



Ius Comitiālis

ISSN: 2594-1356

ISSN-L: 2594-1356

iuscomitalis@uaemex.mx

Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México
México

Maya Espinoza, Ivonne
From the latifundio to the ejido: agrarian distribution in the
Mexican Republic and the State of Mexico (1915-2007)
Ius Comitiālis, vol. 8, núm. 16, 2025, Julio-Diciembre, pp. 96-120
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México
Toluca, Estado de México, México

Disponible en: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=775285726008>

- Cómo citar el artículo
- Número completo
- Más información del artículo
- Página de la revista en redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Sistema de Información Científica Redalyc
Red de revistas científicas de Acceso Abierto diamante
Infraestructura abierta no comercial propiedad de la academia

From the latifundio to the ejido: agrarian distribution in the Mexican Republic and the State of Mexico (1915-2007)

Del latifundio al ejido: reparto agrario en la república mexicana y el Estado de México (1915-2007)

Ivonne Maya Espinoza

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9220-4737>

Universidad Virtual del Estado de Guanajuato (UVEG), México.

ivmaya@uevg.edu.mx

Recepción: 20 de octubre de 2024

Aceptación: 12 de abril de 2025

Abstract: The objective of this article is to analyze the *Proceso de Reparto Agrario* (PRA, Process of Agrarian Repartition) in the Mexican Republic and the State of Mexico (1915-2007), in order to determine: a) how the distribution of land owned by a few large landowning families was carried out to be distributed among peasant families; a situation that modified land ownership from large estates to ejidos and b) identify the factors that led to the decline of ejido lands in the State of Mexico. This was done through the analysis of official data obtained from censuses, information that was tabulated to identify: similarities and differences, as well as to establish periods. The results indicate that: the PRA in the Mexican Republic had three periods: a) Rapid beginning (1916-1930), b) Accelerated development (1935-1940) and c) Continuity (1941-2007). In the State of Mexico, it was different, with four periods: a) Late onset (1920); b) Accelerated development (1930), c) Continuity (1940-1970) and d) Decline (1970-2007), whose triggering factors are indicated. In conclusion, this study contributes to the literature by determining that the PRA had different stages at the national and state levels, which contributes to identifying periods and determining that the process was not linear, helping to clarify the debate.

Keywords: Agrarian law, agrarian distribution, latifundia, ejido, property rights.

Resumen: El objetivo del artículo es analizar el Proceso de Reparto Agrario (PRA), en la República Mexicana y el Estado de México (1915-2007), para determinar: a) cómo se realizó el reparto de tierras que poseían pocas familias latifundistas para distribuirse entre las familias campesinas; situación que modificó la propiedad de la tierra de latifundio a



Esta obra está bajo licencia Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

ejido y b) identificar los factores que dieron origen al descenso de tierras ejidales en el Estado de México. Lo anterior se realizó a través del análisis de datos oficiales obtenidos de censos, información que fue tabulada para identificar: similitudes y diferencias, así como establecer periodos. Los resultados indican que: el PRA en la República Mexicana tuvo tres periodos: a) Inicio rápido (1916-1930), b) Desarrollo acelerado (1935-1940) y c) Continuidad (1941-2007). En el Estado de México fue distinto, se observan cuatro periodos: a) Inicio tardío (1920); b) Desarrollo acelerado (1930), c) Continuidad (1940-1970) y d) Descenso (1970-2007), cuyos factores desencadenantes se señalan. En conclusión, el presente estudio aporta a la literatura el determinar que el PRA tuvo distintas etapas a nivel nacional y estatal, lo cual contribuye a: identificar periodos y a determinar que el proceso no fue lineal, contribuyendo a esclarecer el debate.

Palabras clave: Derecho agrario, reparto agrario, latifundio, ejido, derecho de propiedad.

INTRODUCTION

The study period was defined as 1915 to 2007 because on January 6, 1915, the Agrarian Law was enacted, laying the foundations for land distribution. At first, this distribution was characterized by disorganization and a lack of regulation. However, in 1992, the *Programa de Certificación de Derechos Ejidales y Titulación de Solares* (PROCEDE, Program for the Certification of Ejido Rights and Land Titling) was created as an instrument implemented by the government to regularize social property, which culminated in 2006 (*Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales* [Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources], 2022; *Registro Agrario Nacional* [RAN, National Agrarian Registry], 2012). Subsequently, the *Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía* (INEGI, National Institute of Statistics and Geography) conducted the 2007 Agricultural Census, which is why the 2006 data are found in the 2007 Census. For this reason, 2007 was taken as the end of the study period.

It should be noted that in 2007, the certification of ejido (a form of communal land ownership in Mexico, established primarily for agricultural use. The land is collectively owned by a community but individually worked by its members, who are known as *ejidatarios*) rights was not completed, but there was an average progress of 59.6% at the national level (each state had a different percentage of progress), so an institution was created to continue the work: the *Fondo de Apoyo para los Núcleos Agrarios sin Regularizar* (FANAR, Support Fund for Unregulated Agricultural Communities), which would be supported by the *Comisión para la Regularización de la Tenencia de la Tierra* (CORETT, Commission for the Regularization of Land Tenure).

FANAR has been operated by the *Registro Agrario Nacional* (RAN, National Agrarian Registry) and the *Procuraduría Agraria* (PA, Agrarian Prosecutor's Office) since its creation in 2007 to date (*Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales*, 2022), and its objectives are:

Provide legal certainty and documentary security to families living in agricultural communities by regularizing land owned by ejidos and communities facing various problems related to land regularization and certification. Support consists of awareness-raising, reconciliation of interests, training, legal advice, holding assemblies of ejido and community members, updating internal regulations and community statutes, and document integration, as well as technical and cartographic work, the preparation of certified plans and titles. (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo [National Council for the Evaluation of Development Policy], 2013).

CORETT was created in 1974 as a decentralized public body of a technical and social nature with its own legal personality and assets, under the Ministry of Social Development. It was subsequently reformed in 1999 (*Diario Oficial de la Federación* [Official Gazette of the Federation], 2008, p. 2) and finally, on December 16, 2016, it became the *Instituto Nacional del Suelo Sustentable* (INSUS, National Institute for Sustainable Land Use). For its part, the CORETT was defined as:

An agency primarily focused on the regularization of land ownership in irregular human settlements on ejido, communal, and federally owned land, through expropriation with the consensus of all parties involved, for subsequent regularization and titling of lots in favor of the families that occupy them. (Ramírez, 2003).

According to the above, the difference between FANAR and CORETT is that the former regularizes rural centers and the latter regularized urban centers, an activity that is now continued by INSUS. It is noted that there was a certain rivalry between PROCEDE (later FANAR) and CORETT, since the difference between rural and urban centers is sometimes unclear and, as a result, they had to compete for the delimitation of their functions (Flores, 2008, p. 67).

In addition to PROCEDE, which regularized ejido lands, the *Programa de Certificación de Comunidades* (PROCECOM, Community Certification Program) was also created in 1998 to regularize communities. The latter closed in 2007 and PROCEDE in 2006, with certification coverage of 92% of the country's agricultural settlements. When PROCECOM closed, its work was continued by the *Programa de Regularización y Registro de Actos Jurídicos Agrarios* (RRAJA, Program for the Regularization and Registration of Agrarian Legal Acts) in those communities that, for various reasons, did not obtain their titles (Torres, Fernández, and Gómez, 2018, p. 39). In this regard, PROCEDE and PROCECOM had the objectives of

...measuring and delimiting the ejidos and communities that voluntarily accepted them, granting individual ejido property titles, whether for common use and/or for plots in those ejidos that had agreed to plot division, and systematically identifying all agrarian subjects in registers recorded in the National Agrarian Registry" (Torres, Fernández, and Gómez, 2018, p. 38).

