, FY 1973-74, p. 51).

the average harvest of three normal crop years immediately preceding the promulgation of the Decree.

However, the tenant-farmers usually have not kept the past production records and the records on the part of landowners are not necessarily correct. Moreover, there are some factors in the rural areas which make it difficult to fix the correct amount of production in the past: for example, the prevalent existence of the agad practice. As a result of these, there are frequently big discrepancies between the production records presented by the two parties.<sup>10</sup> The DAR, well aware of this fact, issued the Department Memorandum Circular No. 26 on November 5, 1973 for organizing the Barrio Committee on Land Production (BCLP) to facilitate the mutual agreement between landowners and tenants.

According to this DAR Memorandum Circular No. 26, the BCLP has the responsibility to determine the three normal crop years and to determine the average gross

<sup>10</sup> For fixing the leasehold rentals, a tenant claims that his past three normal harvest were 57 cavans for the year 1966-67, 63 cavans for 1967-68, and 47 cavans for 1968-69. Against this, the landlord claims that the tenant's three normal harvests were 158, 152.5 and 116 cavans, respectively. (Journal of the Court of Agrarian Relations, February 28, 1974, pp. 280-281).

production of each of the land categories in the barrios, namely corn land, upland rice land, lowland rice land unirrigated and irrigated. A BCLP in every barrio is composed of the barrio captain; one representative of the Samahang Nayan; four representatives of the tenant-farmers; two representatives of the owner-cultivators; two representatives of the landowners and one DAR representative. Each representative shall be elected among the members of each stratum. The Committee shall elect its chairman, but according to my observations, the barrio captains are usually the ones appointed as the chairman of the Committee. After the BCLP has decided the average gross production of each category of land in a barrio, the Committee will make public the determined figures for a period of 15 days. If any interested party will not protest publicly against this, the Committee will send the data to the DAR Central Office. The Central Office will finally determine the value of the land per hectare for each land category, with the assistance of the National Computer Center with the calculations. The NCC will compute for the value of palay and/or corn in terms of 50 kg. net per cavan and in terms of kilos in the case of auxiliary crops, if any, using P35 per cavan of rice, the support buying price of the government at the time of the promulgation of PD No. 27.

DAR Memorandum Circular No. 2 issued on January 17, 1974, ordered the standard procedures on land valuation as follows; in case of disagreement between landowners and tenant-farmers on land production, the determination of the average gross production data shall be referred to the BCLP. We should take note of the word "refer to", instead of the word "basis". Also, it is noteworthy that there is a procedural instruction in the DAR Circular No. 2, as follows, "The Agrarian Reform Team Leader, through the adoption of diplomatic and persuasive methods or procedures, shall exert efforts to have the landowner and tenant-farmers agree on the average gross production data applicable to each tenant-farmer and amount of lease rentals paid after the promulgation of PD 27 ...."<sup>11</sup> This special procedural instruction will be the result of considerations to the landowners in order to avoid their resistance and non-cooperation as much as possible.

On February 4, 1974, Secretary Estrella of DAR, issued an Open Letter appealing to all landowners concerned to arrive at the Landowner-Tenant Production Agreement with the assistance of the Agrarian Reform Team

---

<sup>11</sup>Underscoring mine.

Leader in the locality. On April 19, Secretary Estrella again issued Open Letter No. 2, requesting all landowners concerned to agree on the annual average production with the tenants, for the period ending June 30, 1974. Furthermore, he noted that after June 30, all cases shall then be turned-over to the Barrio Committee whose decision shall be used in computing the value of the land. This Open Letter No. 2 touched briefly on the resistance of the landowners. "Reports received from the field indicates that some landowners refuse to sit down with our men and his tenant-farmers to come to agree on the average gross production of the land."<sup>12</sup> Some landowners even refused to receive the Open Letter of the DAR Secretary.

After June 30, however, only very few Landowner-Tenant Production Agreements were accomplished. Recognizing this fact, the DAR Secretary issued Open Letter No. 3 on July 8, requesting the landowners concerned for further efforts to arrive at the agreement with their tenants on the value of the land, otherwise, the matter shall be decided by the BCLP whose decision shall be the basis for the computation of the said value. According

---

<sup>12</sup>See Conrado Estrella, Open Letter No. 2, April 19, 1974.

to DAR Secretary, "it is only when there is disagreement that the issue is brought formally to BCLP for determination and settlement".<sup>13</sup>

The numbers of BCLP which have been organized all over the country are 835 as of July 12, 1974. The highest number has been attained in the Province of Nueva Ecija with 252, the Province of Iloilo with 169, and Leyte with 159. In terms of municipality, the highest number has been attained in Guimba (Nueva Ecija), and Tubungan (Iloilo) with 35, and Muñoz (Nueva Ecija), Tigbauan (Iloilo), Alimodian (Iloilo) with 32, and San Mateo (Isabela) with 25. The numbers of BCLP increased to 897 on August 2, 991 on September 16, and 1,071 on October 4. However, the number of BCLP organized will still be insufficient for these requirements.

After the landowners and the tenant-farmers have agreed on the value of the land, the Land Bank will start compensation payment to the landowners. Let us now look at the accomplishments on land valuation and compensation for landowners. According to Table 7, the reported accomplishments received by the Planning Service,

Table 7

**LAND VALUATION AND LANDOWNERS COMPENSATION**  
As of April 22, July 15, September 16, 1974

Particulars	April 22	July 15	Sept. 16
1. Received by the Planning Service, DAR:			
Number of Landowners	50	99	140
Number of Titles	147	230	381
Number of Tenant-Farmers	2,403	4,130	6,583
Area Tilled by Tenant-Farmers (ha.)	3,515	6,468	9,494
Number of Provinces Involved	11	11	18
2. Valuation (Transmitted to the Land Bank) <sup>1/</sup>			
Number of Landowners	22	58	38
Number of Titles	83	143	217
Number of Tenant-Farmers	1,116	2,609	3,530
Area Tilled by Tenant-Farmers (ha.)	1,609	4,259	5,837
Estimated Cost (₱)	10,454,507	24,548,750	34,701,112
Number of Provinces Involved	4	9	10
3. Compensation (Paid by Land Bank) <sup>2/</sup>			
Number of Landowners	16	29	42
Number of Titles	54	87	116
Number of Tenant-Farmers	605	1,321	1,902
Area Tilled by Tenant-Farmers (ha.)	956	1,914	3,067
Cost (₱)	6,799,188	12,149,846	18,933,895 <sup>3/</sup>
Number of Provinces Involved	4	6	8

<sup>1/</sup>Data of Item No. 2 are part of Item No. 1.

<sup>2/</sup>Data of Item No. 3 are part of Item Nos. 1 and 2.

<sup>3/</sup>Provinces are Tarlac, Pampanga, Camarines Sur, Nueva Ecija, Pangasinan, Albay, Isabela and Cagayan.

Source: DAR, Planning Service, Weekly Reports



DAR as of September 16, 1974 are as follows: Number of landowners and tenant-farmers who have agreed on land value are 140 and 6,583 respectively, and the area involved is 9,494 ha. in 18 provinces. The average size of landholding per landowner is only 67 ha., and the average number of tenant-farmers per landowner is 47.

From these facts, we may properly conclude that it will be considerably difficult for the big landowner and the tenant-farmers to arrive at a complete agreement within the shorter period involved. Table 7 also shows the present situation of compensation being paid by the Land Bank, as follows: Number of landowners: 42, number of tenant-farmers involved: 1,902, area involved: 3,067 ha., compensation costs: 18.9 million pesos and number of provinces involved: 8. The average value of land is calculated as P6,100 per ha., which is almost near the common market values in the provinces concerned. According to the report of the Land Bank as of May 29, they decided to pay the compensation of P9,966,732, involving 934 tenants and 1,420 ha.<sup>14</sup> In this case, we can get the average compensation price of P7,000 per ha. from the calculation, which is almost equivalent to the common

---

<sup>14</sup>DAR Bulletin News, June 7, 1974.

market prices. Also from the calculation, we can get a high amount of average annual production per ha. of 80 cavans of rice. The compensation was paid with 10% of cash and 90% of the Land Bank Bond, which tells us that the method is most preferable to the common farmers at present.

As mentioned already, the present implementation of Operation Land Transfer covers only the agricultural

landholdings of 24 hectares and above, and excludes that

less than 24 ha. The DAR frequently issued the order of

keeping the status quo in the relations between tenant-

farmers and landowners in the areas outside of the

Operation Land Transfer. [For example, Memorandum of

the DAR Secretary on January 2 and January 9, 1973; DAR

Memorandum Circular No. 2 (Amended) on June 18, 1973;

No. 2-A (Amended) on June 19, 1973; DAR No. 316 on

October 22, etc.]. Status quo means the landlord

relationship between tenant farmers and landowners and

the share tenancy relationship is defined as illegal.

In spite of this, however, there are still practices of

share tenancy, and it cannot be denied that there are

still disputes between landowners and tenant farmers

concerning the fixing of the amount of lease rentals.

The fixing of lease rentals has, in some

instances, remained a continuing debate between land-

owners and tenants". (Conrado F. Estrella, Agrarian

Reform in the New Society, p. 35).

