

A NOTE ON THE EVALUATION WORK OF THE AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC. (EGYPT)

by SAN'EKI NAKAOKA*

Introduction

1) Academic research on the economic and social structure of the Nile delta villages has been dealt with in pilot studies by J. Lozach, 'A. 'Ammâr and others.¹ But, generally speaking, most of the research work carried out before the 1940's was restricted to a narrow area, such as the improvement of an irrigation system, a cotton farming project or a taxation system. After the 1940's, the peasant or rural problem became of greater concern: not only on academic but also practical levels since it was connected with the determination of the peasant status within the framework of the Egyptian society itself. This was not easy because of the troubles caused by the agricultural crisis of the 1930's. Important reform programmes were proposed about this time, among which the proposal by Mr Khattâb was the most distinguished one. The Agrarian Reform initiated in 1952 has been a factor which has finally attracted attention to these pressing agricultural problems.²

As yet we do not have sufficient reliable data based on actual field work, especially that dealing with the limited area, to arrive at a real understanding of how far the Agrarian Reform has been effective in

* The author wishes to express his thanks to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Agricultural Credit and Co-operative Bank in the UAR and the Arab States Fundamental Education Centre which helped him in his studies during his stay in Egypt (1960-62) and also to their local officials and the farmers who welcomed him in the countryside. But any statement or view expressed here is to be understood as not necessarily having their approval.

² These pilot studies are, e.g., Willcocks and Craig, *Egyptian Irrigation*, Vols. 2, London, Spon, 1913 (3rd edition), 884 pp.; H. G. Lyons, *The Cadastral Survey of Egypt, 1892-1907*, Cairo, Ministry of Finance, 1918, 421 pp.; J. Lozach & G. Hug, *L'habitat rural en Egypte*, Cairo, La Société Royale de Géographie d'Egypte, 1930, 206 pp.; J. Lozach, *Le Delta du Nil*, Cairo, La Société Royale de Géographie d'Egypte, 1935, 303 pp.; H. K. Selim, *Twenty Years of Agricultural Development in Egypt*, Cairo, Ministry of Finance, 1940; H. Ayrout, *Fellahs d'Egypte*, Cairo, Editions du Sphinx, 1952, 210 pp.; and D. Warriner, *Land and Poverty in the Middle East*, London, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1948, 148 pp.

¹ Dr. Ali Fu'ad Ahmad draws a clear picture of the Egyptian attitude to rural problems before the Agrarian Reform. See: Aly Fouad Ahmad, *A Proposed Experiment in Community Change by the People of Selected Egyptian Villages* (Unpub. Ph. D. thesis), Univ. of Tennessee, 1952. And also Mirrîf Ghâlî provides us a clear explanation of the causes of Agrarian Reform to be initiated. Mirrîf Ghâlî, "Un Programme de Réforme Agraire pour l'Egypte", *L'Egypte Contemporaine*, Vol. XXXVIII, Cairo, La Société Royale d'Economie Politique de Statistique et de Législation, 1948.

changing the economic and social structure of the Nile delta villages. We shall lay responsibility for this dearth of data on the tendency of academic circles in Egypt to ignore the value of field surveys. It is considered that this inquiry into the changing structure of the Nile delta villages, before and after the Agrarian Reform, is all the more important because of this lack of basic data.

Recent research activities carried out by the Egyptian authorities have been directed to countrywide surveys dealing with special subjects of interest to the various ministries, and not aimed at conveying the overall picture of the structure of certain localities or limited areas. Examples are reports on labour force, family budgets and cost of crop production.¹ The Ministry of Agriculture (including the Agricultural Co-operative General Organization), the Ministry of Agrarian Reform (including the Agrarian Reform General Organization) and the Agricultural Credit and Co-operative Bank have branches or agents in every locality and are able to collect data within their own area. But regional characteristics are not obvious in their books and official reports, because they are naturally only concerned with the total amounts of Governmental services and account-settlements in the area under their control. However, if we examine the data which appear, for instance, in the agricultural co-operative of a certain village, we shall begin to grasp the real differences in farms according to their size and way of farm management. Unofficial research work, whilst mostly concerned at covering a non-agrarian reform area, does reflect a better all-round understanding of the changing economic and social situation in the area. In this connection, unofficial research is carried on in quite a different way from officially inspired work both by way of area and method, and this will be examined later on.² By combining the findings of both official and unofficial research,