Therefore, the period of investigation for this research is 2007, as this was the climax of the agrarian distribution, with most of the national and state territory under study having been certified, in addition to the end of PROCEDE.

The results indicate that the process of land distribution in the Mexican Republic had three periods: a) Rapid start, b) Accelerated development, and c) Continuity. The first period took place between 1916 and 1930 and was characterized by a rapid start one year after the enactment of the Agrarian Law of 1915. The second, which took place between 1935 and 1940, was characterized by its accelerated increase from 7.38% of the total ejido land to be distributed to 22% (an increase of more than 14%) in just five years. And the third was observed from 1941 to 2007, a period in which it reached 59.6% (Torres, Fernández & Gómez (2018, p. 39) indicate that it was 92%) of land distribution at the national level according to census data.

Unlike the Mexican Republic, the process of agrarian distribution in the State of Mexico was different, with four periods observed: a) Late start, in 1920 (four years after the start in the Mexican Republic); b) Accelerated development, since in 1930 the country had 6.35% of the total area of ejido land distributed, while the State of Mexico had 21.83% (more than three times

the national percentage); c) Continuity, with 45% of the distributed area in 1940, 56.74% in 1960, and 69.12% in 1970, the latter being its peak. However, there is a fourth period d) Decline, after 1970, characterized by the beginning of the decline in ejido land area in the State of Mexico, with a decrease of more than 7% (61.55%) by 2007. Some of the factors triggering this decline were industrialization, migration from the countryside to the city, and the resulting rapid urban growth of the entity, which increased the number of human settlements and reduced the cultivated areas.

A notable feature of the agrarian distribution to be analyzed in this chapter is the shift from land ownership in the hands of a few (latifundio) to its distribution among most peasant families (ejido).

Therefore, this paper analyzes the process of agrarian distribution in the Mexican Republic in general and specifically focuses on the case of the State of Mexico, as it is the state with the largest population in the country. According to data from the 1910 Population Census of the United Mexican States (*Dirección General de Estadística* [General Directorate of Statistics], 1910a) the State of Mexico had 989,510 inhabitants in that year, and the Mexican Republic had 15,160,369 inhabitants, meaning that the inhabitants of the State of Mexico represented 6.52% of the country's total population.

Of the total population of the State of Mexico, the rural population constituted 84%, comprising 831,347 inhabitants; of whom 166,269 were household heads and only 856 were landowners, meaning that the percentage of household heads who owned individual property in the State of Mexico was reduced to 0.5%, i.e., 99.5% of families did not own land.

The situation at the national level was similar, but each state had different figures ranging from 0.2% in Oaxaca to 11.8% in Baja California, followed by Morelos at 0.5% and Tamaulipas at 7.8%; Overall, on average, 96.9% of families in the country did not own land (*Dirección General de Estadística*, 1910b).

Given the great disparity between those who owned land and those who did not, agrarian distribution emerged as one of the most significant changes resulting from the Mexican Revolution:

The Mexican Revolution triggered an intensive phase of agrarian distribution lasting almost eight decades, which laid the foundation for ejido and community members and their families to access land as a means of achieving better living conditions and development. The agrarian reform process that the country has undergone consists of land distribution (1915-1992) and the regularization and organization of property rights (1992 to date); this is undoubtedly an unfinished process, in which development with legal certainty is on the current agenda. (Monreal, 2018, p. 1).

According to Nieto, the agrarian distribution was a restitution of land that had been taken from the indigenous peoples.

The dispossession of land from its original owners was due to the arbitrariness of the landowners and their collusion with the government. The concentration of land in a few hands was unfair, made the land unproductive, subjugated the people of Mexico, and generated social conflict. Dividing up the large estates, restoring and granting land was a matter of national interest and an act of basic justice. Expropriations had to be carried out in accordance with the law, through the payment of compensation, which had to be minimal (2018, p. 101).

This distribution was not linear and went through a long process, which is addressed in this research. In this regard, Nieto refers to distribution as an essential element of the Mexican Revolution movement, stating that

...it was carried out slowly and haphazardly.” However, regardless of whether the distribution was sufficient, the fact is that the next steps—productivity, improving the quality of life of heads of households and their families, and respect for the property of indigenous communities—remain pending on the current agenda (2018, p. 119).

The Agrarian Law of January 6, 1915, initiated the process of agrarian reform or distribution in the Mexican Republic, recognizing that the indigenous peoples had been stripped of their lands and that, as an act of justice, these lands should be returned to them to ensure the newly acquired peace after the Mexican Revolution of 1910. The distribution of land was intended to promote the welfare of the most disadvantaged classes: the peasants.

Patiño and Espinoza (2015) point out that the origins of the Agrarian Law of 1915 date back to colonial times, when the conquistadors, eager for wealth, dispossessed the indigenous peoples of Mesoamerica of their property, especially their lands. With independence, the situation did not change in favor of the peasantry, but rather the agrarian structure continued to favor the landowners and the church as the ultimate holders of land.

Hence the demand for “*Land and Freedom*” that gave rise to the Mexican Revolution and resulted in the enactment of the Agrarian Law of 1915 and the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States of 1917. This law, in its considerations, established:

That one of the most general causes of unrest and discontent among the country's agricultural populations has been the dispossession of land, communal or distributed property, which had been granted to them by the colonial government as a means of ensuring the existence of the indigenous class, and that, under the pretext of complying with the law of June 25, 1856, and other provisions that ordered the division and reduction of those lands to private property among the residents of the town to which they belonged, they remained in the hands of a few speculators. (Consejo Ejecutivo [Executive Council], 1915, p. 9).

In this regard, Morett (2006) points out that agrarian reform is a profound transformation in the structure of land tenure, different from the prevailing one, carried out by the state, which shapes a new relationship or correlation of forces and generates a different power structure. Agrarian reforms have effects not only from an agricultural or social point of view, but also have a high political and economic impact that modifies power structures.

Land is an important element of power, which is why large landowners sought to acquire more and more land, as this increased their political and economic power, placing them in an oligarchic position. However, with the Agrarian Reform, land ceased to be owned by a few and was distributed among the peasants, establishing a democracy, at least in terms of the distribution of political and economic power, since it was necessary to own land in order to have such power.

This research conducts a comparative analysis of agrarian distribution in the Mexican Republic and in the State of Mexico after the creation of the Agrarian Law of 1915, reviewing this process from its inception, development, and climax, in addition to the decline observed in the State of Mexico in the face of increased urban growth. The aim is to determine how the land owned by

a few oligarchic families was distributed among peasant families and how the system changed from an oligarchy to a democracy in terms of land ownership.

For the purposes of the study, the State of Mexico was divided into four regions: Valley of Mexico, Valley of Toluca, Southwest, and Northwest. Each region is made up of districts. The Valley of Mexico region is made up of six districts: I Chalco, II Texcoco, III Otumba, IV Zumpango, V Cuautitlán, and VI Tlalnepantla. The Toluca Valley Region consists of four districts: I Ixtlahuaca, II Toluca, III Lerma, and IV Tenango del Valle. The Southwest Region consists of four districts: I Tenancingo, II Sultepec, III Temascaltepec, and IV Valle de Bravo. Finally, the Northwest Region consists of only the district of Jilotepec.