The DAR Regional Director has the responsibility to assist in the arrangement of the leasehold contract between landowners and tenant-farmers, and any of the parties may take the matter to the Court of Agrarian Relations (CAR) for adjudication, if he is dissatisfied with the provisional fixing of lease rentals by the DAR Regional Director. The status quo also involves the protection of tenant-farmers from ejectments. One of the most comprehensive instruction is Circular No. 2-A, cited below:

DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM  
CIRCULAR NO. 2-A (AMENDED)  
Series of 1973

TO: ALL REGIONAL DIRECTORS  
DISTRICT OFFICERS  
AGRIAN REFORM TEAM LEADERS  
FIELD PERSONNEL

We have received reports about the rising number of conflicts among tenants and landowners in tenanted rice and/or corn land resulting in the disturbance of peace and order in the rural areas. In previous memoranda, pursuant to instructions of President Ferdinand E. Marcos, we directed that pending the issuance of the implementing rules and regulations of Presidential Decree No. 27, there shall be status quo in the relationship between tenant-farmers and landowners.

Status quo shall mean maintaining the leasehold arrangement existing as of October 21, 1972 and in addition, the following guidelines shall be observed:

1. No tenant-farmer shall be ejected or removed from his farmholdings pending the promulgation of the Rules and Regulations; no new ejectment

cases shall be accepted by the Court of Agrarian Relations on lands within the purview of Presidential Decree Number 27.

2. All pending ejectment cases in courts between tenant-farmers and landowners shall be held in abeyance upon petition of any party-litigant.

3. As of October 21, 1972, tenant-farmers are deemed owners of the land they till, subject to the provisions of the rules and regulations to be hereafter promulgated. Meantime, the leasehold system shall be provisionally maintained. The tenant-farmer shall continue to pay to the landowner the lease rentals for the time being which, subject to the rules and regulations aforementioned may be later credited as amortization payments. In the event of any disagreement between the landowner and the tenant-farmer as to the amount of rental to be paid, the Department of Agrarian Reform thru the Regional Director concerned shall provisionally fix the same, taking as guide the applicable provisions of Section 34 of the Code of Agrarian Reforms and Presidential Decree No. 2 declaring the whole country as land reform areas, Presidential Decree No. 27 emancipating the tenant-farmers from the bondage of tenancy, Letters of Instructions Nos. 45, 46 & 51, Memorandum of the President dated November 25, 1972. However, should any of the parties disagree with the provisional rental, he may take the matter to the Court of Agrarian Relations for adjudication.

No action shall be done to undermine or subvert the intent and provisions of the Presidential Decrees, Letter of Instructions, Memoranda and Directives, such as the following and/or similar acts:

- a. Division or subdivision of tenanted lands after October 21, 1972 except in cases where:
  1. The names of co-heirs or co-owners are stated in the certificate of title;
  2. There is a written partition agreement executed by the parties prior to October 21, 1972, in accordance with the formalities of law;
  3. That division of the estate is pending in court whether testate or intestate proceedings at the time of promulgation of Presidential Decree No. 27.
- b. Change of crops from palay and/or corn to other crops like sugarcane, coconut, tobacco, etc., by the landowners, or by the tenant-farmers.
- c. Harassment of tenant-farmer by landowner through the filing of cases like trespassing, qualified theft, estafa, recovery of possession, malicious mischief, grave threats, coercion, etc. Extreme caution shall be exercised by the officials concerned in dealing with such cases.
- d. Physical acts of dispossession like bulldozing of farm, demolition and/or burning of houses, illegal cutting of irrigation systems, manhandling, mauling, coercion, intimidation or duress, with the end in view of driving away the tenants from their farm-holdings.
- e. No tenant-farmer shall enlarge his tillage as of October 21, 1972.

f) No person shall enter any untenanted rice and/or corn land in order to establish tenancy relationship without the consent of the landowner.

g) Mortgaging tenanted land to a person, group of persons, associations, corporations and/or financial institutions after October 21, 1972.

h) Transfer of ownership after October 21, 1972, except to the actual tenant-farmer tiller. If transferred to him, the cost should be that prescribed by Presidential Decree No. 27.

Whenever necessary, after exhausting all remedies within your authority, you shall seek the assistance of the Provincial Commander concerned to enforce the directives contained in this Memorandum Circular.

For effective updating of continuing policies and plans and programs, you are enjoined to submit as often as possible reports of all cases and activities mentioned in this Memorandum Circular on the actions taken or solutions made in the premises.

This supplements Memorandum Circular No. 2 (amended) dated June 18, 1973.

## PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION

The problems which the government is now confronting with the implementation of Operation Land Transfer are various, complicated and serious in character. Among them, I will take up only the following problems: (1) retention limit for the landowner, (2) the nature of the resistance and non-cooperation of the landowners, (3) the problems accompanying the limited application of Operation Land Transfer to the rice and corn lands and (4) the problems of the Agrarian Reform Team.

### (1) Problem of the Retention Limit

According to PD No. 27, which contains the basic regulations for the Operation Land Transfer of the present day, the size of the retention area for a landowner (as a non-cultivating landowner) is zero in case of the rice and corn lands, as I have already mentioned. In other words, the tenancy system is not permitted fundamentally, in case of the rice and corn lands, under PD No. 27. However, at present, the Government is carrying out Operation Land Transfer only with landhold-

ings of 24 ha. and above, and the Government is still deliberating on the exact time of covering the landholdings of less than 24 ha. Now, the Government is very prudent about this matter, because the decision itself will be closely connected with political and social problems. It is very natural to expect strong resistance from the smaller landowners. "Landowners' resistance to agrarian reform has remained the primary problem. This resistance manifested itself anew under Operation Land Transfer and the most vocal were the small landowners, especially those of the 24 ha. and below category."<sup>16</sup> Because the smaller the landholding, the stronger the attachment of the small landowner (in this paper, the term "small landowner" means the landowner with less than 24 ha. of land) to the income from his landholding. Besides, the compensation for his landholding from the government will be smaller in total, however higher the unit valuation of his landholding will be, compared to that of the large landowner. With this small amount of compensation, he will have no bright, stable prospect from his investment to industry, in such countries as the Philippines. Because

---

<sup>16</sup>DAR, The Philippine Agrarian Reform Program before and after the Declaration of Martial Law, p. 10.



of these reasons, the resistance of the small landowners is very persistent and require careful consideration. The decision of the Government to enlarge the coverage of Operation Land Transfer from now on will be a critical one of political judgment.

So far, it was said that most of the landowners in this country are small landowners,<sup>17</sup> and the survey conducted on the pilot municipalities at the outset of Operation Land Transfer proved these facts. Table 8 is the result of the survey on 17 pilot municipalities.

Most Landowners  
small  
and not large  
1% of  
land is being  
to 24 ha. or  
above

According to this table, the big landowners with 24 ha. and above are only 1.7% of all the landowners and the number of tenants belonging to this bracket are only 21.7% of all tenants. On the other hand, the small landowners with less than 24 ha. are 98% of all the landowners, and tenant-farmers belonging to this bracket are 78.3% of all the tenants. As shown in this table, 91% of the landowners are small ones with lands of less than 7 ha., and 52% of the tenants belong to this bracket.

<sup>17</sup>"As a matter of fact, most of the so-called landlords are in the 24 ha. or less bracket." (Senator Pelaez) (Congressional Record, Senate, Vol. II, No. 11, June 29, 1971, p. 233).

Table 8

NUMBER OF LANDOWNERS AND AREA OF LANDHOLDINGS OF PALAY AND CORN  
BY SIZE OF FARM  
(17 Pilot Municipalities)  
As of July 13, 1973

Land Size Category	Area (By Landowner Holdings)		Landowners		Tenants		Parcels (Tenanted)	
	Ha.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
100 and above	5,902	15.35	21	0.19	1,939	10.40	4,362	14.79
50	3,678	9.56	53	0.47	963	5.17	2,037	6.91
24	4,035	10.49	120	1.06	1,149	6.16	2,383	8.08
12	5,217	13.56	322	2.84	1,558	8.36	3,045	10.33
7	4,191	10.90	498	4.40	1,283	6.88	2,389	8.10
Below 7	15,438	40.14	10,314	91.05	11,747	63.02	15,273	51.79
TOTALS	38,461	100.00	11,328	100.00	18,639	100.00	29,489	100.00

Source: DAR, Planning Service

On December, 1973, the Planning Service of DAR reported the nationwide program scope figures based on the data from the field units all over the country, as the guideline for future policy-making (Table 9). From the figures of Table 9,<sup>18</sup> we can see that only 3.48% of all the landowners, 30% of all the tenant-farmers, and around half of the tenanted area are covered by the present Operation Land Transfer Program, but 97% of the landowners, 70% of all the tenants, and half of the tenanted lands are outside of the present policy coverage. The most important problem is how many tenant-farmers will be included under the policy. If the government will decrease the retention limit for the landowner up to 12 ha., 48% of all the tenants will be benefitted. In case of a retention limit of 7 hectares, 63% of all the tenant-farmers will be benefitted. (Even in this case, note that 37% of all the rice and corn tenant-farmers are still out of the coverage of governmental policy.)