¹ Central Committee for Statistics, Presidency of Republic, *iḥṣā'u alqu wwat al 'āmila bi-l 'annīya fi iqlīm misra, 1959-60* (Labour Force Statistics by Sampling in Egyptian Region, 1959-60), 1961; *baḥīḥ miẓāniyat al usra bi-l 'annīya fi iqlīm misra, 1958-59* (Sample Survey on Family Budgets in the Egyptian Region, 1958-59), 1961. The latest survey of the cost of crop production has been initiated since 1962. Dr. M. I. Badr offered details of the methods and systems which were used in compiling the official statistics concerning the agricultural sector in Egypt. Mohamed Ibrahim Badr, "Developing Statistical Methods and Systems of the Agricultural Sector in Egypt as a Part of Planning for General Economic Development." (Unpub. Ph. D. thesis) Univ. of Wisconsin, 1960.

² Among unofficial researches, we shall take the following as the most distinguished: J. Berque, *Histoire Sociale d'un Village Egyptien au XXème Siècle*, Paris-Le Hye, Mouton & Co., 1957, 87 pp; "Sur la Structure de quelques Villages Egyptiens", *Annales—Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 10^e année, No. 2, pp. 199-215, Paris, Armand Colin, 1955; R. M. Ghonemy, *Resource Use and Income in Egyptian Agriculture before and after the Land Reform with particular Reference to Economic Development* (Unpub. Ph. D. thesis), Univ. of North Carolina, 1952.

it is possible to obtain a clearer picture of the state of Agrarian Reform in Egypt.

2) In this paper, the village of Mit Khalaf and its neighbouring villages in Mudiriyat al Menûfiya (now Menûfiya Governorate) was chosen as a subject for the evaluation work of the Agrarian Reform. The Ministry of Agrarian Reform in UAR co-operated with the Sociology Section of Ain Shams University at Cairo in this project. The temporary report on this work, though not yet officially published, was available in outline for the evaluation work. It is further officially expressed in the following explanation in *the Replies to the United Nations Questionnaires relating to Egyptian Agrarian Reform Measures*, published by the Agrarian Reform General Organization in 1961.

Question No. 4

Have your Government ever undertaken an evaluation of the effects of land reform? Have non-governmental organizations (universities, research institutes) carried out any studies in this field?

Answer

The Statistics Department of Agrarian Reform General Organization undertook evaluation on the different projects of agrarian reform such as an overall picture of co-operatives in an agrarian reform, including capital, services, dividend, losses—evaluation of co-operative marketing of cotton crop including grade, ginning, out turn prices and yield per feddan..... Also the Sociology Section of Ain Shams University at Cairo undertook evaluation of the economic and social conditions of the new farm owners in five of the agrarian reform farms namely: Soursouk (Kalubiah Province)—Meet Khalaf (Menoufiah Province)—Enchas (Sharkiah Province)—Menshiah (Sharkiah Province)—El Marg (Kalubia Province).

Among these villages, the temporary report on Mit Khalaf (Meet Khalaf) area is available as an unpublished draft under the title of "*al baḥṭh al iġimā'iyu li-l zirā'a Mīt Khalaf*" (the social studies on Mit Khalaf area) (hereafter called *the Mīt Khalaf report*). For this research, a special questionnaire was prepared: Agrarian Reform General Organization, *istibayān khaṣ bi-l darāsat al iġtimā'iya li mashrū'i al iṣlāḥ al zirā'i fi manāṭiqat al muġtalifa* (Special Questionnaire on Social Studies of the Agrarian Reform Project in Different Area). This questionnaire includes 126 questions under the following 9 headings: basic data relating to the family, economic conditions before the Agrarian Reform, economic conditions after the Agrarian Reform, the agricultural co-operative, the standard of living, living quarters, furniture, community services and social consciousness.

At the same time, the mid-Nile delta area around Mudiriyat al

Menūfiya has frequently been chosen as the subject of village surveys. Reliable surveys of the so-called non-agrarian reform villages have been compiled. Among these village surveys, material from the Arab States Fundamental Education Center (ASFEC), which has been serving as a training and research centre since 1953, is available.¹ Out of ASFEC's library, we shall refer to the following reports (mimeographed):

qarya Kafr Shubrâ Zingi, i'adâd al qarya min al fawg al sâdis (the village Kafr Shubrâ Zingi, group report on the village by 6th party), 1958. (hereafter called *the Kafr Shubrâ Zingi report*) *Kafr Singalf al Qadim, al taqrir al 'amm li-l fariq* (Singalf al Qadim, general report for the group), 1954. (hereafter called *the Singalf al Qadim report*)

In this paper, two kinds of village surveys, official and unofficial, represented by *the Mit Khalaf report* and ASFEC's report respectively are compared. They will show, although the materials in this paper come from temporary reports, the effects of the Agrarian Reform, and the changing situation in the reform areas.