This division of the State of Mexico follows the academic regionalization carried out by Lizcano: “which combines physical and social factors, as well as dimensions that detect homogeneities differentiated by the dimension that reveals the interaction between human communities of different hierarchies” (2017, p. 37).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

According to the Glossary of Legal-Agrarian Terms published by the *Procuraduría Agraria* (*Procuraduría Agraria* [Agrarian Prosecutor's Office], 2009), ejido lands can be defined as follows:

They are lands belonging to an ejido, granted by one of the agrarian land distribution actions or acquired by any other means and incorporated into the ejido regime. Depending on their use, they are divided into land for human settlement, common use, and parceled land; ownership of these lands is protected by the Constitution, both for the area where the human settlement is located and for the area used for productive activities. (See Art. 27, section VII; LA arts. 9, 11, 44, 49, 83, 155; section III; “Human settlement,” “Land for common use,” and “Parceled land. (Procuraduría Agraria, 2009, p. 148).

Ejido should be understood as social property granted by the Federal Executive, who, in order to do so, first expropriates the land from large landowners. The ejido has three types of land: a) parceled land, which is a part of the ejido exploited individually by the farmer, b) common use lands, which are another part of the ejido exploited jointly by the ejido members, and c) lands for human settlement, which are used for the construction of housing and services (health centers, schools, etc.).

The *Asamblea General de Ejidatarios* (General Assembly of Ejido Members) is the supreme decision-making body, as it has, among others, the following powers (Article 47):

- I. To elect and remove from among its members the Commissariat and the Supervisory Council [...]*
- II. To authorize and modify or rectify, when legally appropriate, the decisions of the Ejido Commissariat.*
- III. Order that the financial statements they approve be posted in a visible place in the municipal offices of the locality (Diario Oficial de la Federación, 1940).*

According to the RAN, the ejido has two connotations:

In the first, it is considered the nucleus of a population or legal entity with its own legal personality and assets; in the second, it refers to lands subject to a special regime of social ownership in land tenure; constitutionally, this personality is recognized and its assets are specially protected (2017, p. 11).

The RAN uses two adjectives to differentiate between ejidos: registered and certified:

1. *Registered ejido. This refers to an ejido created by a Presidential Resolution or Agrarian Court Ruling, where the creative action is executed; or an ejido created on the basis of an assembly agreement, where the assembly minutes are registered. In both cases, the ejido has an area as of the cut-off date. (2017, p. 11).*
2. *Certified ejido. This refers to a registered ejido that has delimited the ejido lands and designated them as parceled lands, common use lands, and/or human settlement lands, in accordance with the provisions of Article 56 of the Agrarian Law. (2017, p. 12).*

The RAN is the institution responsible for issuing the Certificate of Ejido Rights through the Program for the PROCEDURE. The Agrarian Prosecutor's Office and the INEGI participate in this program to carry out technical and administrative activities.

The PROCEDURE is based on the reforms to Article 27 of the Constitution and the corresponding Agrarian Law. This program is based on the power granted by law, in accordance with Article 56, to the ejido assembly to delimit and decide the use of the lands they were granted. Its purpose is to provide security of land tenure by regularizing it through the issuance and delivery of certificates and titles corresponding to common-use lands, plots, and urban lots.

The agrarian distribution restored to the indigenous peoples the lands from which they had been dispossessed and put an end to the latifundios, which were large tracts of land owned by a single owner, as was the case with agricultural estates. As a result, the hacienda owners constituted a privileged group of oligarchs who, in addition to wielding economic power, also held political power. Torres, Fernández, and Gómez define dispossession as:

The forced transformation of a way of life associated with a territory, with differential effects within ejidos and communities. Therefore, dispossession means a transformation in property relations, which are also social relations. Hence, when we refer to this notion, we highlight the differential ways in which the loss of land and associated resources affects different members of the same social group (men and women, young people and older adults) and alters social relations within a community. (2018, p. 6).

To understand this text, it is essential to understand the concept of political community, which, according to Lizcano, indicates that

A political community is understood to be a population that has political rights, mainly those of making binding decisions or selecting those who make them, and the civil rights necessary to exercise the former rights. According to this definition, political communities only exist in democratic political systems (2007, p. 63).

The extent of the Political Community (PC)—whether it is broad or restricted—determines whether that political community corresponds to an oligarchy or a democracy. It is therefore important to understand and differentiate between the concepts of oligarchy and democracy. In this regard, Lizcano points out that the PC is oligarchic when:

...citizenship is reserved for individuals from social classes with high economic levels derived from ownership of the means of production or income, which was often linked to greater social prestige. Therefore, oligarchic PC can only occur in restricted male PC: sometimes in direct democracies (as was the case in some city-states of classical Greece, where only patricians were considered citizens); and always in representative democracies. The main examples of the latter are the early liberal democracies mentioned above, in which only people with certain property and income could vote (2007, pp. 71-72).

As for whether the PC is democratic (direct or representative), Lizcano (2007) points out that it can be classified into four types, according to the criterion that refers to the extent of the PC in relation to the adults in sovereign communities (societies and empires), as follows:

- a) Democracy with restricted male PC: understood as "only some men in society are part of it. This implies that exclusion from the PC is not only related to gender (all women are excluded) but also to other criteria, such as ethnicity, freedom, wealth, property, level of education, etc." (Lizcano, 2007, p. 69).
- b) Democracy with universal male PC, "it is made up of almost all adult males, so the only notable restriction is gender" (Lizcano, 2007, p. 69).
- c) Democracy with universal PC, "all adults, without significant exclusions, are part of the PC" (Lizcano, 2007, p. 71).
- d) Democracy with universal ethnocentric or colonial PC, which occurs "in sovereign communities where both men and women of a certain ethnic group are included in the PC, but men and women from other cultural groups are excluded" (Lizcano, 2007, p. 70).

The above shows a similarity between the PC and the agrarian distribution, since not all adults (men and women) managed to obtain a plot of land; however, the percentage of people who obtained land ownership did increase. Before the agrarian reform, only a few adults owned large tracts of land: the landowners, who constituted a group of oligarchs representing the power of land in the hands of a few people or families.

The agrarian reform succeeded in distributing large tracts of land among peasant families, spreading power among many hands and constituting an important step toward democracy. Agrarian redistribution, according to Lizcano's classification (2007, pp. 68-69) mentioned above, follows the model of Universal Democracy, since almost all adults (mostly men and some women), with no significant exclusions, received a plot of land.

METHODOLOGY

To carry out this research, we analyzed official data obtained from: the 1910 Population Census of the United Mexican States; the 1930 Agricultural and Livestock Census; the 1935 and 1940 Ejido Censuses; the 1960 and 1970 Agricultural, Livestock, and Ejido Censuses; and the 2007 Agricultural Census; all of which were conducted by the INEGI and its predecessors.

With the data obtained, four tables were created to summarize the information: the first table summarizes data on ejido land in the Mexican Republic (1915–1930); the second table summarizes data on ejido land in the Mexican Republic (1935–2007); the third focused on ejido land in the State of Mexico (1930–1940); and the fourth focused on ejido land in the State of Mexico (1960–2007).

Table #1 draws on information from various censuses conducted throughout the Mexican Republic in 1915, 1919, 1924, 1929, and 1930. Table #2 focuses on data from 1935, 1940, 1970, and 2007 at the federal level, using official census data. Tables #3 and #4 record information at the state level from census data from different years: 1930, 1935, and 1940, and 1960, 1970, and 2007, respectively.

To analyze land distribution in Mexico between 1915 and 1930, the existing national ejido land area was measured in hectares. The table therefore starts with zero hectares of ejido land, due to the existence of large estates, and the number of hectares of ejido land increases in line with the distribution among peasant families. At this stage of the *Proceso de Reparto Agrario* (PRA, Process of Agrarian Repartition), it is not possible to calculate the percentage of progress in land distribution because the censuses do not indicate the total area that was planned to be distributed.