---

<sup>18</sup>At the beginning, the DAR estimated that 1,000,000 tenant-farmers and 1,767,000 ha. of tenanted-lands will be included under the Operation Land Transfer Program, as shown in Table 1. According to the later nation-wide estimate as of December 1973, the estimated number of tenant-farmers increased somewhat, but the estimated area of tenanted-lands decreased sharply by 400,000 ha., from 1,767,000 ha. to 1,343,000 ha. This sharp decrease in the area of tenanted-lands will necessitate or require a closer examination.

Table 9

**OPERATION LAND TRANSFER TOTAL PROGRAM SCOPE**  
(Palay and Corn Only)

Land Size Category (ha.)	Tenanted Area		Tenant-Farmers		Landowners	
	ha.	%	No.	%	No.	%
100 and above	410,366	30.55	164,454	15.22	1,524	0.69
50 - 99.99	139,030	10.35	69,515	6.44	2,064	0.93
24 - 49.99	134,248	10.00	89,499	8.29	4,118	1.86
12.01 - 23.99	189,722	14.12	189,722	17.59	12,022	5.44
7.01 - 12.00	153,804	11.45	170,893	15.84	18,075	8.18
7.00 and below	316,027	23.53	395,034	36.62	182,238	82.90
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,343,217</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>1,078,817</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>221,041</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Source:** DAR, Planning Service  
Updated figures, December 1973

President Marcos frequently declared that special considerations be given to the small landowners to avoid their anxiety and unrest.<sup>19</sup> The editorial of Bulletin Today as of January 22, 1973 clarified what President Marcos mentioned at his press conference regarding small landowners of 5 to 20 ha., "who are hardworking members of the middle class".<sup>20</sup> It is noteworthy to point out that President Marcos recognized that this hardworking middle class composed of small landowners "have not contributed to the social discontent in Central Luzon". Because he defined the small landowners so far as part of the social middle class,<sup>21</sup> and the purpose of agrarian reform as the broadening of the agricultural middle class in the rural areas, it will be a contradiction to put the existing agricultural middle class (small landowners) into the coverage of the agrarian reform program. However, it is also true that the overwhelming

---

<sup>19</sup>"The small landowners must be given just treatment--that is to say, they cannot be treated in exactly the same way as the big landowners or inheritors of large estates." (Marcos, Notes on the New Society of the Philippines, 1973, p. 113) See also Letter of Instruction No. 46, December 7, 1972.

<sup>20</sup>Bulletin Today, January 22, 1973.

<sup>21</sup>Letter of Instruction No. 46.

number of tenant-farmers will remain outside the target of the agrarian reform program, if its provisions do not cover agricultural lands of less than 24 hectares.

Consequently, the President ordered the DAR to conduct a survey on the small landowners, by Letter of Instruction No. 143 dated October 31, 1973, as the basis of future policy decision. This Letter of Instructions contains the following guidelines: (a) the absentee landowners shall transfer to their tenants their landholdings regardless of area, no matter how small, and (b) the absentee landowners shall be compelled to do so if they (the absentee landowners) are found to have a source of income other than their landholding or landholdings, and also (c) in determining who is an absentee landlord, the DAR shall ascertain if the absence of such landlord is on account of circumstances beyond his control such as having been driven from the land by fortuitous circumstances, by service in the Armed Forces of the Philippines or other branches of the government. If the absentee landowner falling under this category has been actually tilling the land before being compelled to abandon the tilling of the land, then he shall not be

considered an absentee landlord as referred to in this Letter of Instructions.<sup>22</sup>

In response to this LOI No. 143, the DAR conducted the interview surveys on 10,832 small landowners (those who have landholdings of less than 24 hectares) in the following 9 provinces: Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, La Union, Pangasinan, Isabela, Nueva Ecija, Laguna, Camarines Sur, and Iloilo. Even though there are some questions regarding the method of sampling, the results of this survey are noteworthy. The main points are as follows:

- (1) Out of 10,832 small landowners who were interviewed, 9,600 or 88.6% were absentee landowners (correctly speaking, they are non-cultivating landowners). These landowners own 89.3% of total land areas covered by the survey. (Table 10)
- (2) Out of 9,600 absentee landowners, 8,550 or 89% are small landowners of less than 7 ha. The landowners who have 12.01 to 24 ha. lands represent 4% or less. (Table 11)

---

<sup>22</sup>Underscoring mine.

(3) Among the absentee landowners, 9.4% are Armed Forces and other government offices employees. On the other hand, 82.7% or an overwhelming part are in "Others" category, who have miscellaneous small jobs or are "self-employed". (Among them, perhaps, there are landowners who have no jobs other than collecting rental income). (Table 12)

Table 12

ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS BY OCCUPATION

Kind of Occupation	Number	%
Armed Forces	44	0.46
Other Government Offices	861	8.97
Non-Government Offices	516	5.37
Government Retirees	161	1.68
Non-Government Retirees	71	0.74
Others <i>(self-employed etc.)</i>	7,944	82.72
T o t a l	9,603	100.00

(4) 90% of "Others" category, are the small landowners of less than 7 ha. (Table 13)

(5) Around 60% of the annual average income of whole absentee landowners, are derived from their lands.



Table 13

TOTAL NUMBER OF ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS  
BY OCCUPATION AND BY SIZE CATEGORY

Occupation	Total	7.00 & below	7.01- 12.00	12.01- 24.00
Armed Forces				
No.	44	40	2	1
%	100.00	90.90	4.54	2.27
Other Gov't. Offices				
No.	861	707	101	53
%	100.00	82.12	11.72	6.15
Non-Gov't. Offices				
No.	516	452	38	26
%	100.00	87.59	7.37	5.04
Gov't. Retirees				
No.	161	131	20	10
%	100.00	81.38	12.43	6.20
Non-Gov't. Retirees				
No.	71	67	4	-
%	100.00	94.37	5.64	-
Others				
No.	7,944	7,149	533	242
%	100.00	89.99	6.35	3.64
Total				
No.	9,603	8,553	670	380
%	100.00	89.08	6.98	3.95

75% in the case of "Others" employee, 18.8% in the case of Non-Government employee. Dependence on land income is comparatively low for the Armed Forces and other government offices employee, that is 23.3% and 28.5% respectively.

(Table 14)

Table 14

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE INCOME OF ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS  
AGAINST TOTAL INCOME  
(P)

Occupation	Annual Income		%
	Total	From Land holding	
Armed Forces	6,933	1,622	23.3✓
Other Government Offices	10,054	2,867	28.5✓
Non-Government Offices	7,078	2,866	40.4
Government Retirees	7,728	3,412	44.1
Non-Government Retirees	10,267	1,940	18.8
Others	3,284	2,465	75.0
T o t a l	4,235	2,529	59.7

(6) Dependence of the absentee landowners on the land income increases directly with the increase of

land size. This tendency is especially distinguishable in the case of "Others" employee. (Table 15)

Table 15

**AVERAGE PERCENTAGE INCOME OF ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS  
DERIVED FROM LANDHOLDINGS AGAINST TOTAL INCOME  
BY OCCUPATION AND BY SIZE CATEGORY**

Occupation	Total	Land Size Category		
		7 ha.- below	7.01- 12.00	12.01- 24.00
Armed Forces	23.30	14.58	37.25	16.72
Other Government Offices	26.50	20.08	50.96	55.97
Non-Government Offices	40.40	35.84	64.02	56.90
Government Retirees	44.10	5.45	49.29	24.66
Non-Government Retirees	18.80	13.70	19.68	0.00
Others	75.00	79.40	80.14	85.44
<b>T o t a l</b>	<b>59.70</b>	<b>45.71</b>	<b>71.35</b>	<b>76.22</b>

(7) Among the 9,600 absentee landowners, 70% were tilling their land prior to their present occupations. From this survey, we learn the following facts: an overwhelming part of the small landowners are absentee or non-cultivating landowners, and the majority of them have only small landholdings of less than 7 hectares. Furthermore, the great part of this absentee or non-

cultivating landowners are mostly "self-employed", whose dependence on the income from the land is very high. Accordingly, social disorders and unrest may have happened sometimes due to the grievances of these small landowners thinking that the government will carry out the Land Transfer Scheme without special considerations or compensations to them. Needless to say, the scope of these considerations will be limited to a certain degree, because of the final recurrence of the burden to the tenant-farmers themselves, and also of the budget limitation. One of the serious political concerns which will confront the government in the near future is the question of the maximum retention limit of landholding. Another is whether to create a scheme of special compensation for the small landowners or not.

As clarified in LOI No. 143, the small landholdings of AFP men or other government employees who are now absentee-landowners are excluded from the coverage of the Land Transfer Scheme because their being absentee landlords are considered to be the results of circumstances beyond their control. However, it is quite conceivable that there are strong psychological resistances on the part of landowners who are now under the Land Transfer Scheme, which is being implemented by

the DAR staffs with the cooperation of the AFP men in the local area.

