

28 OCT 1983

Biblioteca

✓
110
E
53

R ✓

LAND TENURE AND AGRARIAN REFORM IN CENTRAL AMERICA



IICA
E15
531



IICA

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

SEPTEMBER, 1983



1944

LAND TENURE AND AGRARIAN REFORM IN CENTRAL AMERICA

00004822

~~002803~~

INTRODUCTION

The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture has been requested to express its viewpoint on land tenure and agrarian reform actions in Central America. The Institute is pleased with this opportunity to discuss one of its areas of competence.

IICA's Programs

IICA is a specialized agency of the Inter-American System. Its purposes are to encourage, promote, and support the efforts of the Member States to achieve agricultural development and the well-being of their rural populations. It has organized its work into ten programs that focus on problem areas in agricultural and rural development, and its actions take place in the framework of these programs through projects that are continuously adapted to the social, economic, and political dynamics of the countries. In the area that comprises the seven countries of Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic, IICA is developing fifty-seven projects, for which fifty-two permanent employees have been assigned to work in the countries on national or regional projects in the ten following programs:

- Program I. Formal Agricultural Education
- Program II. Support of National Institutions for the
 Generation and Transfer of Agricultural Tech-
 nology

- Program III. Conservation and Management of Renewable
Natural Resources
- Program IV. Animal Health
- Program V. Plant Protection
- Program VI Stimulus for Agricultural and Forest Produc-
tion
- Program VII. Agricultural Marketing and Agroindustry
- Program VIII. Integrated Rural Development
- Program IX. Planning and Management for Agricultural
Development and Rural Well-Being
- Program X. Information for Agricultural Development and
Rural Well-Being

Concurrence

IICA selects its task areas through a process of concurrence performed by Institute Offices in each country. Agreement is reached with national authorities, often through technical personnel assigned to national agencies. IICA presently has twenty-seven national offices.

In Central America, IICA reaches agreement on regional actions during regular meetings of the Technical Committee and the Council of Ministers of Agriculture of the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation in Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic (CORECA). Annual meetings are also held of agrarian reform executives sitting on the Board of Directors of the Agrarian Reform Program for Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic (PRACA), and the Board of Directors of the Program for the Improvement of Coffee Cultivation (PROMECAFE). IICA operates the Executive Secretariat for these organizations and for other regional groups in which the Institute participates.

The Tropical Agriculture Research and Training Center, CATIE, also associated with IICA, plays an important role as a catalyst of agricultural research in Central America and Panama. It is a center of excellence that provides post-graduate education and training for technical personnel from the countries of the region.

IICA's Role in Agrarian Reform

The subject of agrarian reform falls under the aegis of Program VIII, designed to support integrated rural development processes and efforts to organize productive, participative agrarian structures. IICA has been working in agrarian reform since 1961. One of its first challenges was to manage Project 206, Rural Development and Agrarian Reform, as part of the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States.

When the Inter-American Agrarian Reform Center (IICA/CIRA) was established in Bogota, Colombia, it provided a means for IICA to expand its contributions by training national technical personnel, supporting numerous studies and research projects, editing technical publications, and developing a specialized library on the subject.

The IICA Offices in the countries gradually broadened their operating programs to include actions for supporting national agrarian reform agencies. In 1976, IICA/CIRA completed its outreach activities and began to accentuate the reinforcement of existing agencies in each country.

Action in Central America

In its focus on Central America, IICA introduced the annual meetings of agrarian reform executives. The second such meeting was held in 1967,

when the directors and presidents of national agencies decided to establish the Agrarian Reform Program for Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. Using the Program format, these officials comprised the Board of Directors of PRACA, which holds annual Program meetings. As planned, PRACA was to be supported with funds contributed by national agencies. An agreement was later signed under which IICA acts as the cooperative agency and assumes the role of executive directorship.

In 1968, PRACA began to support training activities for professionals, technical personnel, and farmers in the member countries, and has also held multinational training events. It has completed studies and research projects and published its findings based on Program activities, as a means of disseminating agrarian reform concepts, methods, and results.