Subsequently, an analysis was carried out of the data from the 1935, 1940, 1970, and 2007, indicating the area (in millions of hectares) and the percentage of ejido land, because the RAN provided data on the ejido land area of the Mexican Republic in millions of hectares and indicated the percentage of that land that had been subject to the PRA. The percentage was calculated based on the total territory surveyed.

At the state level, data on the area and percentage of ejido land were taken from the first data record available in 1930, followed by 1935 and 1940; the area was measured in hectares and the percentage was calculated based on the total territory surveyed.

For the analysis of state data from 1960, 1970, and 2007, the area and percentage of ejido land were taken into account, and the state geographical divisions established by Lizcano (2017) were used: regions, districts, and municipalities. The percentage was calculated based on the total territory surveyed. Municipalities that disappeared or had not yet been created appear in gray cells. In the regions, the total area appears in gray; only the percentage data is available, which was calculated using the average of the districts.

The calculations were performed using Excel tables, which were then transferred to Word for presentation in tables.

According to data from the INEGI (INEGI, 1935), in 1915 there was no ejido land in Mexico. The first lands definitively granted as ejidos were in 1916, with a total area of 1,246 hectares nationwide. Distribution at the national level peaked between 1935 and 1940, with growth of more than 14% in just five years.

The distribution of land nationwide evolved through three periods determined by the advances in the areas granted, as reflected in the censuses: the first emerged at the beginning of the reform between 1915 and 1930 (see Table #1), characterized by the start of the agrarian reform; the second, from 1935 to 1940 (see Table 2), in which the agrarian reform developed with a growth of 14%; and the third, from 1941 to 2007 (see Table #2), in which slow growth can be observed, reaching its peak with 59.6% of ejido land distributed.

Table #1: Ejido land in the Mexican Republic (1915-1930)

	Year				
	1915	1919	1924	1929	1930
National ejido land area	0	267 151	2 295 564	8 043 193	8 344 651

Source: own elaboration with data from INEGI (1930, 1935).¹

Table #2: Ejido land in the Mexican Republic (1935-2007)

Census	1935		1940		1970		2007	
Area and percentage of ejido land	Surf.	%	Surf.	%	Surf.	%	Surf ² .	%
National total territory (census)	9.7	7.3	28.9	22.0	69.7	49.8	84.5 ³ 83.3 ⁴	59.6

Source: own elaboration with data from INEGI (1935, 1940, and 1970), Morett (2017), and RAN (2010).

The data in Tables #1 and #2 shows that during the first period, land distribution began, going from zero ejido land in 1915 (0%) to 8,344,651 hectares (6.35%) in 1930. In the second period (1935 to 1940), distribution reached its highest point of growth, increasing from 9,717,011 hectares (7.38%) to 28,922,808 (22%); which is why this period is considered the stage of accelerated development of agrarian reform at the national level, growing 14% in just five years. In the third period (1941-2007), there was slow growth in land distribution, increasing by only 37.6% in more than six decades, from 28.9 million hectares (22%) in 1940 to 83.3 million hectares (59.6%) in 2007.

AGRICULTURAL DISTRIBUTION IN THE STATE OF MEXICO

In the State of Mexico, agricultural distribution did not follow the parameters observed at the national level, as it began later: in 1920, unlike the Mexican Republic, which began in 1916. However, the distribution process was faster. if we compare the data from the 1930 Census (INEGI, 1930), we can see that the Mexican Republic had 6.35% of ejido lands distributed, while the State of Mexico already had 21.83%, exceeding the national agrarian distribution by more than 15%.

Agrarian distribution in the state also has three periods; however, they are different from those indicated at the national level. The first, from 1920 to 1929, was characterized by the late start of agrarian distribution (at the national level, as already mentioned, it began in 1916); the second, from 1930 to 1940, was characterized by accelerated development, with a growth in distributed

¹ Area is measured in hectares. It was not possible to calculate the percentage because the total area to be surveyed is not indicated.

² The abbreviation "surf" corresponds to surface area in millions of hectares.

³ The ejido land area owned by the Mexican Republic in millions of hectares, without indicating the percentage of this land that has been subject to the agrarian distribution process (Morett, 2017).

⁴ The ejido land area owned by the Mexican Republic in millions of hectares, according to the percentage of that land that has been subject to the agrarian distribution process. The percentage was calculated based on the total registered territory (RAN. 2010)

ejido lands from 21.83% to 45% (see Table #3); the third, a climax, with growth from 45% in 1941 to 56.74% in 1960, reaching 69.12% in 1970.

Subsequently, from 1971 to 2007, there was a decrease in the area of ejido land from 69.12% to 61.55% (see Table #4). Some of the factors that contributed to the decrease in ejido land area in the State of Mexico are discussed below. Agrarian distribution in the State of Mexico began in 1920 and was consolidated between 1930 and 1940 (INEGI, 1935 and 1940). In 1930, the State of Mexico had 355,943 hectares (21.83%) of ejido land, and in just five years, it grew by 12%, reaching 551,658 hectares (33.81%) in 1935. This growth remained at the same rate, and in the following five years it grew by 12%, since in 1940 the state had 730,838 hectares of ejido land (45%).

Between 1941 and 1960, growth was slower, increasing by only 11% in 20 years (from 45% to 56.74%). In 1960, the state had a ejido land area of 936,878 hectares (56.74%) (INEGI, 1960). On the other hand, from 1961 to 1991, there was a stagnation in agrarian distribution, as it only grew by 15% in 30 years. In 1970, the State of Mexico had 979,684.7 hectares of ejido land (69.12%), and by 1991 it had grown by only 2%.

The third period (1992-2007) is characterized by a decrease in ejido land area, which was due to various factors that will be discussed later. In conclusion, agrarian distribution in the State of Mexico did not have the same parameters of initiation and consolidation as at the national level. It began in 1920, while its consolidation was more rapid (1930). However, it coincides with the slow growth that occurred between the 1940s and 1970s, as well as the decrease in ejido land observed from 1992 to 2007.

Table #3: Ejido land in the State of Mexico (1930–1940).

Census	1930		1935		1940	
Area and percentage of ejido land	Surf.	%	Surf.	%	Surf.	%
State territory over total territory (census)	355 943	21.83	551 658	33.81	730 838	45

Source: own elaboration with data from INEGI (1930, 1935, and 1940).⁵

Table #4: Ejido land in the State of Mexico (1960–2007).

Census	1960		1970		2007	
Area and percentage of ejido land	Surf.	%	Surf.	%	Surf.	%
STATE OF MEXICO (Statewide over total census territory)	936 878	56.74	979 684.70	69.12	783 951.92	61.55
VALLEY OF MEXICO		58.79		59.80		61.54
CHALCO		60.05		58.65		60.19
Chalco	16 383	79.61	16 607	74.14	6 996.63	72.18
Valle de Chalco					526.06	88.63

⁵ The abbreviation “Surf.” corresponds to surface area in hectares. The percentage was calculated based on the total territory surveyed.