As frequently mentioned, the DAR is now carrying out Operation Land Transfer targetting at only the large landholdings of 24 ha. and above. Recently, the DAR Secretary said in his concise accomplishments-report: "In the last 20 months, all tenanted estates from 50 ha. and above have been parcelled out and redistributed to the tenant-tillers. The backbone of feudalism for centuries has at last been broken."<sup>23</sup> "With the backbone of feudalism, as symbolized by the big landed estates, now broken up, the case of the small landowners having 24 ha. or less has presented yet another problem."<sup>24</sup> According to Secretary Estrella, the backbone of feudalism is in the large landed estates, not in the small landholdings. It seems to me that, in this case, feudalism means mostly the paternalistic, dependent relationships between landlords and tenants, exemplified by the "protection and the obedience" relationships between feudal lords and serfs during the feudal age in Europe. For example, Secretary Estrella explains as

---

<sup>23</sup> Estrella, Agrarian Reform in the New Society, p. 25. Underscoring mine.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 37.

follows: "The great majority of our farmers are tenants, sharecrop tenants. Tenancy per se is not bad. But in this country tenancy relations have metamorphosed into a paternalistic relationship wherein the farmers depend on their landowners for practically everything that they need. Share crop tenancy has promoted not interdependence between two economic partners, but total dependence of one on the other. Multiplying this a thousand-fold we can see a mass of humanity deprived of the ability to act, under the control of a few, and practically powerless."<sup>25</sup> This kind of appraisal of the land tenure system in this country is very common, as has also been expressed by former Senator Raul S. Manglapus who eagerly sponsored the enactment of the Code of Agrarian Reforms in the Philippines (R.A. No. 6389). According to him, an evil of tenancy is "paternalism in its most deceptive and insidious form", and "a kind, benevolent landlord (and we have many of these) can at best treat his tenant as a child, making his decisions for him, not only those decisions that have to do with planting

---

<sup>25</sup> Estrella, The Meaning of Land Reform, Manila, 1974, p. 32.

but even those that have to do with the tenant's own being and life ... The tenant's mind persists in child-like innocence, uncreative, unproductive, crushed by the overpowering paternalism of the system."<sup>26</sup> It is natural to conclude that the final objectives of agrarian reform is to establish independent farmers freed from the paternalism of the landlords exercising the responsibility to act as citizens in a democratic society.<sup>27</sup> It seems to me that paternalism, according to Secretary Estrella, is closely connected with the big landed estates, and not with the small landholdings, and if this is so, we can logically conclude that the purpose of agrarian reform might almost be attained today, after "all tenanted estates from 50 hectares and above have been parcelled out and redistributed to the tenant-tillers." But, how do we interpret the following facts obtained from the research work done especially on the Central

---

<sup>26</sup> Raul S. Manglapus, "Land and Ideology," Solidarity, Vol. 2, No. 8, July-August, 1967, p. 2.

<sup>27</sup> "The primary objective of land reform is the creation of a strong citizenry that will have a real stake in our democracy." "The main philosophy behind this program is to give dignified existence and economic prosperity to the small farmers by freeing them from pernicious institutional restraints and practices." (Estrella, The Meaning of Land Reform, pp. 25, 33.)

Luzon area.<sup>7</sup> According to the research works so far, most of the big landowners are absentee landlords, and the ones who have usual contact with the tenant farmers on the big estates, especially in the Central Luzon area are the third person or Katiwalas. Because of this, the relationship between landowners (or katiwalas) and the tenant-farmers are more or less institutionalized in the big estates. (For example, the existence of the ration system of providing rice to the tenants during the lean months and also the common written contracts instead of verbal contracts).

The relationships between landowners and tenants on the big estates may be characterized as having an impersonal character, comparatively.<sup>28</sup> The increasing impersonality of the landlord-tenant relationship as seen on the big landed estates especially in Central Luzon has been accelerated by the social unrest during and after the War. In contrast, we have the case of the small landowners, who usually live in the town near the farms, keep the usual contacts with their tenant-farmers, and often

---

<sup>28</sup>Enriqueta A. Bernal, "The Role of Landlords in the Philippine Agricultural Development: An Exploratory Study," (Ph.D. Thesis to the UPCA, May, 1967, p. 95). Also refer to the case of big landlord, Manolo Tinio in Nueva Ecija (Ben Kerkvliet, "Peasant Society and Unrest Prior to the Huk Revolution in the Philippines, Asian Studies, Vol. IX, No. 2, August, 1971, pp. 168-169).



have the kinship<sup>29</sup> or fictitious kinship (compadre) relationships. As a result of this, their relationships are very close and personal in character. The assistance and directions from the landowners are not institutionalized and are usually tinted with bare paternalism.

It may be true that the bloody disputes and agrarian unrest had developed mainly in the big landed estates, and as expressed by President Marcos, the small landowning class had not contributed to the main causes of social unrest in Central Luzon. It seems to me that this reflects exactly the fact that the paternalistic relationships have been very weakened on big landed estates, while paternalism still fully functions on the small landholdings at present. Lopez, who conducted the wide-scale survey on the landlord-tenants relationship in Central Luzon, clarified the following fact, "the landlords of the tenants who shifted to genuine leasehold had significantly higher educational attainment, more educated spouses, much older children, larger total area of landholding, and more number of tenants, compared to the landlords of the tenants who remained share-

---

<sup>29</sup> Refer to Rivera & McMillan, "An Economic and Social Survey of Rural Households in Central Luzon." USOM, Manila, 1954, p. 62.

tenants."<sup>30</sup> It is true that the big landlords have a stronger political influence than the smaller landlords, but it is also true that the former are more educated, more enlightened than the latter in general. What I want to point out here is that the feudalistic character is more closely connected with the smaller landholdings rather than with the larger landed estates. It can be said, therefore, that contrary to the view of Secretary Estrella, the backbone of feudalism is in the smaller landholdings, rather than in the big landed estates. (Concerning this view, of course, academic discussion and a historical reading will be necessary). If so, another question will be asked. What is the real purpose of the present agrarian reform program of the Philippines--the elimination of the causes of agrarian unrest or the elimination of feudalism in the rural areas? These two purposes will become one and the same thing, when the scope of agrarian reform program is narrowed down to the small landholdings. Insofar as the coverage of the agrarian reform program is limited to the large landed estate, however, the discrepancies of these two purposes will still remain.

---

<sup>30</sup> Rogelio M. Lopez, "Landlord-Tenant Relations: Their Effects in the Implementation of Land Reform and Production Efficiency in Central Luzon," University of San Carlos, Cebu, 1971, p. 259.

(2) Resistance and Non-cooperation of Landowners

As seen from the foregoing remarks, the resistance of landowners to the implementation of agrarian reform has been very persistent. It takes various forms from positive forms of resistance to outright sabotage. So far, the DAR formally recognizes the facts about the landowner's resistance and the disputes between landowners and the tenants, and often issued policies, guidelines and cautions against these abuses, in the forms of Memoranda or Memorandum Circulars of the Secretary.

It can be said that the DAR Memorandum Circular No. 2 (Amended) as of June 18, 1973 was the most thorough and explicit of all the memorandum circulars explaining the forms of resistance of the landlords to agrarian reform. In this Memorandum Circular, the DAR Secretary pointed out the landowner's refusal to conclude the leasehold contract with their tenants as a transitional device, and enumerated the various forms of misconduct of the landowners as follows: (1) Non-liquidation of the harvests; (2) Filing of cases of qualified theft, estafa, coercion, threats, etc., to harass the tenant-farmers; (3) Filing of ejectment cases in lands within the purview of PD No. 27; (4) Changes of crops from palay

and/or corn to other crops like sugarcane, coconuts, etc.; (5) ✓ Physical acts of dispossession like bulldozing of farms, demolition and/or burning of houses, man-handling, mauling, intimidation, etc., (6) ✓ Sale or mortgage of lands to persons, group of persons, associations, corporation, and/or financial institutions; (7) ✓ Subdivision or fragmentation of the land; (8) ✓ Conversion of the land into urban areas without following the procedure prescribed by law and other regulations.

This memorandum circular also pointed out the fact that landowners and the tenant-farmers did not agree on the rentals to be paid by the latter to the former, and made the following directive -- "in the event of disagreement and this results in the failure of mediation (by the DAR Regional Directors), the case shall be referred to the Court of Agrarian Relations for adjudication." Then, the DAR Memorandum Circular No. 2-A (amended as of June 19, 1973) issued the new directive for prohibiting the ejectment of tenants by the landowners. After this Circular pointed out in its preamble the facts about the rising number of conflicts among tenants and landowners in tenanted rice and/or corn land resulting in the disturbance of peace and order in the rural areas, it directed that the status quo (the

leasehold arrangement existing as of October 21, 1972) be kept in the relationship between tenant-farmers and landowners, and also directed the following guidelines:

- ✓(1) no new ejectment cases shall be accepted by the CAR on lands within the purview of PD No. 27.
- (2) All pending ejectment cases in courts between tenant-farmers and landowners shall be held in abeyance upon petition of any party litigant. The fact must be added that these two continuing Circulars No. 2 and No. 2-A ordered the agrarian reform personnel concerned to seek the assistance of the Provincial Commander to enforce the directives in these Circulars should all remedies within their authority be exhausted.

On October 22, 1973, President Marcos further issued ✓PD No. 316, prohibiting the ejectment of tenant-farmers by the landowners. After the Decree noted in its preamble the fact that many ejectment cases and criminal cases have been filed in the Courts by the landowners against their tenants and that subsequently, the peace and order conditions in the rural areas have been threatened, it added certain restrictions to the authority of the Courts. This decree is very important in showing the transitional supremacy of administrative power to judicial power under the Martial Law. Because

of this, it will be helpful to cite the full text below:

PRESIDENTIAL DECREE NO. 316

Prohibiting The Ejectment Of Tenant-Tillers From Their Farmholdings Pending The Promulgation Of The Rules and Regulations Implementing Presidential Decree No. 27.