I. Basis of Research in the Mit Khalaf Area

1) The introductory chapter of the report on Mit Khalaf area may be summarized as follows:

The surveys of rural areas carried out by the various Egyptian ministries have been based on their administrative requirements and have not been intended to produce a portrayal of the social and economic structure of limited areas. In the agricultural year 1956-57, the Ministry of Agrarian Reform co-operated with the Agriculture Department of Alexandria University in experimental trials at Khazzân and Kafr al Dawwâr in Mudiriyat al Bahaira, which were aimed at increasing cotton production in these reform areas. The success of this experiment paved the way for the next step, that of a close association between the ministry and the independent scientific organization. Thanks to the good offices of Mr Sayyed Mar'ai, the Minister of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform at that time, effective liaison was established between the Ministry of Agrarian Reform, the Sociology Section of Ain Shams University and the Sociology Section of Cairo University, for this field work. This was the first time in which the Ministry worked with the research organization officially.

A meeting of the representatives of the Ministry, Cairo University and Ain Shams University was held in December 1957, when the two universities could not agree on the form of the written report on this research activity. Dr. 'Abd al 'Azîz 'Izzat insisted that the working group should be responsible for research only and not for the recommendations

¹ *c.f.* UNESCO, *Sirs el Layyan: Light and hope for the Arab World*, 1955: G. C. Antawati, "Les publications du Centre de Sirs et Layyan," *La Revue du Caire*, No. 245, 1961.

to be drawn up afterwards.¹ On the other hand, Dr. Hassan Sa'âtî of Ain Shams University felt that the working group should be responsible for the application of the recommendations and furthermore they should be social advisers to the rural area. With this issue unsettled, the co-operation was limited to two organizations: the Ministry of Agrarian Reform and Ain Shams University.

The working group made a preparatory survey of 224 families in the village Sirâg in Mudiriyat al Qaliyûbiya during the three months (February–April 1958), in order to prove the form of the questionnaire to be applied at the next stage. In August 1958, the field survey began in Mît Khalaf area, using revised formula. Then the work was extended to a further area and finally to the 2,700 families in the 4 villages: Sursuq, al Marg, Menshiya and Inshâs.

2) Mît Khalaf Agrarian Reform area includes 13 village communities (*balad*) and its cultivated area (*zimâm*) amounts to 2,067 *feddân*² and 6 *kirât*, where are living 1,134 emancipated peasant families (*mutafa'in*). Among these beneficiaries, 416 families are *mumallakin* (who enjoy full ownerships), 226 *mu'allagin* (who were given temporary or suspended ownerships) and 452 *musa'agirin* (who were given tenant-rights).

The Mît Khalaf report covered 8 village communities, where 797 families were living. This survey therefore covers all the families affected by the Agrarian Reform in the eight village communities of the Mît Khalaf area. But this evaluation work has some shortcomings which should not be overlooked:

a) Most of the field workers were lacking in experience of this type of work and the leader, Dr. Hassan Sa'âtî is a specialist in the industrialization and urbanization fields.

b) The field workers, most of whom were students without experience of this type of work, were in the villages for only 15 days, much too short a time for carrying out a proper survey. Moreover a survey trip from Cairo was included within this short period.

c) Important matters overlooked in this survey include: the *'âila* (joint-family) system which is considered an essential part of Egyptian village life, the local rural marketing structure, the peasant family budget, and the cost of crop production.

d) The field workers did not collect sufficient data to disclose the situation prior to the Agrarian Reform.

The research activity was restricted to the so-called agrarian reform area. The area which is partly owned or under tenancy outside the

¹ Dr. 'Abd al 'Azîz 'Izzat organized a working group to make a field survey of three villages near Cairo but his report is not reliable, because conclusions are drawn from a few and doubtful samplings. c.f. 'Abd al 'Azîz 'Izzat and Muhammad Tala'at 'Issa, *mashrû'u al khidmat al 'amma* (General Work Project), Gâmi'at al Qâhira, Al Qâhira, 1957, 501 pp.