Amecameca	1 981	10	10 260.70	72.44	1 660.65	29.57
Ayapango	1 339	50.30	1 339	44.20	1 724.84	64.15
Ayotzingo						
Temamatla	2 135	81.76	595	50.07	503.53	35.09
Cocotitlán	1 446	65.72	1 307.50	58.04	508	42.08
Ixtapaluca	12 458	72.11	12 449	69.53	5 293.02	87.64
Juchitepec	7 849	72.18	631	19.11	6 425.28	77.59
Tepetlixpa	2 037	48.29	1 953	45.38	2 022.67	62.11
Ozumba	2 086	46.62	2 766.90	52.56	1 029.30	36.77
Ecatzingo	---	---	4 987	63.79	1 417.23	76.65
Atlautla	2 820	52.37	11 023	76.75	1 514.32	41.90
Tenango del Aire	2 011	53.84	1 857.50	53.91	1 884.49	61.80
Tlamanalco	12 017	87.89	10 730.50	82.64	1 684.96	66.60
Cuatzingo (San Gregorio Cuatcingo o Cuatzinco)						
TEXCOCO		71.85		64.28		61.04
Texcoco	17 178	76.49	23 942	76.84	8 221.36	70.33
Nezahualcóyotl			---	---	15.81	30.22
Acolman	5 330	80.24	4 951	78.47	3 839.30	86.14
Atenco (San Salvador Atengo, Atengo)	4 910	96.19	5 294	94.33	2 936.47	96.60
Tepetlaoxtoc	7 113	60.05	4 410.6	50.19	2 167.28	44.06
Papalotla	84	21.93	83	20.91	8.25	6.21
Chiautla (Chautla)	1 521	75.44	107	15.67	645.12	79.60
Chiconcuac	735	95.57	608.90	89.08	1.50	24.63
Tezoyuca	1 082	74.72	166.90	59.60	613.62	82.38
Chicoloapan	2 247	76.24	2 226	71.33	1 171.45	98.63
Chimalhuacán	1 666	67.72	1 681	77.42	119.75	26.26
La Paz (Magdalena Atlipac, Atlicpan o Atlicpac)	1 505	65.83	1 510	73.25	354.15	87.49
OTUMBA		63.14		61.39		63.07
Otumba	10 982	71.44	10 529.30	71.07	5 960.24	59.72
Nopaltepec (Santa María de la Asunción Nopaltepec)	4 786	71.67	5 404	75.50	5 014.77	79.90
Axapusco (Ajapusco)	16 088	85.24	14 500.30	81.34	16 975.96	80.93
Tecamac (Santa Cruz Tecamac)	7 498	55.20	7 965.80	63.25	4 988.92	61.45
Reforma (Ozumbilla Reforma)						
Temascalapa (Temascalapan)	8 439	62.86	8 077.20	59.67	9 895.26	56.01
Teacalco (San Juan Bautista, Teacalco)						
Teotihuacan	2 320	38.42	934.80	18.70	2 633.63	58.98
San Martín de las Pirámides (San Martín Obispo)	3 217	57.20	3 057	60.24	1 486.54	44.51
ZUPANGO		51.95		56.66		67.59
Zumpango	7	0.52	5 911	45.06	6 609.67	55.01

Hueypoxtla	22 002	68.58	20 896.10	83.23	13 117.96	93.18
Nextlalpan (Santa Ana Nestlalpan)	2 160	41.84	3 748.10	61.36	2 873.68	73.47
Jaltenco (Jaltenco Libre)	951	57.49	167.40	9.09	30.75	53.22
Tonanitla					450.48	36.69
Tequisquiác (Tequixquiác)	5 555	72.66	5 292.90	63.89	6 296.04	74.07
Apaxco (Apaxco de Ocampo, Apasco)	6 204	70.64	6 204	77.37	4 286.65	87.53
CUAUTITLÁN		60.04		62.16		65.31
Cuautitlán	4 089	60.64	4 155.20	60.66	1 075.17	59.09
Cuautitlán Izcalli					947.99	71.33
Huehuetoca	5 021	60.75	5 328	61.54	4 218.73	82.55
Teoloyucan (Teooyuca)	1 156	34.95	1 175	37.33	806.58	41.70
Coyotepec	3 588	87.76	1 485	73.03	5 587.03	99.35
Tepotzotlán	9 412	64.40	9 396.90	72.34	6 298.89	86.13
Tultepec (San Pedro Tultepec)						
Melchor Ocampo (San Miguel Tlaxomulco, San Miguel Ocampo)	1 086	63.02	1 047	57.97	320	42.01
Tultitlán	3 725	48.81	3 524	72.26	158.73	40.58
TLALNEPANTLA		45.72		55.69		52.08
Tlalnepantla	3 324	51.16	2 330.8	86.04	242.35	98.53
Ecatepec (San Cristóbal, Ecatepec Morelos)	30 277	68.70	3 358	61.22	139.81	92.92
Coacalco (San Francisco Coacalco, Coacalco de Berriozábal)	1 017	34.20	929.40	31.93	1.94	0.38
Huixquilucan (Huisquilucan)	2 289	29.78	6 654	64.02	1 350.87	34.08
Jilotzingo (Santa Ana Jilotzingo, Montealto)	2 718	24.89	2 717.50	55.97	807.31	34.98
Isidro Fabela (Santiago Tlazala, Iturbide)	618	31.49	534.50	22.54	820.18	65.35
Naucalpan	8 707	88.62	6 643.90	90.22	3 415.02	28.58
Nicolás Romero (Azcapuzaltongo, Montebajo)	14 226	58.82	14 008.40	65.57	7 835.73	84.11
Zaragoza (Atizapán de Zaragoza)	1 230	23.85	1 069	23.70	141.47	29.81
TOLUCA VALLEY		58.68		70.56		62.32
IXTLAHUACA		76.81		77.91		74.10
Ixtlahuaca	22 052	82.39	22 210	80.60	20 530.43	82.27
Jiquipilco (Xiquipilco)	12 936	58.48	11 155	66	11 960.59	40.74
Atlacomulco	12 215	65.41	10 947.40	65.96	30 181.64	80.75

Jocotitlán (Xocotitlán)	18 561	76.39	24 171.20	80.78	16 782.82	74.84
El Oro (Mineral del Oro, El Oro de Hidalgo)	9 512	88.45	8 714	85.30	10 971.38	88.10
San Felipe del Progreso (San Felipe del Obraje)	53 763	72.05	55 724.10	73.55	17 247.81	69.87
San José del Rincón					28 18 1.04	74.95
Temascalcingo	19 963	87.91	24 942.8	90.45	14 950.53	87.40
TOLUCA		65.70		72.35		65.78
Toluca	18 005	61.22	19 905.50	80.37	10 330.63	74.13
Almoloya de Juárez	32 627	70	19 180	64.54	21 453.80	61.24
Villa Victoria (Merced de las Llaves, Las Llaves)	30 672	81.78	23 383.20	80.01	18 176.76	74.42
Metepec	2 302	40	1 996.60	45.22	796.51	42.10
Temoaya	13 603	83.42	13 625.40	80.64	10 708.23	68.05
Zinacantepec	21 373	75.52	19 892	91.61	9 301.42	77.03
Tlalcilalcapan (San Fco. Tlalcilcalpa)						
LERMA		55.61		75.81		57.77
Lerma	10 734	79.80	14 316.80	87.76	10 846.56	77.01
San Mateo Atenco	1 199	61.23	1 194.60	71.38	103.16	30.87
Atarasquillo						
Ocoyoacac (San Martín Ocoyucan, San Martín Ocoyoacac)	3 258	9.34	9 862.70	87.45	2561.30	42.51
Tultepec	976	53.42	1 213.20	54.34	768.76	75.19
Oztolotepec (San Bartolomé Oztolotepec)	3 375	65.21	4 500.40	72.36	2 922.97	58.64
Xonacatlán (San Fco. Xonacatlán)	3 344	64.71	3 344	81.57	2 748.16	62.45
TENANGO DEL VALLE		36.60		56.18		51.63
Tenango del Valle (H. Villa de Tenango)	7 526	62.10	15 558.20	73.26	9 321.88	84.84
Calimaya	4 128	42.16	6 512	63.94	2 815.09	37.08
San Antonio la Isla	439	33.58	439.40	35.76	1 028.49	63.44
Rayón	748	40.87	403.80	30.96	1 100.06	44.39
Chapultepec	518	59.74	517	57.95	754.04	80.53
Mexicalcingo	190	16.26	344.20	44.66	270.13	19.62
Jocuingo (Xoquizingo)	---	---	5 500	75.28	4 167.69	64.37
Tianguistenco (Tianguistenco)	498	18.32	491.50	20.73	1 651.46	30.82
Capulhuac	---	---	617.20	40.47	464.22	39.03
Almoloya del Río	---	---	400	73.24	441.77	49.53
Texcaliac (Texcalyacac)	---	---	1 485.40	91.70	1 115.43	88.66
Atizapan (Atizapán Santa Cruz)	205	19.78	204.80	38.26	324.56	61.72
Xalatlaco (Jalatlaco)	---	---	1 318.30	84.24	262.06	7.27