WHEREAS, notwithstanding my earlier instructions that no tenant-farmer shall be ejected from the land cultivated by him, many landowners are ejecting or threatening to eject their tenants;

WHEREAS, numerous complaints for ejectment have been filed in the Courts by landowners against their tenants and orders have been issued enjoining or restraining the latter from entering and cultivating their farmholdings or impounding their harvest; and likewise, numerous criminal cases have been filed by landowners against tenant-tillers which arise from the possession and cultivation of farmholdings and other agrarian causes, as a result of which tenant-farmers have been arrested and detained;

WHEREAS, the aforementioned acts have resulted in strained relations between landowners and tenant-farmers or tillers of the soil which threaten to disturb the peace and order condition in the rural areas;

WHEREAS, these ejectment suits or other acts of harassment by landowners intended to eject or remove their tenants cannot be sanctioned or condoned by the Government, especially in the light of our current efforts to bring forth a New Society, a Filipino Society that is more compassionate and adheres to the basic principle of social justice;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, FERDINAND E. MARCOS, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers in me vested by the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, and pursuant to Proclamation No. 1081, dated September 21, 1972, and General Order No. 1, dated September 22, 1972, as amended, do hereby order and decree, as part of the law of the land the following:

SECTION 1. - No tenant-farmer in agricultural lands primarily devoted to rice and corn shall be ejected or removed from his farmholding until such time as the respective rights of the tenant-farmer and the landowner shall have been determined in accordance with the rules and regulations implementing Presidential Decree No. 27.

SECTION 2. - Unless certified by the Secretary of Agrarian Reform as a proper case for trial or hearing by a court or judge or other officer of competent jurisdiction, no judge of the Court of Agrarian Relations, Court of First Instance, municipal or city court, or any other tribunal or fiscal shall take cognizance of any ejectment case or any other case designed to harass or remove a tenant of an agricultural land primarily devoted to rice and corn, and if any such cases are filed, these cases shall first be referred to the Secretary of Agrarian Reform or his authorized representative in the locality for a preliminary determination of the relationship between the contending parties. If the Secretary of Agrarian Reform finds that the case is a proper case for the Court or judge or other hearing officer to hear, he shall so certify and such court, judge or other hearing officer may assume jurisdiction over the dispute or controversy.

SECTION 3. - In all cases, efforts shall be exerted by all government officials to maintain the status quo in the relation between tenant farmers and landowners as already embodied in Presidential instructions.

SECTION 4. - All provisions of existing laws, orders, rules and regulations, or parts thereof, in conflict or inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

SECTION 5. - This Decree shall take effect immediately.

Done in the City of Manila, this 22th day of October, in the year of Our Lord, nineteen hundred and seventy-three.

The effects of PD No. 316 and the succeeding DAR Memorandum Circular No. 29 of December 6, 1973 were felt at the trial proceedings held after this date. For example, the Court of Appeals decided that the ejectment case [Rodolfo Espiritu vs. Feliciano Gandia] be referred to the Secretary of Agrarian Reform on December 12, 1973, citing the full text of PD No. 316.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, the Court of Appeals decided on January 11, 1974, based on its interpretation of PD No. 316 and closely following DAR Memorandum Circular No. 29, that no further motion for reconsideration of the ejectment cases [Demetria Lara Vda. De Guzman, et. al. vs. Basilio de Guzman] be entertained.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Journal of the Court of Agrarian Relations, Vol. XVIII, No. 12, December 31, 1973, pp. 45-50.

<sup>32</sup> Journal of the Court of Agrarian Relations, Vol. XIX, No. 1, January 31, 1974, pp. 38-40.



As seen above, the frequent issuances of Presidential Decrees and DAR Memorandum Circulars prohibiting the ejectment of tenant-farmers by the landlords<sup>33</sup> are considered to be a reflection of the prevalence of the ejectment cases so far, causing social unrest in the rural areas.

Let us glance for a moment at the activities of the Court of Agrarian Relations which is the special court for the disputes between landowners and tenants. According to Table 16, accepted agrarian cases of CAR have increased during the years from FY 1969-1970 to FY 1972-73 (the Annual Report of FY 1973-74 is now in preparation), reflecting the increasing disputes between landowners and tenants. As a result of this, workload for the CAR staffs sharply increased year by year, partly reflecting the slow progress of its machinery for disposal. The disposed number during the fiscal year is smaller than the outstanding number at the end of the preceding fiscal year. This decreased disposal ability of the Court of Agrarian Relations can be explained by

---

<sup>33</sup> DAR Memorandum Circular No. 8 as of April 1, 1974 is the latest one prohibiting the ejectment of the tenants and ordering the maintenance of status quo relationship.

Table 16

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE  
COURTS OF AGRARIAN RELATIONS

	FY 1969-70	FY 1970-71	FY 1971-72	FY 1972-73
Outstanding at the end of preceding Fiscal Year	6,812	6,442	8,050	9,650*
Filed Number during the FY	4,990	7,301	7,617	8,695
Workload during the FY	11,802	13,743	15,667	18,345
Disposed Number during the FY	5,561	5,878	6,074	9,387
Outstanding at the end of the FY	6,442	8,050	9,761*	9,264

\*Note: The difference in the figures is not clear.

FY 1969-70 means July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970.

Source: Courts of Agrarian Relations, Annual Report, FY 1969-70, FY 1970-71,  
FY 1971-72, FY 1972-73

the following factors: the decrease of the mobility of the staffs (the lack of motor vehicles and traveling expenses), the disturbance of the business activities due to inadequate appropriation (an exodus of the more competent stenographic reporters), and also the shortage of qualified legal officers in the Bureau of Legal Assistance, DAR for representing the tenants, lessees litigants before the CAR and other Courts.<sup>34</sup> We frequently hear complaints from the farmers regarding the serious shortage of legal officers in the Agrarian Reform Offices on the local level. On the other hand, the decreased quality of the legal officers are explained by the CAR Annual Report as follows: "The ranking and more experienced special attorneys of the said defunct Office [former Office of Agrarian Counsel] were transferred to the Citizens Legal Assistance Office while the lower echelon legal officers of the same defunct Office were transferred to the Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance, ... The result obviously, has been the lessening of government lawyers authorized to appear for farmers before CARs and other Courts, not

---

<sup>34</sup>Tenth Annual Report, Court of Agrarian Relations, FY 1972-1973, pp. 76-79.

to say the inevitably more inferior service that could be rendered by the less experienced legal officers of the former OTAC."<sup>35</sup>

According to Table 17, which gives the frequency of agrarian cases disposed of within the year, we can find the decreasing tendency in the tenants' ejectment cases and an increasing tendency of the cases of the change of tenancy system and/or fixing of rentals during these years. Especially after the proclamation of Martial Law which strengthened the prohibition of ejectment of tenant-farmers, the number of the former is decreasing gradually,<sup>36</sup> and that of the latter is

---

<sup>35</sup> Court of Agrarian Relations, *op. cit.*, p. 78. According to BALA Annual Report FY 1973-74, the big problems which they are confronting are 1) lack of personnel, 2) low salary rates and so on. See the following remarks: "Our present WAPCO salary rates are not realistic enough to attract competent and qualified lawyers to join our fold. And what is worst, those in the service have resigned and/or transferred to other offices while many others are intending to follow suit."

<sup>36</sup> However, the actual situation is that the problem of ejectment of tenants by the landowners is still serious in many parts of the country. See the following recommendation by the DAR Regional Office V in Legaspi. "Before the cases of ejectment reached alarming stages, it is the view of the legal officers that proper steps be taken by the Central Office for the adoption of a policy or another decree to put a stop to those frantic reaction of the landowners." (Annual Report FY 1973-1974)

Table 17

## FREQUENCY OF ISSUES IN AGRARIAN CASES DISPOSED

	FY 1969-70		FY 1970-71		FY 1971-72		FY 1972-73	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reinstatement of ejected tenant	857	13.4	992	13.5	945	10.5	917	9.4
Ejectment	934	14.6	1,020	13.9	1,101	12.2	1,108	11.4
Liquidation and reliquidation	518	8.1	617	8.3	699	7.7	989	10.2
Recovery of rentals	47	0.7	61	0.8	255	2.8	132	1.4
Change of System and/or Fixing of rentals	1,933	30.2	2,494	33.9	3,633	40.2	4,034	41.5
Others	2,099	32.8	2,177	29.6	2,395	26.5	2,535	26.1
Total	6,386	100.0	7,361	100.0	9,028	100.0	9,715	100.0

Source: Same as Table 16.

increasing sharply. Also, parallel to these tendencies the number of the case of reinstatement of ejected tenants is decreasing. The case about the change of tenancy system (to leasehold system) and/or the fixing of rentals accompanying it reached 42% of the total agrarian cases. Furthermore, this tendency will become more evident in the future. We can also see the same tendency in the Central Luzon area, and 58% or 1903 cases out of a total of 3,260 cases filed in FY 1972-73 were concerning the change of the tenancy system and/or fixing of rentals.<sup>37</sup> In the Central Luzon area, the number of agrarian cases filed in the CAR branch offices within FY 1972-73 are 1,276 in Nueva Ecija, 938 in Pangasinan, 407 in Bulacan, 330 in Pampanga, 169 in Tarlac, and 140 in Bataan and Zambales.<sup>38</sup> Concerning the recent increase of cases of agrarian problems filed at the CAR branch offices, the CAR expressed their willingness to try these cases in this manner: "The containment of these people's redresses within the

---

<sup>37</sup> Annual Report, Court of Agrarian Relations, FY 1972-1973, p. 36.