² One *feddân* (1.038 acres) equals 24 *kirât*.

Agrarian Reform by beneficiaries, was not related to their farms inside the Agrarian Reform. Unfortunately the survey does not consider the problem from the viewpoint of the total land holdings of an individual peasant, a defect which will be considered later.

II. *Social and Economic Conditions in the Mit Khalaf Area*

1) Evaluation of the research work on social conditions.

The First Part of the report deals with the social conditions in the area, as revealed by the work of the survey.

Table 1 shows the number of families, the average size of the family and the ratio between the sexes. Table 2 shows the construction of the

Table 1

size	no. of family		total no. of family members		male	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	6	0.4	6	0.1	3	0.1
2	37	4.6	74	1.4	37	1.3
3	73	9.2	219	4.0	108	4.0
4	94	11.8	376	6.9	179	6.5
5	115	11.4	575	10.6	292	10.7
6	119	15.0	714	13.1	349	12.8
7	95	11.9	665	12.2	349	12.8
8	65	8.2	520	9.5	259	9.5
9	45	5.6	405	7.4	203	1.4
10	44	5.5	440	8.1	238	8.7
11	38	4.8	418	7.7	215	7.9
12	23	2.9	276	5.1	138	5.0
13	24	3.0	312	5.7	147	5.4
14	19	2.4	448	8.2	216	7.9
total	797		5,448		2,733	50.2

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 30.

Table 2

relationship	number	%
head of family	797	14.6
wife	687	12.6
daughter	851	15.6
son	1,391	25.5
sister	58	1.1
brother	170	3.1
father, mother and grand father and mother	156	2.9
grandson	516	9.5
others	822	15.1
total	5,448	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 34.

Table 3

cause of increase	No.	%
birth	411	64
marriage	119	18.6
divorce	18	2.8
widow	15	2.3
others	79	12.3
total	642	
cause of decrease	No.	%
death	101	48.6
marriage	17	22.6
others	60	28.8
total	208	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 31.

family according to relationship. And Table 3 shows the changes of family-members and cause, comparing the two periods: 1955 when the land was re-distributed and 1958 when the research was carried out. The report also includes data showing the marriage status according to the degree of relations, the construction of family groups according to age, the distribution of family members according to the degree of relationship and educational status and so forth.

Throughout the tables concerning family and family members, there is an assumption that most of the family is composed of the basic or nuclear family members and most of the household consists of a basic or nuclear family (*usra*).¹ Though tables show the existence of lineal relatives, the report does not use any term to draw an exact line between the nuclear family, lineal relatives and kinship groups. In the neighbouring villages, for instance, in Kafr Shubrâ Zingî or Kafr Singalf al Qadîm, it is possible to see quite a different situation in the household. This trend was mentioned by 'Abbâs 'Ammâr in his book, *The People of Sharqiya* (Cairo, La Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, 1944, vols. 2). He wrote:

The household (family groups—father, mother and children, with whom may be living other relatives) is of paramount im-

¹ Mr Ibrahim M. Salah, General Controller of the Department of Statistics and Census, divided the Egyptian households into two categories: private households and collective households. He mentioned further that, since the collective households represent only a small proportion of all households, they are usually excluded from most tables of households statistics. And he used the term family to imply at least the nuclear family. *c.f.* Household and Household Surveys in the UAR, A Note submitted by Ibrahim M. Salah to the Economic Commission for Africa, Working Group of Consultants in Household Surveys, Addis Ababa, 11th-20th. Dec. 1961 (unpublished).

portance in Eastern Society not only because it plays so large a part in emotional life, but also because there still flourishes the *joint-family*, including in one homestead all the direct male descendants with their wives and families. The oldest male member is head of the family and exercises almost unlimited patriarchal power. From the economic point of view there is an element of communism in the sense that the normal unit of the Eastern rural society is the family of two, three or more generations and augmented by other relatives who, though may be forming part of the household, share the family budget. (Vol. 1, pp. 251-252) It is improbable... that the *joint-family* was neglected in the censuses and one is left to wonder whether the rather small proportion of the larger size families was due to lower frequency of the *joint-family* system in the province or to the limited number of the different *private families*. (Vol. 1, p. 296).... The *joint-family* as a socio-economic institution may prove to be suitable for the rural community of Sharqiya. (Vol. 1, 299).