THE SOUTHWEST		52.93		63.72		50.74
TENANCINGO		38.36		53.15		43.83
Tenancingo	6 623	60.94	10 062.50	76.26	8 104.05	79.33
Zumpahuacán	944	19.52	714	19.34	307.92	8.44
Coatepec Harinas	6 412	46.82	6 768	59.67	6 153.26	40.20
Ixtapan de la Sal	1 309	28.87	1 308.40	24.04	1 259.78	21.03
Tonatico	3 806	45.26	3 905.40	54.17	3 087.37	43.56
Malinalco	14 950	72.25	16 729.40	93.54	4 658.54	91.84
Ocuilán	1 279	31.12	1 525.80	39.23	3 742.21	44.87
Villa Guerrero (Tecuapetla)	1 115	2.17	8 046.10	58.95	1 981.86	21.41
SULTEPEC		54.75		66.92		51.86
Sultepec	---	---	9 804	76.07	15 323.83	50.38
Texcaltitlán	11 546	91.71	8 370	69.18	4 205.18	56.89
Amatepec	16 473	35.9	16 066.4	45.61	14 255.57	27.82
Tlatlaya	39 534	64.91	39 403	69.3	36 009.62	61.11
Zacualpan	7 130	10.72	2 998	47.19	7 627.33	32.56
Almoloya de Alquisirás	5 679	70.55	4 689.60	94.21	5 345.63	82.44
TEMASCALTEPEC		68.55		76.80		57.99
Temascaltepec	30 415	87.4	27 249.80	79.48	12 613.16	56.39
Tequesquiapan (Tequesquiapan)						
San Simón Guerrero (Guerrero)	---	---	4 315	81.90	1 856.26	76.42
Acatitlán						
Cuentla						
Tejupilco (Texupilco)	17 563	49.71	45 232.20	69.04	20 150.82	47.69
Luvianos					20 009.98	51.47
San Andrés Ocotepec						
San Lucas del Maíz						
VALLE DE BRAVO		50.07		58.03		49.31
Valle de Bravo	6 632	39.63	6 230.4	38.93	5 187.52	34.92
Ixtapan del Oro	5 456	89.51	4 726.6	87.78	2 574.53	72.44
Amanalco (San Gerónimo Amanalco, Amanalco de Becerra)	18 915	96.21	15 012	96.48	4 767.71	78.26
Donato Guerra (Asunción Malacatepec)	8 276	65.79	7 738.40	84.23	5 871.67	72.88
Otzoloapan (San Martín Ozoloapan)	359	7.04	721	11.68	641.54	9.09
Santo Tomás	3 765	46.58	3 581.20	53.76	2 279.72	39.03
Zacazonapan	273	8.98	273	6.92	278.16	7.65
Villa de Allende (San José Malacatepec, San José de Allende)	21 371	46.85	17 891	84.51	12 402.07	80.28

THE NORTHWEST		57.32		60.02		64.57
JILOTEPEC		57.32		60.02		64.57
Jilotepec	33 217	58.51	23 612.90	57.31	22 702.85	46.91
Acambay	22 054	74.63	28 412.40	85.34	45 164.47	81.71
Timilpan	12 078	73.65	4 587	53.11	4 946.89	64.57
Soyaniquilpan (Soyaniquilpan de Juárez, San Francisco Soyaniquilpan)	7 434	65.59	5 551	64.71	5 938.92	77.08
Aculco	17 905	50.13	16 275	62.90	32 792.55	72.14
Polotitlán	6 855	49.74	5 144	37.57	3 644.73	34.98
Chapa de Mota	7 099	34.13	6 550.40	36.88	9 525.48	61.70
Morelos (San Bartolomé Morelos)	10 893	59.42	13 194.20	78.12	15 080.01	73.41
Villa del Carbón	13 894	50.15	12 275.10	64.30	10 155.02	68.71

Source: own elaboration with data from INEGI (1960, 1970, and 2007).⁶

In general terms, there were two regions that experienced continuous growth in ejido lands: the Valley of Mexico and the Northwest, unlike the regions of the Toluca Valley and the Southwest, which experienced a decline in the last census in 2007 (see Table 4).

The Valley of Mexico region maintained growth in ejido lands between 1960 and 2007, increasing from 58.79% to 61.54%. Of its six districts, two maintained an upward trend in the percentage of ejido lands: Zumpango and Cuautitlán. Two had an increase: Chalco and Otumba; and two decreased minimally: Texcoco and Tlalnepantla, the former by 3.24% from 1970 to 2007, and the latter by 3.61% from 1970 to 2007.

The District of Chalco saw a decrease in 1970, as it had 60.05% of ejido land in 1960 and only 58.65% in 1970. However, in 2007, it saw an increase of 1.54%, reaching 60.19%. A similar situation occurred in the Texcoco District, which saw a decrease of 7.57% in 1970, due to the fact that in 1960 it had 71.85% of ejido land and in 1970 only 64.28%. The decline continued over the years, and by 2007 it was only 61.04%. As for the District of Otumba, it experienced a decrease in 1970, going from 63.14% in 1960 to 61.39%, but increased slightly in 2007 to 63.07%, without reaching the figures of 1960.

The districts of Zumpango and Cuautitlán continued to rise, the former from 51.95% in 1960 to 67.59% in 2007, and the latter from 60.04% in 1960 to 65.31% in 2007. Finally, Tlalnepantla maintained an increase between 1960 and 1970, with 45.72% and 55.69%, respectively, while in 2007 it decreased to 52.08%.

The district of Chalco is made up of thirteen municipalities: Chalco, Amecameca, Ayapango, Temamatla, Cocotitlán, Ixtapaluca, Juchitepec, Tepetlixpa, Ozumba, Ecatzingo, Atlautla, Tenango del Aire, and Tlalmanalco. Valle de Chalco appears as the 14th municipality in the 2007 Census with an ejido land area of 88.63%. Of these municipalities, eight saw a decrease in the

⁶ The abbreviation “Surf.” corresponds to surface area in hectares. The percentage was calculated based on the total territory surveyed. The gray cells correspond to municipalities that disappeared or had not yet been created. In the regions, the total surface area appears in gray; only the percentage data calculated using the average of the districts is available. State geographical divisions established by Lizcano (2017) were used.

percentage of ejido land between 1960 and 1970: Chalco, Ayapango, Temamatla, Cocotitlán, Ixtapaluca, Juchitepec, Tepetlixpa, and Tlalmanalco; and five increased their percentage of ejido land: Amecameca, Ozumba, Ecatingo, Atlautla, and Tenango del Aire. By 2007, seven municipalities had decreased in ejido area compared to 1970: Chalco, Amecameca, Temamatla, Cocotitlán, Ozumba, Atlautla, and Tlalmanalco. Ayapango, Ixtapaluca, Juchitepec, Tepetlixpa, Ecatingo, and Tenango del Aire had increased their ejido area compared to 1970.