<sup>38</sup> Calculated from Appendix 15 of above.

sphere of the law as manifested by the number of cases received by several branches of the CARs is an unmistakable sign that the centuries-old manners of exacting justice in agrarian relations through violence is being abandoned. There were, to be sure, still sporadic instances of armed reprisals by peasants against their landholders and vice versa but these are isolated instances spawned more by personal differences and ignorance of the availability of governmental resources to help them resolve their differences in a more conciliatory attitude."<sup>39</sup>

The resistance and sabotage offered by the landowners to the agrarian reform program have become stronger and taken various forms today, parallel to the increased efforts of the Government people to implement the program, even though it covers only the rice and corn lands. The most common practices used by the landowner is to file criminal charges against his tenants to the local Courts, whatever the reasons may be. After this, it often happens that the tenants are arrested and put in jail by the police. Haply, I heard that the PC men also cooperated with the landlords sometimes in

---

<sup>39</sup>Court of Agrarian Relations, op. cit., p. 37.

arresting the tenants.<sup>40</sup> Some tenant-farmers have been terrorized and they hesitate to ask for their bestowed rights from their landowners.

Furthermore, many of the judges and attorneys in the local Courts, for example, the Municipal or City Courts, and the Court of First Instance, are landowners themselves, and/or closely connected with the landowners in the locality. They often engage in the law business in their private law offices, outside of their office hours (day-time judge in a Court, night-time lawyer in a private law office). Naturally, the rich landowners pay them high salaries for the settlement of legal matters.<sup>41</sup> In many cases, it will be true that the landowner consults with his private lawyer before he goes to Court to file charges against his tenants. Since the private lawyer is also a judge of the Court, the trial proceedings will often be favorable to the landowners.

---

<sup>40</sup>The Annual Report of the DAR Regional Office VII points out some of their problems. "Sporadic harassment of landowners against DAR personnel and tenant-tillers. Uncooperative attitudes of some Military personnel." (Annual Accomplishment Report FY 1973-1974, typed, p. 4).

<sup>41</sup>"In the Province of Nueva Ecija, for instance, landlords resisted land reform by maintaining their own legal panels." (Estrella, The Meaning of Land Reform, p. 51).



However, there are more problematic cases in reality. Sometimes the tenants are forced to sign the agreement with the landowner to return his land voluntarily or to sign the paper on which he has been employed as agricultural laborer on the farm, fearing the harassment and reprisal from the landowner. Because of the nature of these illegal negotiations, we cannot get their exact figures, but we have heard cases of this kind in many rural areas. So long as the tenant-farmers themselves refuse to fight for their rights, the various orders and laws, no matter how beautifully couched, are not enough to protect the rights of the tenant-farmers.<sup>42</sup> At present there are many cases reported wherein the landowner refuses the offer of the Agrarian Reform Team Leader to sit down at the same table with his tenants to fix the land value and/or the lease rentals.<sup>43</sup> This is, of course, one of the tactics of sabotage by the landowners to delay the government's Operation Land Transfer. Some

---

<sup>42</sup> I heard that some tenant-farmers who surrendered their lands voluntarily to the landowners, came to the Agrarian Reform Office in the locality asking help, after knowing of their legally bestowed rights.

<sup>43</sup> See the Open Letter No. II of DAR Secretary as of April 19, 1974, and also The Bulletin Today, August 16, 1974.

ardent Team Leaders who seriously request the attendance of the landowner to the conference with his tenants are threatened in various ways by the landowner.

This non-cooperation of landowners towards Operation Land Transfer coupled with the lack of effective weapons against this on the part of the Team Leader is one of the causes of dissatisfaction of the tenant-farmers. In the case of Japanese Agrarian Reform, the resistance of landowners against this had been very vehement, because to the landowners it held the aspect of the infringement of the right of private property. According to the most authoritative document compiled after the accomplishment of agrarian reform, "the landlord class resisted against the progress of the Agrarian Reform Program with all kinds of methods in their hands. The forms of their resistance are various, from the change of land use, the taking-over of the tenanted land, disguised self-cultivation, the forced request of rentals in produce, illegal selling-out of their tenanted-land, to deception, conciliation, threat and violence to their tenants. Besides these, they also adopted methods of reprisal to their tenants by taking-over the grass land, prohibiting the tenants to enter their

forest-lands for gathering firewoods, and sometimes, the puppeteering of agricultural land commission which was the agrarian reform implementing body in the local areas."<sup>44</sup> In the Philippines at present, even though there are some differences in the forms of resistance, almost the same abnormalities are occurring in almost all the rural areas.

(3) The Problems Accompanying the Limited Application of the Operation Land Transfer to the Rice and Corn Lands

The present Operation Land Transfer covers only the rice and corn tenanted lands. Presidential Decree No. 27 formalizes that "this [decree] shall apply to tenant farmers of private agricultural lands primarily devoted to rice and corn under a system of share-crop or lease-tenancy, whether classified as landed estate or not." The reason for the limited application of the present Agrarian Reform Program will be closely connected

---

<sup>44</sup> Agrarian Reform Documentary Committee, The Outline of Agricultural Land Reform Account, Tokyo, 1951, p. 393.

with the social unrest on rice and corn tenanted lands, judging from the sentence of PD No. 27.<sup>45</sup> However, the following questions are expected to arise. Is there no social unrest in the sugar area in Central Luzon where almost all sugar production has been raised by the tenant-farmers? How about in the tobacco areas in Ilocos and Cagayan Provinces in Northern Luzon, whose tobacco production has been solely the work of the tenant farmers?<sup>46</sup> Another important question will be asked, further: How can we determine exactly the "agricultural lands primarily devoted to rice and corn" in the field? Since it is a recognized fact that the actual

---

<sup>45</sup> According to Professor Perfecto V. Fernandez, UP Law School, "Rice and corn areas were selected for another reason. These were the areas of urgent reforms, because of the endemic social unrest associated with rice tenancy especially in Central Luzon, in some areas in Iloilo, in the Bicol Region, and also in some areas in the North." (Agrarian Reform Institute, Seminar Papers on Agrarian Reform, College, Laguna, 1974, p. 3)

<sup>46</sup> "Central Luzon has been the hotbed of social unrest. Sugar, the main crop of the Philippine economy, has provided a fertile ground for tenancy. Practically nine out of 10 farmers in Central Luzon sugar areas are tenants. The wide gap between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' there is deplorable. Tenancy is also high in the tobacco country. Some 86 out of 100 farmers there do not even own the land they till." (Edward R. Kiunisala, "Dawn of a New Era," Philippines Free Press, April 20, 1963, p. 5)

cropping patterns are of infinite varieties in the rural areas, interpretation and actual adaptation of this somewhat ambiguous term of "primarily" will produce some troubles and burdens for the field staffs of DAR.<sup>47</sup>

The next problem is this: how many tenant-farmers are producing crops other than rice and corn in this country? To our regret, we have no exact statistical data about this, but we can use the substitute figures for this as shown in Table 18. This table indicates the number of tenant-farmers who reported the particular crop production. However, we should note that the tenant-farmers who reported the particular crop production in this Table may also be producing rice and corn. Concerning this, the Table does not distinguish the proportion of area planted to the particular crop in one farm. In spite of this fact, we can naturally conclude that there are many tenant-farmers who are producing crops other than (or combined with) rice and corn.<sup>48</sup> Based on Table 18, we can point out the following problem.

---

<sup>47</sup>Concerning this point, we have many problems which should be discussed in detail.

<sup>48</sup>The number of these tenant-farmers will show an increase today, because the total number of farms increased from 2,160,000 in 1960 to 2,480,000 in 1970. (Estimated figures of 1970 by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

If one tenant-farmer borrows 10 hectares of land from a landowner, and grows rice in 7 ha. and coconuts in 3 ha., the target of Operation Land Transfer is only 7 ha. of rice land, excluding 3 ha. of coconut land. In this case, "the agricultural lands primarily devoted to rice and corn" mean 7 ha. of rice land, according to the interpretation of the DAR. As a result of this, the tenant-farmer remains as a tenant concerning the coconuts-land, and he will become at best a part-owner through Operation Land Transfer.

Judging from this example, we can conclude that at least 550,000 of tenant-farmers as shown in Table 18 (half of them are growing coconuts) will remain as tenant-farmers or arrive at the level of part-owners, at best, if they grow rice and/or corn at the same time. We should also point out the fact that there are still many tenant-farmers on fruit lands, salt-beds and fish ponds.