The subject area of PRACA's activities has changed and grown over time, parallel with the change and growth of agrarian reform processes in Central America. In the early 1970's, PRACA worked in Central America to disseminate concepts and methods drawn from experiences in other countries, especially in South America, where Central American technical personnel were invited to participate in training activities. Seminars, courses, and publications provided the tools for training personnel from different population groups in Central America, including politicians, members of the military, church people, educators, journalists, and above all, staff members of the newly emerging agrarian reform agencies.

As historical processes developed, several countries began to place an increasing emphasis on agrarian reform actions. IICA, working through PRACA and other mechanisms for technical cooperation, provided information,

advisory services, and cooperation as laws, regulations, and plans were drafted. At all times, it encouraged contact among technical personnel in countries with comparable experiences. This made it possible for the techniques developed in certain countries to be used in others.

As the land grant process proceeded, and a "reformed sector" became more clearly defined, IICA intensified its work in training agrarian reform beneficiaries to organize their enterprises. For this purpose, it supported efforts to provide outreach and training to improve business management in the organizations, train national technical staff, and hold training activities for beneficiaries. It performed the most extensive farmer exchange that has taken place in the area, using its concept of reciprocal training. Through the Government of Holland and PRACA, IICA was able to carry out its "Project for Development Assistance to Campesino Community Enterprises on the Central American Isthmus" (GOBHOL/IICA/PRACA). From 1978 to 1981, this project held 194 training activities, sponsored sixteen trips for exchange and reciprocal training, and produced 165 specialized publications. It also provided advisory services and cooperated with technical authorities in charge of public agencies for agrarian reform. This project benefited 8 644 farmers and 1 297 technical people.

As the present decade began, national agrarian reform agencies in Central America have given conspicuous priority to supporting the commercial development of enterprises operated by agrarian reform beneficiaries. Consequently, IICA has shifted its emphasis to the preparation, selection, and implementation of business development methods. Through its concurrence mechanisms, IICA began to perceive management problems in the enterprises. With financial and technical support from the European

Economic Community and the Government of France, it has now introduced a project in four Central American countries to reinforce management skills in associative agricultural production enterprises.

In the 1960's and 1970's, fully six thousand of these enterprises were established in Latin America and the Caribbean, although they assumed unique characteristics for each of the different countries of the region. These new enterprise models hold considerable promise by comparison with traditional means of organizing production. Their advantages can be synthesized as an ability to combine economic growth with equitable distribution of income and meaningful participation in enterprise decision-making by farmers who traditionally had little or no control over economic resources.

Management of associative agricultural production enterprises is one of the crucial stumbling blocks to economic, financial, and social success. This problem is being addressed by the FORGE project, which pursues the overall objective of reinforcing managerial skills in associative enterprises. It trains enterprise members and technical advisers from public institutions and from second and third degree organizations. The project is also building specific training and advisory units on agricultural management.

Through the FORGE project, managerial skills are reinforced primarily at two levels: in the associative enterprises, and with national technical support staff.

At present, PRACA is drafting a profile for a multinational project to test an operating model under which beneficiaries will receive technical assistance in formulating investment projects, annual farming plans, and

long-term managerial development plans. All this is coordinated with the timely provision of financial resources for carrying out plans and projects, and the use of a managerial and technical training service that will equip enterprises to carry out their plans effectively. Enterprise members will thus learn to continue leading their organizations without the need for special government support, and will acquire true self-management capabilities. The many experiences and methods obtained in IICA's earlier efforts in this field are being used in developing the project.

Patterns of Agrarian Reform in Central America

IICA's actions have closely followed the processes unfolding in the countries.

The meeting of Punta del Este was crucial in Central America, as in the rest of Latin America. Most agrarian reform laws and official decisions to carry out agrarian reform programs followed closely on the heels of Punta del Este. Nevertheless, agrarian reform actions became truly meaningful at different times in each different country, depending on specific political circumstances.

Political decisions that emerge from Presidential offices are often highly visible. However, they must never be allowed to mask the backdrop of campesino pressures against which such policy changes are played out. Certainly, campesino pressure is not the only factor that leads to change in government attitudes or that inspires agrarian reform. Nevertheless campesino pressure has been very much present in every case in Central America, and the consequences of this presence can be seen in the scope ultimately achieved by the resulting reform programs.