In the district of Chalco, the municipalities that experienced the greatest decrease in ejido land area between 1970 and 2007 were: Amecameca with a loss of 42.87%, Atlautla with 34.85%, Tlalmanalco with 16.04%, Cocotitlán with 15.96%, Ozumba with 15.79%, Temamatla with 14.98%, and finally the municipality of Chalco with an incipient decrease in ejido land area of 1.96%.

The district of Texcoco is made up of eleven municipalities: Texcoco, Nezahualcóyotl, Acolman, Atenco, Tepetlaoxtoc, Papalotla, Chiautla, Chiconcuac, Tezoyuca, Chicoloapan, and Chimalhuacán. In 2007, La Paz was added to the census as the district's twelfth municipality. Of the eleven municipalities, eight saw a decrease in their ejido land area between 1960 and 1970, with the exception of Texcoco, Chimalhuacán, and La Paz, which showed an increase. By 2007, five municipalities continued to see a decrease in their ejido land area: Texcoco, Tepetlaoxtoc, Papalotla, Chiconcuac, and Chimalhuacán.

In the district of Texcoco, the municipalities with the greatest decrease in ejido land were: Chiconcuac with 64.45%, followed by Chimalhuacán with 51.16%; Papalotla had a decrease of 14.7%, Texcoco of 6.51% and Tepetlaoxtoc of 6.13%.

The district of Otumba is made up of seven municipalities: Otumba, Nopaltepec, Axapusco, Tecámac, Temascalapa, Teotihuacán, and San Martín de las Pirámides. The ejido area of four municipalities decreased between 1960 and 1970: Otumba, Axapusco, Temascalapa, and Teotihuacán. By 2007, the area of five municipalities had decreased compared to 1970: Otumba, Axapusco, Tecámac, Temascalapa, and San Martín de las Pirámides. The municipality with the greatest loss of ejido land is San Martín de las Pirámides, with 15.73% between 1970 and 2007, followed by Otumba with 11.35% in the same period. Temascaltepec lost 3.66%, Tecámac 1.8%, and Axapusco 0.41%.

The district of Zumpango comprises six municipalities: Zumpango, Hueypoxtla, Nextlalpan, Jaltenco, Tequixquiác, and Apaxco. In 2007, the municipality of Tonanitla was added to the census, becoming the seventh municipality in the district. Between 1960 and 1970, two municipalities saw a decrease in the percentage of ejido land: Jaltenco and Tequixquiác, by 48.4% and 8.77% respectively. In 2007, however, all municipalities saw an increase in the percentage of ejido land.

The district of Cuautitlán is made up of six municipalities: Cuautitlán, Huehuetoca, Teoloyucan, Coyotepec, Tepotzotlán, and Melchor Ocampo, to which the municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli was added in the 2007 Census. Between 1960 and 1970, all municipalities saw an increase in their ejido area, with the exception of Coyotepec, which decreased by 14.73%. By 2007, all municipalities had increased their ejido lands, with the exception of Cuautitlán, which saw a slight decrease of 1.57%.

The district of Tlalnepantla is made up of nine municipalities: Tlalnepantla, Ecatepec, Coacalco, Huixquilucan, Jilotzingo, Isidro Fabela, Naucalpan, Nicolás Romero, and Zaragoza. Between 1960 and 1970, four municipalities saw a decrease in their ejido land area: Ecatepec, Coacalco, Isidro Fabela, and Zaragoza; and by 2007, four municipalities had decreased their percentage of ejido land compared to 1970: Coacalco, Huixquilucan, Jilotzingo, and Naucalpan. Between 1960 and 1970, Isidro Fabela lost 8.95% of its ejido lands, Ecatepec lost 7.48%, Coacalco lost 2.27%, and Zaragoza lost 0.15%. By 2007, Naucalpan had reduced its ejido land area by 61.64%, Coacalco by 31.55%, Huixquilucan by 29.94%, and Jilotzingo by 20.99%.

In general, in the Mexico Valley Region, the municipalities that had the greatest decrease in ejido land area, greater than 30%, were: Chiconcuac with 64.45%, Naucalpan with 61.64%, Chimalhuacán with 51.16%, Amecameca with 42.87%, Atlautla with 34.85%, and Coacalco with 31.55% during the period from 1970 to 2007. Meanwhile, the municipality of Jaltenco had the largest decrease for the period from 1960 to 1970, with 48.4%.

The Toluca Valley Region, with its four districts (Ixtlahuaca, Toluca, Lerma, and Tenango del Valle), shows an upward trend between 1960 and 1970 and a decrease in 2007. The district of Lerma had the largest decrease in ejido lands, with 18.04% between 1970 and 2007, followed by the district of Toluca with a loss of ejido area of 6.57% between 1970 and 2007; The districts of Ixtlahuaca and Tenango del Valle had smaller losses, 3.81% and 4.55% of ejido land area, respectively.

The Toluca district went from 65.7% in 1960 to 72.35% in 1970 and decreased in 2007 to 65.78%. Lerma increased from 55.61% to 75.81% between 1960 and 1970, decreasing to 57.77% in 2007. Tenango del Valle went from 36.60% in 1960 to 56.18% in 1970, decreasing in 2007 to 51.63%. The district of Ixtlahuaca is made up of seven municipalities: Ixtlahuaca, Jiquipilco, Atlacomulco, Jocotitlán, El Oro, San Felipe del Progreso, and Temascaltepec. In the 2007 census, San José del Rincón was added. Between 1960 and 1970, only one municipality saw a decrease in the percentage of ejido land: Jiquipilco, which had an incipient decrease of 1.79%. By 2007, four municipalities saw a decrease in their ejido area: Jiquipilco, Jocotitlán, San Felipe del Progreso, and Temascalcingo, with 25.26%, 5.94%, 3.68%, and 3.05%, respectively.

The district of Toluca is made up of six municipalities: Toluca, Almoloya de Juárez, Villa Victoria, Metepec, Temoaya, and Zinacantepec. During the period from 1960 to 1970, all municipalities saw a decrease in their percentage of ejido lands, with the exception of the municipality of Toluca, which increased by 19.15%. By 2007, all municipalities had decreased their percentages of ejido land compared to 1970. The municipality of Toluca decreased by 6.24%, Almoloya de Juárez by 3.33%, Villa Victoria by 5.59%, Metepec by 3.12%, Temoaya by 12.59%, and Zinacantepec by 14.58%.

The district of Lerma is made up of six municipalities: Lerma, San Mateo Atenco, Ocoyoacac, Tultepec, Otzolotepec, and Xonacatlán. All the municipalities that make up the municipality of Lerma increased their percentage of ejido land between 1960 and 1970; however, by 2007, all except Tultepec had decreased their percentage of ejido land: Lerma decreased by 10.75%, San Mateo Atenco by 40.51%, Ocoyoacac by 44.94%, Otzolotepec by 13.72%, and Xonacatlán by 19.12%.