Why were the sugar, coconut, and other cash crop lands not covered by the Agrarian Reform Program under the present Martial Law regime? One of the reasons is the strong political power of sugar and coconut interests; another comes from considerations for export

Table 18

NUMBER OF TENANT-FARMERS WHO REPORTED THE  
PARTICULAR CROP PRODUCED (1960)

	Number of reported tenants (A)	Number of share-tenants out of (A)
sugar cane	24,841	21,706
tobacco	37,520	33,589
abaca and maguey	24,910	19,504
coconut	255,823	211,398
coffee	10,275	--
sub-total	353,369	296,197
camote	98,495	--
cassava	96,173	--
sub-total	194,668	--
TOTAL	548,037	296,197

Note: -- no figure

Source: Census of the Philippines 1960,  
Agriculture Summary Report.

earnings. In 1963 when the Agrarian Reform Bill was discussed on the Senate floor, Senator Oscar Ledesma and Alfredo Montelibano, former Chairman of the NEC, strongly defended the interests of sugar producers. Senator Ledesma warned the Senate floor that sugar was the second foreign exchange earner and that should the Agrarian Reform Program cover the sugar lands, international relations would be jeopardized if the sugar quota allotments to the United States are not filled.<sup>49</sup> The political power of the Philippine sugar block is significant, and fundamentally this situation has not changed under the Martial Law. Today, due to the export promotion policy of the Government together with the increase of sugar quota of the US, the importance of sugar and coconut products in the national economy has increased. Considering this, the possibility of the future coverage of sugar and coconut lands in the agrarian reform program has been decreased.

The harvested area of sugar cane increased by 123,000 ha. within a short period, from 318,000 ha. of

---

<sup>49</sup> Congressional Record, Senate, Vol. II, No. 19, July 8, 1963, pp. 1108-1112.



FY 1968 to 441,000 ha. of FY 1972.<sup>50</sup> We must consider that this increased area of sugarcane has been realized at the sacrifice of the other crop lands, especially the rice lands.<sup>51</sup> The significant increase of the domestic<sup>52</sup> and also external demand for Philippine sugar, combined with the imperative of the increased export earnings to the government will necessitate further expansion of the sugarcane area.

As a result of this, competition between sugar cane and rice (or other crops) lands will be strengthened as far as the marginal agricultural lands have been developed. The contradictions among the increased food production policy, export promotion policy and agrarian

---

<sup>50</sup> Figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Note that the harvested area is smaller than the planted area.

<sup>51</sup> Gerardo P. Sicat, "The Political Economy of the Sugar Industry and the Nation," Solidarity, Vol. VII, No. 10, October 1972, p. 39. Concerning the prospective competition in areas between sugarcane and other crops in 1970's, see Thomas R. McHale, "The Philippine Sugar Industry in the 1970's," in The Philippine Economy in the 1970's: Prospects and Problems of Development, IEDR, UP, 1972, p. 206.

<sup>51</sup> Cf, McHale, op. cit.

reform policy will also arise. Recently, the government announced the expansion of sugarcane area by 40,300 hectares for increased export earnings, explaining that the maximum production capacity of the existing 37 sugar centrals will necessitate a total of 530,000 ha. of sugarcane area.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, the government decided to permit the additional construction of five sugar centrals quite recently, totalling 42 sugar centrals all over the country.<sup>54</sup> Now, with this movement, the following questions will naturally be asked. How will it be possible to increase the sugarcane area matched with the prospective increase of sugar production? Is there any danger posed to make the landowners illegally convert their rice and corn tenanted land to sugarcane land, contrary to the prohibition of the DAR Memorandum Circulars? The DAR was obliged to issue guidelines on the conversion of rice and corn lands to sugarcane land to meet the requests of the sugar planters. According to this, 1) The conversion is limited only to the

---

<sup>53</sup> Bulletin Today, April 20, 1974.

<sup>54</sup> Bulletin Today, August 25, 1974.

unirrigated upland lands which is certified as more suitable to sugarcane than rice or corn cultivation.

2) The conversion of rice or corn tenanted land to sugarcane land should not operate contrary to the regulation of PD No. 27. In other words, the conversion of said land shall only be realized after the tenant-farmers have been converted to owner-farmers through Operation Land Transfer.<sup>55</sup>

In spite of this, the actual situation does not look so bright. From my recent observation trip, I found that the rice and corn tenanted lands were being converted to sugarcane land in significant proportions especially in the Province of Iloilo, the North-western part of Leyte, and the Davao areas. DAR Regional Office VI in Iloilo reported one of the problems of Operation Land Transfer - "rampant conversion of riceland to sugarcane and/or coconut by landowners as a calculated move to evade PD No. 27."<sup>56</sup> I hear that, in Leyte and Davao,

---

<sup>55</sup>Explanation by Mr. Benjamin R. Labayen, Assistant Secretary of the DAR. (Bulletin Today, October 16, 1973. In this, however, the guidelines were not accurate.)

<sup>56</sup>DAR Regional Office VI, Annual Report FY 1973-1974, p. 88.

the tenanted corn lands are also being converted to coconut and banana lands. It is said that the total corn area in Leyte has decreased from the previous 32,000 ha. to 16,000 ha. of today.<sup>57</sup> I have heard that, in the Bicol area, the landowners have been prohibiting their tenant-farmers to plant rice and/or corn between the coconut trees for fear of future troubles. Tenants are also being harrassed with threats of or actual ejection. "The existence of the emancipation act and other related decrees have created apprehension among landowners of coconuts, abaca, citrus and other permanent crops prompting them to bring cases against their tenants solely to remove them."<sup>58</sup> I think this kind of phenomenon is not only limited to small areas, and it is one of the causes of agrarian unrest in the rural areas today.

#### (4) Problems of the Agrarian Reform Team

The executive and promotional organization of the Operation Land Transfer at the lowest level in the country is the Agrarian Reform Team Office as I have

---

<sup>57</sup> Figure from Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Tacloban.

<sup>58</sup> DAR Regional Office V, Annual Report 1973-1974 (typed), p. 36.

already mentioned. The people of this Team Office carry out all kinds of activities everyday concerning the OLT, including the survey of landowner-tenants relationship, issuance of Land Transfer Certificates, fixation of the land value and average normal production of land, handling of disputes and problems between landowners and tenants, and to convey policies and programs of the government to the farmers, etc. Accordingly, they usually work on a tight schedule, making contacts with the landowners and tenants, sometimes with the District Office, or Regional or Central Office, attending meetings, joining the training courses and so on. Needless to say, the successful implementation of the agrarian reform program largely depends on their activities, especially on their enthusiasm and dedication to the task, fairness, endurance and efficiency.

In the case of the agrarian reform in postwar Japan, the counterpart of this Team Office was the City, Town or Village Agricultural Land Commission. Every city, town or village had one agency of the Agricultural Land Commission to implement the agrarian reform program. Each agency has the complete responsibility to carry out the work including the survey of every parcel of

land, purchase from the landowners of agricultural land and their sale to the tenants, the exchange and consolidation of agricultural lands, and the registration of land titles, etc. in the rural area. On the whole, their activities had been highly evaluated. One of the most authoritative documents on the Japanese Agrarian Reform expressed the following: "The noticeable role of the Agricultural Land Commission for preventing the violent stream of rampant taking-back of agricultural lands by the landowners immediately after the War should be highly evaluated. The fact that the tenant farmers, who had been harassed for a long time by the landowners' taking-back of the land could now go to the newly-organized Agricultural Land Commission in their village to consult their problem. [sic] Instead of going directly to the Court, they held open discussions among their elected representatives without fear of the police. This was one step towards their freedom and independence."<sup>59</sup> The secretaries of these Commissions played the key roles in promoting these activities. "Among the secretaries, there are many youths

---

<sup>59</sup> The Outline of Agricultural Land Reform Account, p. 519.

of progressive idea, full of hope.... Thus, the group of full-time secretaries was the main prop and stay of the complete accomplishment of the agrarian reform program of today."<sup>60</sup> "The merit of the secretaries of the Agricultural Land Commission for implementing the agrarian reform program was immeasurable."<sup>61</sup> There was an average of three secretaries per Agricultural Land Commission, and they carried out enthusiastically the works of agrarian reform, fully assisting the members of the Commission, in spite of their unstable position and insufficient salaries, under the democratic and even revolutionary atmosphere prevailing immediately after the War in Japan.

The Philippine counterpart of the secretaries of the Agricultural Land Commission in Japan is the Team Leader. The actual promotion of Operation Land Transfer in this country will depend largely on the character and organizational ability of the Team Leader. For example, the background of his birth, the family relationships, past career, etc., may bear significant influences on his

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 515.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 551.

activities. It is true that many of the Team Leaders come from the neighborhood of their Office, and this is a positive factor for facilitating the OLT owing to their acquaintance with the local situations and dialect. At the same time, however, it may have a negative effect due to his relationship with the local land owning class.

If we compare the Agricultural Land Commission in Japan with the Agrarian Reform Team Office in the Philippines, we will notice two main differences between them. One relates to the coverage area. In Japan, every city, town, or village had their Agricultural Land Commission, but, in the Philippines, one Team Office usually covers one or more municipalities. Considering that one municipality involves 20 barrios<sup>62</sup> on the average, the coverage area of one Team Office is considerably larger than that of the Japanese Agricultural Land Commission.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, one Japanese

---

<sup>62</sup> In terms of the number of households, the Japanese village is a little larger than the barrio in the Philippines, on the average.