The case of Honduras deserves special mention. In this country, Decree No. 8 gave campesino farmers the right to take unused land on their own initiative, and to set up associative production enterprises. In a sense, this matched the degree of reform to campesino pressure. Agrarian reform occurred whenever campesinos took land, and the result was over six hundred campesino enterprises in the first year of reform operation.

In some instances, campesino demands were made in one geographic area, while responses focused on another. Agrarian reform agencies received government owned land for expanding the agricultural frontier, or acquired territory in underpopulated areas that provided room for more beneficiaries. As farmers began to receive a positive response to their demands for land, campesino pressure apparently disappeared. Those who had pushed hardest had achieved their goals, and the primary concern was now the search for new responses that would not include land grants. Thus, campesino pressure ceased to be the focal point of agrarian reform.

The subject of campesino pressure in Central America requires a special approach. We have seen that when campesino pressure provokes no immediate response, it joins other pressures in the country and eventually grows into a greater force using methods more violent than land occupation. It can no longer be satisfied with agrarian reform solutions which affect only a small part of the campesino population. Even in those countries in which pressure is no longer a major factor conditioning present political



circumstances, it has not vanished altogether. Local conflicts continue to break out periodically, and it is clear that certain circumstances could once again unleash efforts by unsatisfied campesinos to use force.

Coverage of Campesino Land Grants

The attached table has been prepared to facilitate discussion of this subject. It contains information on the number of families that have benefited from settlement and agrarian reform in the last two decades, and includes data on the number of hectares granted. This table shows that 28 763 families have benefitted in Guatemala, 67 527 families have benefited in El Salvador, 64 335 through Decree 153 in 1980, 39 637 families have benefitted in Honduras, 59 356 families have benefitted in Nicaragua, of which 54 600 were after 1979, 22 000 families have benefited in Costa Rica, and 19 513 families have been involved in Panama.

It is important for this analysis to examine the dates on which the actions took place, the nature of the movements which motivated them, and the circumstances under which they occurred.

The first agrarian reform initiatives emerged when the countries of the Americas signed the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961. Settlement and land grant processes stemmed from this document in Guatemala (1962), El Salvador (1962), Honduras (1961), Nicaragua (1963), Costa Rica (1961) and Panama (1963). Some of these operations were meager efforts, while others were relatively significant in the overall context of operations throughout the area. However, they appear less impressive when actual land coverage in the different countries is taken into consideration. The actions taken in Honduras are a very clear example of these early operations.

This program, with certain fluctuations, eventually benefited nearly forty thousand families, especially between 1973 and 1978. The Government of Honduras has gradually given in to pressures by the campesino population and farmer groups, which are the strongest legally recognized campesino organizations in Central America. The land appropriation and granting process in this country became a significant escape valve for ameliorating the conditions of poverty and campesino pressure in Honduras.

A second type of land appropriation and grant process took place in Nicaragua as a result of the revolutionary process. In this case, land was appropriated through confiscation, as had not occurred in any other country of the region. The swift pace of the process also marked a strong break with earlier methods. In less than one year, total land appropriations totalled four times those made during two decades of Honduran agrarian reform, which itself was the most significant effort that the zone had seen, in terms of numbers of families.

Another significant difference is that in Nicaragua, most of the hectares that were appropriated have now been organized as community or state property. In the other countries, individual and associative tenure has been the rule.

A third type of operation was used in El Salvador. While it appears to have benefited more families than the process in Nicaragua, it takes fourth place on the Isthmus in terms of amount of land granted. It has been implemented over a very short period, as in Nicaragua, and most land grants have used the associative tenure system. The program was originally designed in 1980, but at present it has failed to achieve the profound changes originally planned, and its continuation is in doubt.

Services for the Agrarian Reform Sector

Underlying campesino pressure to obtain land is the rural worker's need to enjoy full employment that will provide adequate compensation, offer stable working conditions, and produce food for farmers and their families. All of this helps enhance the social importance that land ownership entails.