In Egypt there are two words which mean the family: *'ā'ila* and *usra*. They are sometimes used indiscriminately to indicate the word family, because the word *'ā'ila* used to express sometimes a basic family unit (*usra*) and sometimes a family group (*'iddat al usra = 'ā'ila*). But, as a technical term of social science, it is reasonable to discriminate the two words: *usra* for a nuclear family and *'ā'ila* for a family group or joint-family. Dr. J. Berque takes the word *nāhiya* as a term which is to indicate "groupes des familles", that is kinship. He used the word "famille" to mean *'ā'ila* in principle and rarely *usra*. The word *nāhiya* meant originally a community or a part of community, regionally equivalent to *ḥayyu* (a quarter) in the village settlement.¹

Taking the case of Kafr Shubrâ Zingi, which is a middle-sized village of about 4,500 population, the population is divided into 450 children (under 6 years old), 3,900 youths and adults (from 7 to 60 years old) and 150 old (more than 60 years old). Out of the median 3,900, 1,800 (48%) are male. Different from the neighbouring village of Kafr Singalf al Qadīm, the villagers are reputed to have a common ancestor, but are now settled in 4 *ahyâ'* (quarters), in which many of them are under the *'ā'ila* system.

The most influential *'awâ'il* (pl. of *'ā'ila*) in Kafr Shubrâ Zingi are: al Tiḥaiwī, Abu Mansûr, Abu Ismâ'il, al Gazzâr and Abu Nâgi. Except for al Gazzâr, these 4 *'awâ'il* are maintaining a close bond inside *'ā'ila* and live together in a particular part of the *ḥayyu* in the village. The lesser influential *'awâ'il* are: al Ma'adâwī, al Gabbâr, al Gâwish and Abu Maş'ûd, among which Abu Maş'ûd is still maintaining a pattern of family group settlement. Abu Fâ'id, a less important family, also conforms to a similar pattern.

¹ J. Berque, *Histoire Sociale d'un Village Egyptien au XX^{ème} Siècle*, 1957, pp. 24-25, 47.

Solidarity of simple families under the same 'ā'ila may be seen in the patterns of landownership. Abu Manṣūr and Abu Ismā'il have their lands in the south part of the zimâm en bloc, Abu Maṣ'ūd and al Tiḥaiwī in the west part and Abu Ma'adâwī in the north. They are considered to be the leading families in the south, west and north parts of the village respectively. These 9 big 'awā'il own a larger part of the zimâm as the following table reveals:

Table 4

name of 'ā'ila	area of property (feddân)
al Tiḥaiwī	30
Abu Manṣūr	60
Abu Ismā'il	50
al Gazzâr	30
Abu Nâgī	30
al Ma'adâwī	40
al Gabbâr	25
al Gâwish	25
Abu Maṣ'ūd	35
total	325

Source: *The Kafr Shubrâ Zingī report*, p. 7.

Out of 857 *feddân* of the total zimâm in this village, 325 *feddân* are occupied by these 9 large family groups. Most of the other 'ā'ila settle in every *ḥayyu* separately and own scattered lands in the zimâm. It is difficult to determine the exact number of 'ā'ila existing in this village, because of not being able to distinguish whether families are in the 'ā'ila

Table 5

name of 'ā'ila	no. of family members
Qadīra	113
al Gâfi	79
'Eid	69
Salâma	69
Ḥammâd	65
Hebna	61
Sha'ib	31
Beheirî	27
'Amâra	25
Abu Khaḍra	24
al Sagīr	21
'Abd al Waḥed	19
Kattaw'u	17
other families	334
emigrants	546

Source: *The Kafr Singalf al Qadim report*, p. 8.

pattern or not. Anyway, as there are 752 *usâr* (pl. of *usra*) in this village, it may be concluded that the average size of *usra* in this village is smaller than in Mit Khalaf, and that the stronger the union of '*â'ila*, the more influential its power.

The village Kafr Singalf al Qadim produces the figures in Table 5.

The total population of this villages is 1,500, of which 546 have come from other areas, and are officials and labourers employed on the construction of irrigation canals or roads. The remaining 954 are natives of this village, representing 218 families (*usâr*) living in 189 households. In this village we can discern 13 '*â'ila* comprising 620 family members. In the neighbouring village, Minshât Shif, which the author visited in 1960, the following figures were obtained: population about 600, 120 *usâr* and 13 '*awâ'il*. Among the 13 '*awâ'il*, the more influential ones maintained a close family group.