<sup>63</sup> Because of the large coverage area for the Team Office, one of their big problems is the shortage of vehicles for transportation together with limited travel allowances. The recent high prices of gasoline will also hinder their activities.



Agricultural Land Commission has a minimum total of 13 people including ten commission members and three secretaries. On the other hand, the average number of people in one Team Office is usually 20. Considering these facts, we may easily conclude that the workloads of the members of a Team Office are much greater than those of their counterparts in Japan.

Another rather important point relates to the character of the organization. The Japanese Agricultural Land Commission was composed of the representatives of landowners and farmers. The composition of a Commission was 5 tenants, 3 owner-cultivators and 2 landowners' representatives, elected from each stratum, and the chairman, who was elected among them, managed the Commission. These Commission members who were the representatives of landowners and the farmers met on the same table, discussed vehemently sometimes, executed and materialized the Agrarian Reform Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Government, with the assistance of the secretaries. Of course, in reality, a number of Commissions were under the landowners' influence. However, the tenant-farmers could counter-act these actions with the full use of their right of recall to

the Commission members, sometimes using the backup of the outside tenant-unions. In fact, we had many such cases in the whole country. Needless to say, the Agrarian Reform in postwar Japan, on the whole, was the one "from above," and "by the Government," but it was also true that the farmers (the tenants) themselves had participated in the execution of the program, at the lowest level of administration." Congress handed the part of the historical task of implementing the agrarian reform to the local Agricultural Land Commission whose members were elected among the farmers by the farmers."<sup>64</sup> The results were highly evaluated, as I have already cited. This evaluation, I think, is considerably overstated, but it is also true that such kind of evaluation had not been questioned after the accomplishment of Agrarian Reform.

However, the Agrarian Reform Team Office in the Philippines is entirely different from this. It is the lowest level organization of the Government, and its people are all government officers. It is, of

---

<sup>64</sup>"The Outline of Agricultural Land Reform Account," p. 509.

course, true that the farmers are cooperating with the OLT to some extent, but it is undeniable that the OLT in principle is the work "from above," and "by the Government". In such cases, the farmers will only consider agrarian reform as benefits or as a gift from the benevolent Government. Most of the tenant-farmers in this country have been considered as the simple object of the beneficence of the landowners. Now, is the Government going to replace the position of the landowners? Secretary Estrella pointed out that "the dependence of the tenants on their landlords is such that almost every move and decision of the tenants is subject to the approval or censure of the landowners. Our farmers have become mere pawns deprived of will power and initiative, and have been reduced to a state of extreme dependence upon the landowners."<sup>65</sup> Supposing this observation is right, the next question will be asked: Isn't there any possibility that the farmers will depend upon the Government extremely after the agrarian reform, contrary to the sincere desire of the Government to establish free, independent, and responsible citizens in a democratic society?

---

<sup>65</sup> Estrella, The Meaning of Land Reform, p. 27. There are, of course, different opinions about this point. (For example, Lopez, op. cit., p. 280).

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have written a mere sketchy outline of the contents and implementation of Operation Land Transfer and also presented some problems concomitant with the implementation of the program, but as I have already mentioned in the beginning, this is merely tentative and still incomplete, especially owing to the time constraint and partly to my poor ability to express myself in English. My humble desire here is only to present some data and problems about the present agrarian reform and to arouse animated discussions among the scholars and researchers.

Almost two years have passed since the start of the Operation Land Transfer in November 1972, and we can see the many problems and difficulties attending it, even under the Martial Law regime, in spite of the earnest efforts of the DAR people. Many legislators who had participated in the enactment of the new Constitution anticipated this point, I imagine, and the new Constitution in 1973, which regulated the

basic principles of the Philippine nation and the State, included a special article providing for an agrarian reform program as follows: "The State shall formulate and implement an agrarian reform program aimed at emancipating the tenant from the bondage of the soil and achieving the goals enunciated in this Constitution." (Article XIV, Sec. 12). Agrarian reform is originally a policy of the administration which should have been implemented during a comparatively short period of time. If so, the fact that the implementation of agrarian reform has been specifically regulated in the Constitution in this country will tell us that from the point of view of many of the former legislators, it will be very hard and would take time to accomplish.

One of the most important problems which is left for further study is related to the prospect of the full, complete amortization payments of the tenant-farmers or "deemed owners". If the "deemed owner" can pay the land value fully and completely within 15 years, then he will become full owner-farmer through the bestowment of the land title. It is only then that we can say that the agrarian reform program has been duly accomplished. However, it is fairly difficult

to foresee the prospect concerning this, mostly due to the serious lack of surveys. Here, I would like to point out some problems relating to this prospect. The tenant-farmer who has received the Land Transfer Certificate from the government necessarily has a duty to repay the land value (plus the value of home lot) year after year, and he will also bear the responsibility of paying the land tax<sup>66</sup> and irrigation fees instead of the landowner. He will also have the strict duty to pay and deposit a fixed amount of money to the Samahang Nayan (Barrio Associations)<sup>67</sup> which he was forced to join under the Operation Land Transfer. Besides

---

<sup>66</sup> See Secretary of Justice, Opinion No. 35, February 27, 1973.

<sup>67</sup> The Samahang Nayan (SN) has the Barrio Guarantee Fund and also the Barrio Savings Fund Programs. The members of the SN have the duty to pay a minimum of one cavan of palay per ha. per harvest for the Barrio Guarantee Fund. For the Barrio Savings Fund, the members shall be deducted 5% of every production loan of PNB or other authorized financial institutions or shall contribute a minimum amount of five pesos per month. Besides these burdens, each member should pay 10 pesos as entrance fee and a membership fee of 5 pesos per year. Needless to say, these fees are heavy burdens to the tenant-farmers. I heard that some tenant-farmers did not like to join the SN owing to the high fees. I also heard that some farmers borrowed from moneylenders to pay the fees of the SN in Guimba, Nueva Ecija.

these, many farmers have the responsibility to repay the crop production loans to the Government. As of now the collection of the loans due are strictly being enforced including the collection of house tax and income tax, which had been neglected before. Some tenant-farmers have chronic debts other than these new burdens. Considering these, we may say that the burdens of the tenant-farmers under the Operation Land Transfer are not inconsiderable. The Government ordered the Rural Bank to deliver the emergency loans to the tenant-farmers (PD No. 57 as of November 19, 1972) and again ordered all financial institutions to accept the Land Transfer Certificate as a collateral for the loans to the tenant-farmers, up to 60% of the land value (PD No. 315 as of October 22, 1973). However, the rural banks which have been under the control of local landowners and other private financial institutions, originally based on the principle of profit and minimum risks, cannot be considered as the liberal supplier of loans to the tenant-farmers. In fact, I observed that rural banks are reluctant to supply loans to the tenant-farmers in some areas. There are also some questions about the full collateral capacity of

the Land Transfer Certificate.<sup>68</sup>

One of the most important factors for the full repayment of tenant-farmers will be the stability and increased production of the annual crop. The stability of the production should be especially emphasized. However, rice production in Central Luzon area is not so stable according to recent reports due to the recurrent natural calamities. Because of the devastation of the forest resources on the mountains in the areas of Luzon especially after the War, the farmers in Central Luzon are very vulnerable to natural calamities, for example, floods if there is much rain, and droughts if there are fairly little rains. The Government is spending much money for the construction of various infrastructures, parallel to the implementation of agrarian reform. However, from my observation, the most urgent and fundamental task for the Government today is the reforestation of the mountains surrounding the Central Luzon Plain. It will necessitate, of course, enormous funds from the Government and much time for its realization, but if this work is not realized, the irrigation systems in the Plain will neither fully

---

<sup>68</sup>"Land Transfer Certificates are not honored as collateral by some rural banks." (Annual Report, DAR Regional Office VI, FY 1973-74, Iloilo City, p. 88).



function nor last.<sup>69</sup> It cannot be emphasized enough that the nation-wide reforestation movement is a condition sine qua non for the completion of agrarian reform, especially in the Central Luzon area.

---

<sup>69</sup>"In this country, when the monsoon rains come, the lowlands become an ocean and during summer they become deserts. On both times the ugly shadow of hunger and disease looms large and dark over a helpless population. We have practically lost our forest. We can now see and feel what its absence is doing in our existing irrigation systems. During summer, water lines sink to alarmingly low levels. When the rain comes, there is heavy siltation in the reservoirs due to the runoffs and erosion. This means that we are not only getting lesser and lesser water but also the life span of our irrigation dams are shortened due to heavy siltation." (Jose C. Medina, Jr., Dimensions and Strategies of the Agrarian Reform Program, A Paper read before PATAP, March 14, 1974, pp. 21-22). "In the investigated area in Guimba, Nueva Ecija, comparatively well-to-do farmers realized the pump irrigation project with the borrowed money. Due to the increased number of pumps there, water shortage is seriously felt at present. In this area, it is said that there was no water shortage in prewar days, but after the War, especially recently, water shortage of the river is serious. This phenomenon reflects the devastation of the forest resources on the hills and mountains near the water source. Owing to this devastation at forest resources, especially in the Central Luzon area, farmers suffer natural calamities easily." (From the Summary of my Field Survey in Central Luzon, April 10, 1974).