The tendency to eliminate latifundia-minifundia regimes is a response to such needs, as these productive units traditionally provided the lowest levels of employment and treated the farmers poorly. Experiments were done with granting family plots to place the land in the hands of those who worked it.

However, the slow, complex procedures used for granting land to campesino applicants only inspired greater campesino pressure which jeopardized the government's ability to carry out a well planned process. Central American countries examined experiences in Mexico and South America, and adopted models of group land grants for the establishment of associative production enterprises. This decision shaped the major features of agrarian reform in Central America because it gave agrarian reform agencies an efficient mechanism for handling large numbers of applicants. It shortened the period of uncertainty and quickly dampened the intensity of campesino pressure, except in those cases where such measures were too late in coming and were felt only by those who had already benefited.

In recent years, national agrarian reform agencies have turned their attention to providing services for land grant beneficiaries. All the countries have clearly distinguishable "reformed sectors" to which

material and human resources are allocated. As this process develops, agrarian reform agencies are gradually easing out their legal advisors, appraisers, and outreach staff, replacing them with specialists in production techniques, business management, marketing, and planning.

The functions of agrarian reform agencies have not been legally redefined. In practice, however, the agencies have assumed responsibility for erecting public works, health posts, educational centers, transportation, marketing, industry, and even recreational facilities for the reformed sector, on the assumption that no other public agencies were capable of adequately meeting this sector's special needs.

The emergence of these new responsibilities in agrarian reform agencies has given rise to three unanswered questions:

- a. Should agrarian reform agencies be assuming responsibilities that actually pertain to other institutions, regardless of whether the recipients are agrarian reform beneficiaries?
- b. When agrarian reform agencies assume these functions, do they cease to carry out their original duties adequately, including the appropriation and granting of land titles? Does this mean that no more land will be transferred?
- c. For how long and to what extent will agrarian reform beneficiaries continue to require these special services?

None of these concerns must be neglected. However, each one requires its own solutions. Clearly, the same institutions that provided services to former owners of the land may not be the best suited to serve the reformed sector. Neither can it be assumed, however, that the



institutions established for transferring property will easily adapt to new functions of this kind. The experience of other countries suggests that an ideal solution may be to establish special, short-term agencies equipped to support planning and financing efforts in the enterprises and provide member training until, on the basis of predetermined measurements, the members are declared capable of operating self-managed enterprises and sustaining the business development process themselves.

It is still essential for every country in Central America to be capable of meeting requests for land and responding to campesino pressures. For this purpose, agencies must exist which are capable of perceiving and gauging needs, planning land acquisitions, carrying out transfers, and providing immediate funding for these processes.

If the two mechanisms are to operate effectively, agrarian policy decisions in every country must be made on the basis of true working criteria. The parameters that circumscribe these decisions must also be clearly established:

- a) There must be a clear statement of how much land is to be transferred, what land will be affected, and how many new beneficiaries will receive services, without producing an explosion of unrealistic expectations which can not be met, or underestimating real pressures, and
- b) Parameters must be defined for determining how long each group of beneficiaries will be supported until it becomes capable of operating as a true self-managed enterprise in the national economy.



Quality of Life and Agrarian Structure

The indicators of social conditions and quality of life (see Table 2) clearly demonstrate that, while the countries are extremely heterogeneous, they fall into two basic categories: one includes Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua, with major social and economic problems and a high degree of instability; the other contains Costa Rica and Panama, which have fewer problems. Clearly, Costa Rica occupies a privileged position in the context of Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Table 3 shows indicators of agrarian structure, rural population, and income for the six countries. It, too, shows considerable dissimilarity for the eight indicators.

The indicators of agrarian structure (see Table 3) show that Panama and Costa Rica had the lowest inequality of land distribution at that time.

It is important to note that the percentage of landless agricultural workers gives an idea of the economically active rural population that owns no land and has a relatively low level of income and social benefits-

As this percentage rises, the proportion of the economically active population that has no control over the land also climbs, and instability grows. The purpose of this and other indicators contained in the table is to draw attention to the degree of relative instability that can arise in rural areas of these countries. The table also shows that Panama and Honduras have the lowest percentage of landless agricultural workers.