In this connection, it might be claimed, in order to maintain the reliability of Table 1 and 2, that in Mit Khalaf, contrary to the neighbouring villages, there may be no '*â'ila* relation, although this is not considered likely.¹ The possibility of a relationship between the family system and pattern of ownership in the case of Mit Khalaf should also be examined. Table 3 should also be checked for a movement of labour either in or out, as was noted in Kafr Singalf al Qadim and Minshât Shif.²

The '*â'ila* system in Egyptian rural areas should be considered in relation to its effects on the pattern of the family, the peasant family budget, the pattern of landownership, and how it affects community development. This is an anthropological, sociological and economic pro-

1 *c.f.* M.S.S. Gadalla, *Land Reform in Relation to Social Development of the Farm Population in Egypt* (Unpub. Ph. D. thesis), Univ. of Missouri, 1960. He wrote: Land reform has failed in its intention to create small and independent farm families. Instead of breaking up the traditional network of the joint families and kinship groups, the reform strengthened their interaction and widened the scope of their functions. For the purpose of land distribution, the family was defined as "a group of individuals getting their livelihood from one and the same source on the land, no matter whether members of the group reside in one or more places". Before the reform, members of the joint family used to depend for their livelihood on one farm rented by the head of the family. After the reform, landownership was vested in the family head and the situation was not changed. Members of the joint family, no matter whether they reside in one or more places, still depend for livelihood on the land assigned to their chief. The establishment of co-operative societies provided common agricultural functions for the joint families and the kinship groups. While before the reform they farmed their land independently, after the reform they were obliged to form themselves into a society for cultivating the land and the marketing the products co-operatively (pp. 206-207).

2 According to the author's observation, out of 120 *usâr* in Minshât Shif, 28 moved to Cairo and are working in the same firm. As for the case of the migrant to the city, Mrs Janet Abu Lughod analyzed it in her article, "Migrant Adjustment to City Life: the Egyptian Case", *The American Journal of Sociology*, July, 1962, pp. 22-32.

blem, which should not be passed over without closer examination.

The factors deciding the family position in the social structure of the village are: firstly the size of property ownership and secondly the educational status of the family members, which is particularly enhanced by a schooling abroad. In Kafr Shubrâ Zingi, al Tiḥaiwî, Abu Maṣṣûr and Abu Nâgî are more educated than other families. There was an alliance between al Tiḥaiwî and Abu Maṣṣûr, when Abu Tiḥaiwî, Abu Ismâ'il and Abu Maṣṣûr were contesting 'umda (village headman) status. It cannot be concluded, of course, that this was a struggle between the more educated and the less educated, but education appears to be a new factor in developing leadership within the community, rather than by family loyalties. Unfortunately, *the Mit Khalaf report* does not touch on these matters.

2) Evaluation of Economic Conditions in the Mit Khalaf Area

The Second Part of the report on the Mit Khalaf area provides economic data. The following conclusions are arrived at:

Table 6 shows the occupational distribution between 797 families (*usâr*). In the original note to this table, "other occupations" is not explained, although it states that grocers are included. Also there is no mention whether these are part or full time occupations, and the degree to which they support the household economy, in the case where are more than two occupations in any one family.

Table 6

occupation	agriculture		non-agriculture		non-profession		official, police & soldier		student	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
head of family	752	94.4	17	2.1	13	1.6	15	1.9		
wife	555	80.7	69	10.0	63	9.2				
daughter	323	38.0	125	14.7	372	43.7			31	3.6
son	749	53.8	69	5.0	339	24.4	57	5.1	177	12.9
sister	40	69.0	8	13.8	10	17.2				
brother	139	81.8	7	4.1	5	2.9	16	9.4	3	1.8
parent & grand p.	52	33.4	22	14.1	81	51.9	1	0.6		
grandson	132	25.8	35	5.8	310	60.1	1	0.2	37	7.2
others	502	61.2	88	10.7	194	23.6	7	0.8	30	3.6
total	3,246	59.6	436	8.1	1,387	25.4	97	1.8	278	5.1

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 39.