To a certain extent, the number of temporary, migrant, or part-time workers is also an indicator of labor underemployment, and consequently a factor of instability. As can be seen, Costa Rica has the fewest such

workers. Although definitive information is not available, Panama is assumed to have relatively lower levels than the group average.

Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama experienced low rural population growth rates from 1960 to 1979, in percentage terms. These three countries, although not in the same order, also show the lowest percentages of economically active population involved in agriculture. Together, these two indicators give an approximate idea of the degree to which rural populations can increase their pressure for access to land. Other static indicators can also be used to reflect the same situation.

Unfortunately, figures found on underemployment in the population economically active in agriculture covered only four countries. These figures do, however, attest to the heterogeneous nature of the zone, and reflect lower levels of pressure in the rural areas of some countries. Again, Costa Rica and Panama have the lowest levels of underemployment in the economically active population.

The last indicator, per capita income, does not cover only the rural areas, but rather the countries as a whole. Again, it reflects the same heterogeneity as the other indicators; Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua are in the most difficult straits in terms of economic, social, and demographic status, while Costa Rica and Panama, both of which are underdeveloped countries with considerable problems, are facing lesser difficulties. The implicit hypothesis is that these countries therefore have fewer problems of social and political instability.

HYPOTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

A number of hypotheses can be drawn from this presentation, including:

- a) agrarian reform has occurred whenever campesino pressure was strong and growing,
- b) when the magnitude of agrarian reform programs has been inadequate in terms of levels of poverty and existing agrarian structures, the countries have become enmeshed in greater, more far-reaching social conflicts,
- c) in Honduras, which has considerable problems of poverty and agrarian structures, agrarian reform programs have had greater breadth, while still limited, this coverage has served as a relatively effective vehicle for helping to keep social conflicts within controllable limits,
- d) in El Salvador, efforts have been made to implement an agrarian reform program of some magnitude, but because of the level of social conflict already unleashed on the country, it has proven impossible to take full advantage of the potential of agrarian reform as a stabilizing factor,
- e) in Costa Rica and Panama, where levels of poverty and problems of agrarian structures are less severe than in the other countries of the area, social conflicts have not erupted with the same force. Processes of appropriating and granting land, while limited, have helped keep social conflicts within controllable limits. Nevertheless it should not be forgotten that during the last



seventeen months, thirty-nine farm invasions have taken place in Costa Rica^{1/}, and as a result, several draft laws have already been proposed for facilitating the transfer of land to campesino farmers,

- f) agrarian reform as such has no ideological biases, and can be used for different purposes, every government must decide what type of agrarian reform it wishes to initiate,
- g) land ownership data suggest the same conclusion that has been recommended by many authors, that changes in land tenure would be desirable not only as an act of justice, but also as a means of mitigating social tensions.

Many years of experience have shown that agrarian reform must go hand in hand with broad financial, technical, and administrative support for associative and cooperative enterprises, and with other measures for providing incentives to small-scale producers. At the same time, measures for supporting the production, generation, and transfer of technology, and for fostering marketing and agroindustry, are fundamental for bringing about integrated agricultural development and harmonious progress in rural areas, all of which contribute to overall development in the region.

1/ La Nacion, September 5, 1981, p. 6A.

In Central America, agriculture and the rural population have a heavy impact on the social, political, and economic life of the region. Fully 52 percent of the population of the region is directly dependent on agriculture, while 48 percent of the labor force in the region works in agriculture. For the nations as a whole, agriculture provided 76 percent of total export earnings in 1979.

At the same time, food imports have been rising. Costs jumped from over 111 million dollars in 1970 to nearly 505 million dollars in 1979. This increase in food imports is disturbing, if it is interpreted as a reflection of the inability of the agrarian sector, and especially the small-scale producers, to supply traditional staples in the quantity and quality needed to meet the needs of the population.

IICA is aware of this fact. It is working in Central America, as far as its limited resources allow, and focusing on all the basic facets of agricultural development and rural well-being, in each country and for the entire region.

Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation

Under the heading of regional endeavors, special mention should be made of the initiative taken by the Ministries of Agriculture of the countries of Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. They have established a forum for discussion and a mechanism for cooperation and for coordinating the efforts being made by agricultural public sectors and agricultural production groups in the countries of the region. This agency can maximize the benefits of cooperation provided by the international community.

In 1979, the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation was born. IICA was placed in charge of the Secretariat of Coordination, through an agreement with the seven Ministries of Agriculture represented on the Council, and the Regional Office for Central America and Panama, ROCAP/AID, of the Government of the United States of America. ROCAP provides budgetary support to supplement the contributions of the countries themselves.

In particular, the operating program approved by the Technical Committee and the Council of Ministers may prove to be of vital importance. It includes four basic studies, seven preinvestment studies, nine investment projects, and four institutional reinforcement projects, with priorities based on the interests of the countries.

Another important initiative is the preparation of a specific program for food security. The program will include nine projects for helping to solve this problem.

The countries have recognized the importance of maximizing the use of specialized human resources in the region through reciprocal technical cooperation. Their ultimate goal is for all the agricultural public institutions to form a common agricultural sector for the entire region, and CORECA hopes to expand this mechanism in the near future.

IICA has provided CORECA with access to a bibliographic, numerical, and geographic information system and a data bank. These have been incorporated into a regional information system so they may be used for other regional initiatives.

In closing, we should note that under existing circumstances at this moment in time, a vicious circle is operating in Central America, with economic deterioration producing social and political breakdown which in

turn intensifies economic deterioration. In order to break this spiral, internal efforts must be supplemented with dynamic initiatives from outside, through export opportunities, direct investment, concessionary funding, and technical cooperation.

In the area of technical cooperation, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, IICA, is prepared to place its full capabilities, and any additional resources it may receive, at the service of initiatives from inside the countries and from the region as a whole.

TABLE 1. FAMILIES BENEFITED BY AGRARIAN REFORM AND SETTLEMENT IN THE COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL MAERICA SINCE 1960 AND HECTARES GRANTED

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>LEGAL INSTRUMENT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF FAMILIES</u>	<u>HECTARES GRANTED</u>
Guatemala	1956	Decree Law 559		
	1962	Decree 1551 Settlement	28 763 <u>a/</u>	466 278 <u>a/</u>
	1980	Decree 27-80 Settlement		
El Salvador	1962	Settlement	3 198 <u>b/</u>	7 250 <u>b/</u>
	1980	Decree 153 Agrarian Reform Law	64 335 <u>c/</u>	214 175 <u>c/</u>
Honduras	1961	Decree 69 Founding INA		
	1972	Decree Law 8	39 637 <u>d/</u>	225 493 <u>d/</u>
		Decree Law 170 Agrarian Reform Lay		
Nicaragua	1963	Settlement	4 756 <u>b/</u>	195 571 <u>b/</u>
	1979	Decree 3 and 38 for Confiscation	40 000 <u>e/</u>	980 000 <u>e/</u>
	1981	Decree 782 Agrarian Reform Law	14 600 <u>f/</u>	216 300 <u>f/</u>
Costa Rica	1961	Law 2825 Land and Settlement	15 819 <u>g/</u>	443 969 <u>g/</u>
Panama	1963	Law 37 approving Agrarian Code and enacting agrarian reform	19 513 <u>h/</u>	523 511 <u>h/</u>

PREPARED BY: Ernesto S. Liboreiro, IICA, on the basis of:

- a/ Richard Hough, Russell Derossier, et. al. Tierra y trabajo en Guatemala: una evaluación. AID/Washington and Development Associates. Guatemala 1982 & 1983. Appendix 1, Table 15. Information was taken from this table only as of 1960, with operations based on the 1956 Decree Law 559, amending the 1952 agrarian reform Law 900 of 1952.
- b/ IDB. Economic and social progress in Latin America: Social Progress fund. Eighth annual report. 1968. Washington, D.C. As quoted in Terry L. McCoy. La reforma agraria: un análisis político del cambio estructural. Land Tenure Center. University of Wisconsin. No land appropriations are reported after 1954. Marco A. Ramírez. Situación de la reforma agraria y de la organización campesina en Guatemala. In: III Reunión Interamericana de Ejecutivos de Reforma Agraria, Caracas, December 1959, pp. 111-115.
- c/ MAG-OSPA in El Salvador. Información global del desarrollo del proceso de reforma agraria. Mimeo. October, 1980. Table No.1 The number of families was obtained by dividing the number of persons benefitted, 386010, as indicated in Table of the report, by 6, assumed to be the average family size.
- d/ INA-Departamento de Planificación. Situación actual y perspectivas del programa de reforma agraria y desarrollo rural en Honduras. Tegucigalpa, Dec. 1982. Mimeo. pg.4. Data for July, 1982.
- e/ Approximately 1 400 000 manzanas were confiscated, equivalent to 980 000 has, for establishing the Community Property Area on which over 40 000 workers are employed. See MIDINRA. 3 años de reforma agraria. CIERA. Managua. August 1982. pp. 9, 15, 44.
- f/ Preliminary, unpublished estimates based on the period since Decree 782 (Agrarian Reform Law) of October, 1981 went into effect of the 216 300 has., 189 000 have been titled as cooperatives, containing 13 000 families. The rest are individual titles.
- g/ Unpublished information from the Department of Beneficiary Selection of the Costa Rican Agrarian Development Institute, through August 31, 1983.
- h/ DNDS-MIDA. The National Office of Social Development and Rural Development Programs. Paper presented by Panama in the Regular Annual Meeting of the PRACA Board of Directors. December 1982. Appendix 1. The 523 511 hectares were appropriated. Of these, 296 000 (?) has have been granted under individual title.

TABLE 2
PHYSICAL QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX
POLY PHYSICAL QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX (Maximum 100)

	PHYSICAL QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX	INDEX OF LIFE EXPECTANCY AT ONE YEAR OF AGE	INFANT MORTALITY INDEX	LITERACY 15 YEARS AND OVER % OF TOTAL	LIFE EXPECTANCY AT ONE YEAR OF AGE	INFANT MORTALITY PER 1000 LIVE BIRTHS	RATINGS FOR THE REGION	RATING FOR 150 COUNTRIES WORLD WIDE
Barbados	89	83.8	86	98	70.7	38	1	29
Uruguay	87	87.9	82.9	90	72.3	45	2	32
Costa Rica	85	81.5	86	89	69.7	38	3	36
Trinidad & Tobago	85	75.1	87.8	92	67.3	34	4	37
Argentina	85	85.4	76.7	93	71.3	59	5	38
Guyana	85	81.5	85.1	87	69.8	40	6	39
Cuba	84	84.9	90.1	78	71.1	29	7	41
Jamaica	84	79.0	91.4	82	68.8	26	8	43
Suriname	83	74.4	89.6	84	67.0	30	9	48
Panama	80	76.2	85.1	78	67.7	40	10	54
Venezuela	79	75.1	81.1	82	67.3	49	11	55
Grenada	77	66.9	88.7	76	64.1	32	12	57
Chile	77	74.9	68.5	88	67.2	77	13	58
Guadeloupe	76	61.0	83.3	83	61.8	44	14	59
Paraguay	75	70.0	73.9	80	65.3	65	15	61
Mexico	73	72.8	73.4	74	66.4	66	16	63
Colombia	71	73.1	59.5	81	66.5	97	17	65
Ecuador	68	66.9	88.0	68	64.1	78	18	70
Brasil	68	70.3	66.2	66	65.4	82	19	71
El Salvador	64	57.9	77.0	57	60.6	58	20	73
Dominican Rep.	64	64.9	59.0	68	63.3	98	21	74
Peru	62	61.3	53.6	72	61.9	110	22	75
Guatemala	54	47.7	67.1	46	56.6	80	23	80
Nicaragua	54	54.9	47.7	58	59.4	123	24	81
Honduras	51	56.7	50.5	45	60.1	117	25	84
Bolivia	43	35.1	54.5	40	51.7	108	26	94
Haiti	36	50.8	35.6	23	57.8	150	27	107

NOTE: The data for these indices were taken from the early years of the 1970's (between 1970 and 1975), see page 126-127 of the source.