It is difficult to classify a non-agricultural family, particularly when details of the make-up of the budget of the individual family member is not known. Neither is there any indication as their jobs, nor even if they are main or part-time jobs, in *the Mit Khalaf report*. Dr. Ḥâmid Muṣṭafa 'Ammâr wrote in his book, *Growing up in an Egyptian Village* (London, Rou-

ledge & Kegan Paul, 1954) that there are many cases which overestimate the diversification of occupations in the census. On the contrary, in *the Kafr Shubrâ Zingi report*, most of casual employment or non-agricultural occupations which could be observed by the author are overlooked, without any explanation.

Table 7, which shows the agricultural occupation of the heads of 797 families before the Agrarian Reform according to the rank of owner, tenant and agricultural labourer, has the original note stating that agricultural labour as a main or part-time job did not yield enough to give an income in the peasant family budget in as far as 98 heads of families were concerned. But, this report gives no indication of the amount of rents and wages. This is presumably because it assumes that rents and wages are being paid and received as regulated by law. But perhaps this assumption does not reflect the real situation as may be seen in Egyptian newspaper columns and elsewhere.

Table 7

	No.	%
tenant	587	72.5
owner & tenant	118	11.8
tenant & labourer	88	11.0
owner	3	0.4
owner, tenant & labourer	3	0.4
owner & labourer	2	0.3
labourer	5	0.6
total	797	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 40.

As 94.4% of the heads of families (752 heads) are classified as agricultural families after the Agrarian Reform, so 45 heads of families have changed their occupations from agriculture to non-agriculture for reasons which are not given in the report. Other figures show non-agricultural occupations: 17 non-agricultural, 13 non-professional and 15 police-officials-soldiers, heads of families. It is still not possible to understand the relations between the two tables; Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 8 shows the change of property and land under tenancy effected by the Agrarian Reform but the table does not show the size of farms operated by the peasant families. *The Mit Khalaf report* concludes from this table that, after the Reform, the majority of operating owners own 2-3 *feddân*, a five-fold increase in number of owners from before. This reform also created a tenant status who cultivates 2-3 *feddân*. This report indicates that 2-3 *feddân* farmers, either owners or tenants, are influential in this area, where the owners are recognized as operating owners. As for tenants, they decreased by 42% in the Agrarian Reform period.

Table 8

unit	owner				tenant			
	(before A.R.)		(after A.R.)		(before A.R.)		(after A.R.)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
under 1 f.	106	84.1			57	7.2	17	5.1
1—2 f.	11	8.7			216	27.4	39	11.6
2—3 f.	5	4.0	446	90.1	271	34.4	230	65.9
3—4 f.	0		41	8.3	110	14.0	40	12.0
more than 4	4	3.2	8	1.6	133	17.0	8	2.4
total	126		495		787		334	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 41.

According to the original note on Table 8, 3 categories of land were distributed to peasants in Mit Khalaf: areas of 2 *feddân*, $2\frac{1}{4}$ – $2\frac{1}{2}$ *feddân* and $2\frac{3}{4}$ –3 *feddân*. The percentages of recipients in each category were 66.3%, 13.9% and 10.1% respectively (these proportions do not total 100%). This report recommends that the size of distributed arable lands should be re-examined by the Statistics Department of the Ministry of Agrarian Reform. The recommendation is based on the assumption that the distribution of 2–3 *feddân* of arable lands created the 2–3 *feddân* farms.

Table 9

size	no. of owner	%	no. of tenant	%
under 1 f.	142	88.2	34	54.0
1—2 f.	11	6.9	16	25.4
2 f.	8	4.9	13	20.6
total	161		63	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 42.

But if the total land holdings of each farmer, within and outside the agrarian reform area, are considered, this assumption cannot be permitted. Table 9 represents the area of land owned and under tenancy outside the Agrarian Reform area, which must be related to farmers in the Mit Khalaf area. It is necessary to make clear to which status of beneficiaries the lands outside the Agrarian Reform area is related, as 161 peasants in Mit Khalaf own their arable lands and 63 occupy land as tenants. That is: 20% of peasants own land outside the agrarian reform area, 88% of whom own land of less than 1 *feddân* and 6.9% of peasants occupy land under tenancy outside the agrarian reform area, 54% of which is less than 1 *feddân*. The fact orders that the research on changing ownership and farm-operation effected by the Agrarian Reform should not be restricted to the so-called Agrarian Reform area, according to a regional principle. It is very difficult to conduct field work on ownership and farm-operations when individual holdings are divided in this manner, but

it is necessary to understand the realities of the Reform.

The author made a personal examination of the differences between the size of individual farms estimated a regional and on a personal principle, taking a sample of all the families of North 'Ezba in Mît Khalaf. The same 'Ezba is dealt with in the following table based on the book in Shibîn el Kom branch of the General Agrarian Reform Organization, organized on a regional principle. (Table 10) According to the author's observation, the lands occupied by the beneficiaries inside and outside the Agrarian Reform area, were as follows (Table 11):

Table 10

family	land owned inside A.R.	land under tenancy inside & outside A.R.
A	3 f 11 k 9 s	unnoticed
B	3 f 3 k 3 s	unnoticed
C	2 f 19 k 21 s	unnoticed
D	2 f 15 k 1 s	unnoticed
6 other lesser families	un-examined	

Table 11

family	land under tenancy inside & outside A.R.
A	5 f
B	1 f
C	1 f
D	3 f
6 other lesser families	nothing

The case of North 'Ezba may not be typical of all areas of Mît Khalaf but it may be concluded that most of the lands under tenancy inside or outside the Agrarian Reform area, as shown in Table 11, are concentrated within a certain stratum of the beneficiaries in Mît Khalaf. A more exact survey, based on the changing structure of farming operation and farm size, according to individual holdings, would undoubtedly confirm the author's observation, though this trend occasionally derives from the size of family.

Now we shall take into consideration the increase of yield per *feddân* effected by the Reform. Cotton production per *feddân* increased and the mode of production changed from 5-6 *kantâr* in 1956 to 6-7 *kantâr* in 1957-58. (Table 12) As for wheat production, the yield increased from 6-7 *ardeb* to 7-8 *ardeb* in mode. (Table 13) In Table 14 which deals with maize production, 40% of beneficiaries are included under the item of "no memory", because maize has not been a target of increased production. Most of the maize is consumed by the farmers themselves as their main

Table 12

(1 *kantâr*=44.9 kg.)

yield per f. (<i>kantâr</i>)	1956-57		1957-58	
	no. of family	%	no. of family	%
not-planted or no memory	13	1.6	11	1.4
2-3	43	5.9	16	2.0
3-4	98	12.3	34	4.3
4-5	176	22.1	101	12.7
5-6	184	28.1	118	14.8
6-7	176	22.1	229	28.7
7-8	64	8.0	169	21.2
more than 8	39	4.9	119	14.9
total	797		797	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 43.

Table 13

(1 *ardeb*=150 kg.)

yield per f. (<i>ardeb</i>)	1956-57		1957-59	
	no. of family	%	no. of family	%
not-planted or no memory	310	38.9	319	40.0
2-4	101	20.6	134	16.8
4-5	109	13.7	107	13.4
6-7	140	17.6	119	15.0
8-9	108	13.6	90	11.3
more than 10	29	3.6	29	3.3
total	797		797	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 45.

Table 14

(1 *ardeb*=140 kg.)

yield per f. (<i>ardeb</i>)	1956-57		1957-58	
	no. of family	%	no. of family	%
not-planted or no memory	17	2.1	15	1.9
2-4	52	6.5	42	5.3
4-5	142	17.8	116	14.6
5-6	97	12.2	92	11.5
6-7	238	29.9	175	21.9
7-8	138	17.3	200	25.1
more than 8	113	11.2	157	19.7
total	797		797	

Source: *The Mit Khalaf report*, p. 44.

foodstuff and it is rarely offered on the local market, except to the lower class of town dwellers. Thus an improvement in maize production could not be expected. Generally speaking, productivity per *feddân* of cotton

and wheat in this area reaches the standard levels of the Nile delta. It could be increased, greatly, because the distributed lands were sometimes of lower grade in value. But this report does not say anything about labour productivity, cost of crop production and difference of productivity according to the size of farm. It is unnecessary to mention that cotton productivity per *feddân*, for instance, depends greatly on the amount of fertilizer-input and the increase of yield per *feddân* is followed by an increase in the cost of production.

As we have seen, there are many defects in the *Mit Khalaf* report. It is appreciated that it must be very difficult to carry out a field survey in the Egyptian countryside and research activities are forced to lag behind the rapid progress of the reform project. But this is a step in the right direction, although there is much work yet to be done in evaluating the true nature of the Egyptian Agrarian Reform.