SOURCE: Measuring the Conditions of the World's Poor-The Physical Quality of Life Index by Morris David Morris-Pergamon Policy Studies-Pergamon Pren 1979 / Data prepared by DAP/IICA.

TABLE 3 INDICATORS OF AGRARIAN STRUCTURE, RURAL POPULATION AND INCOME IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Countries	"Gini" land concentration $\frac{a/}{}$	Percent of estab. with under 5 has. $\frac{b/}{}$	% Law of EAP in agriculture $\frac{c/}{}$	Number of Temporary Workers $\frac{d/}{}$	Rural population growth 1960-79 $\frac{e/}{(\bar{x})}$	Percent EAP in agric. 1978 $\frac{f/}{}$	Underemployment EAP in agriculture $\frac{g/}{}$	Per capita income in 1978 $\frac{h/}{}$
				(thousands)	(\bar{x})	$\frac{f/}{}$	(thousands)	(dollars)
Guatemala	0,83 (1960)	87,0 (1964)	54.1	306	83.7	57	n.d.	910
El Salvador	0,83 (1950)	86,7 (1975)	50.4	280	77.1	52	293	660
Honduras	0,78 (1974)	63,9 (1974)	27.0	120	58.8	64	n.d.	480
Nicaragua	0,80 (1960)	35,4 (1963)	47.0	250	22.2	44	59	840
Costa Rica	0,78 (1960)	43,2 (1973)	56.6	80	33.7	29	35	1 540
Panama	0174 (1960)	45,4 (1977)	20.8	n.d.	42.0	35	45	1 290

Prepared by Ernesto S. Liboreiro on the basis of:

- a/ The "Gini" index shows the distribution of agricultural establishments by size. The figures in parentheses gives the year for which the coefficient of concentration was calculated. The datum for El Salvador was taken from Russett, Bruce Mart, et.al., World handbook of political and social indicators, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1964; the data for 1960, from Albert R. Berry and William R. Cline. Farm size, factor productivity and technical change in developing countries, cited as forthcoming in: The World Bank. Labor force. Employment and labor markets in the course of economic development. World Bank Staff Working Paper No.336. June 1979. pg. 102 (?); the datum for Honduras is from IDHER, La tenencia de la tierra en Honduras. Colección Siembra No.1 Tegucigalpa. 1981. pp.24 and 73.
- b/ IICA. Eighth Inter-American Conference on Agriculture. OAS/SER.K/11.8.1. CIES/AGRI/1. San José, Costa Rica. February, 1981. Table III.8, p.55. The numbers in parentheses show the dates of the data. The figure for Honduras was taken from the 1974 National Agricultural Census.
- c/ The figure on Landless Agricultural Workers (LAW) as a percent of the Economically Active Population (EAP) in agriculture was obtained from Ernesto S. Liboreiro. La problemática del pequeño agricultor en el contexto de la reforma agraria y el desarrollo rural en América Latina y el Caribe. In: FAO, Reforma Agraria, Colonización y Cooperativas, 1979. No.1 cuadro 4. p.99.
- d/ Confederación Universitaria de Centroamérica-CSUCA-Programa Centroamericano de Ciencias de la Salud. Los trabajadores temporeros en la agricultura centroamericana. Costa Rica. 1983, p.6.
- e/ Calculations bases on IDB data. Economic and social progress in Latin America. 1979 Annual Report. Tables 1 and 2. p. 437.
- f/ The World Bank. World Development Report 1980, August 1980, Table 19.
- g/ OIT/PREALC. El problema del empleo en América Latina; Situación, perspectivas y políticas. PREALC. Santiago de Chile. April, 1976. Table 6, p.10. It should be noted that the figures in this column of the table do not show unemployed persons; they are the "unemployment equivalent" of all types of underuse.
- h/ The World Bank. World Development Report 1980. August 1980. Table 1. p. 170.

IICA
E15
531 LAND TENURE AND AGRARIAN
Autor REFORM IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Título

Fecha Devolución	Nombre del solicitante
20 nov 1969	L. Pina