For its part, the district of Tenango del Valle is made up of eight municipalities: Tenango del Valle, Calimaya, San Antonio la Isla, Rayón, Chapultepec, Mexicalzingo (*Mexicaltzingo*), Tianguistenco, and Atizapán, to which five more were added in the 1970 census: Joquicingo, Capulhuac, Almoloya del Río, Texcaliac (*Texcalyacac*), and Xalatlaco. Of the eight municipalities that existed between 1960 and 1970, two saw a decrease in the percentage of ejido land: Rayón and Chapultepec, with 9.91% and 1.79% respectively. By 2007, of the thirteen municipalities that made up the district, seven showed a decrease in their percentages: Calimaya with 26.86%, Mexicalzingo with 25.04%, Joquicingo with 10.91%, Capulhuac with 1.44%, Almoloya del Río with 23.71%, Texcaliac with 3.04%, and Xalatlaco with 76.97%.

In general, in the Toluca Valley Region, the municipalities that had the greatest decrease in ejido land area, greater than 30%, were: San Mateo Atenco with 40.51%, Ocoyoacac with 44.94%, and Xalatlaco with 76.97%, all during the period from 1970 to 2007.

As for the Southwest Region, its four districts show an increase between 1960 and 1970 and a decrease by 2007. The district of Tenancingo went from 38.36% in 1960 to 53.15% in 1970, decreasing in 2007 by more than 9 percentage points to 43.83%. Sultepec went from 54.75% in 1960 to 66.92% in 1970, falling dramatically by more than 15 percentage points in 2007 to 51.86%. The district of Temascaltepec saw the greatest decrease in ejido lands, from 68.55% in 1960 to 76.8% in 1970; however, in 2007, it decreased by more than 18 percentage points to 57.99%. Valle de Bravo, with a ejido land area of 50.07% in 1960, increased to 58.03% in 1970, but decreased in 2007 by more than eight percentage points to 49.31%. Therefore, the district in the Southwest Region that had the largest decrease in ejido lands was Temascaltepec, with a decrease of 18.81% in 2007 compared to 1970.

The district of Tenancingo is made up of eight municipalities: Tenancingo, Zumpahuacán, Coatepec Harinas, Ixtapan de la Sal, Tonatico, Malinalco, Ocuilán, and Villa Guerrero. Two of the eight municipalities saw an initial decrease in the percentage of ejido land between 1960 and 1970: Zumpahuacán and Ixtapan de la Sal, by 0.18% and 4.83% respectively. In 2007, six municipalities saw a decline in their ejido lands: Zumpahuacán with 10.9%, Coatepec Harinas with 19.47%, Ixtapan de la Sal with 3.01%, Tonatico with 10.61%, Malinalco with 1.7%, and Villa Guerrero with 37.54%.

The district of Sultepec is made up of six municipalities: Sultepec, Texcaltitlán, Amatepec, Tlatlaya, Zacualpan, and Almoloya de Alquisiras. The municipality of Sultepec was included in the 1970 census. Of the six municipalities, only one saw a decrease in the percentage of ejido land between 1960 and 1970: Texcaltitlán with 22.53%. In 2007, all municipalities saw a decrease in their ejido land area: Sultepec saw a 35.69% decrease in ejido land compared to 1970, Texcaltitlán saw a 12.29% decrease, Amatepec by 17.79%, Tlatlaya by 8.19%, Zacualpan by 14.63%, and Almoloya de Alquisiras by 11.77%, respectively. Between 1960 and 1970, only the municipality of Texcaltitlán saw a decrease in its ejido area, by 22.53%.

The district of Temascaltepec is made up of four municipalities: Temascaltepec and Tejupilco, joined by San Simón de Guerrero in the 1970 census and Luvianos in the 2007 census. The three municipalities that made up the district in 1970 saw a decrease in their ejido lands by 2007: Temascaltepec had a decrease of 23.09%, San Simón de Guerrero decreased by 5.48%, and Tejupilco decreased by 21.35%. The municipality of Luvianos appears in the 2007 Census with an ejido area of 51.47%.

The district of Valle de Bravo is made up of eight municipalities: Valle de Bravo, Ixtapan del Oro, Amanalco, Donato Guerra, Oztoloapan, Santo Tomás, Zacazonapan, and Villa de Allende. Between 1960 and 1970, three municipalities saw an initial decline in their ejido area: Valle de Bravo by 0.7%, Ixtapan del Oro by 1.73%, and Zacazonapan by 2.06%; However, the remaining five municipalities increased their percentage of ejido land: Amanalco increased by 0.27%, Donato Guerra by 18.44%, Oztoloapan by 4.64%, Santo Tomás by 7.18%, and Villa de Allende by 37.66%. Between 1970 and 2007, all municipalities decreased their percentage of ejido lands, with the exception of Zacazonapan, which saw a slight increase of 0.73%; The others decreased their ejido area by the following percentages: Valle de Bravo by 4.01%, Ixtapan del Oro by 15.34%, Amanalco by 18.22%, Donato Guerra by 11.35%, Oztoloapan by 10.78%, and Santo Tomás by 14.73%.

In the Southwest region, the municipalities that experienced the greatest decrease in ejido land area, greater than 30%, were: Villa Guerrero, with a decrease of 37.54% from 1970 to 2007, and Villa de Allende, with a decrease of 37.66% between 1960 and 1970. The Northwest region remained on the rise in its Jilotepec district, going from 57.32% in 1960 to 64.57% in 2007.

There are nine municipalities in the district of Jilotepec: Jilotepec, Acambay, Timilpan, Soyaniquilpan, Aculco, Polotitlán, Chapa de Mota, Morelos, and Villa del Carbón. Between 1960 and 1970, four of the municipalities saw their ejido areas decrease by the following percentages: Jilotepec by 1.2%, Timilpan by 20.54%, Soyaniquilpan by 0.88%, and Polotitlán by 12.17%. The following municipalities saw an increase in their ejido land percentages between 1960 and 1970: Acambay by 10.71%, Aculco by 12.77%, Chapa de Mota by 2.75%, Morelos by 18.7%, and Villa del Carbón by 14.15%.

Between 1970 and 2007, four municipalities saw a decrease in their ejido areas: Jilotepec by 10.4%, Acambay by 3.63%, Polotitlán by 2.59%, and Morelos by 4.71%. However, five municipalities increased their ejido land areas: Timilpan by 11.46%, Soyaniquilpan by 12.37%, Aculco by 9.24%, Chapa de Mota by 24.82%, and Villa del Carbón by 4.41%.

In general, in the Northwest Region, none of the municipalities had a decrease in their ejido lands greater than 30% of their areas during the study period.

Finally, it is concluded that of the 15 districts that make up the four regions into which the State of Mexico is divided, three had a significant decrease, greater than 15%, in their ejido area: Sultepec with a decrease of 15.06% between 1970 and 2007, Lerma with 18.04%, and Temascaltepec with 18.81%, both in the same period.

CAUSES OF THE DECLINE IN EJIDO LAND IN THE STATE OF MEXICO

The decline in ejido land area in the State of Mexico was observed between 1970 and 2007, falling from 69.12% in 1970 to 61.55% in 2007. Some of the factors that explain this decline in ejidos are:

- a) The industrialization of the State of Mexico, which gave way to the development of secondary (industry and construction) and tertiary (service provision) activities, surpassing primary activities (agriculture and livestock).

- b) Migration from the countryside to the city in search of better living conditions, especially employment in the secondary and tertiary sectors required by urbanization, better public services (drinking water, electricity, drainage, and roads), and access to education and health care.
- c) The subsequent urbanization of the State of Mexico, as part of the rapid population growth in cities.

The *Consejo Estatal de Población* (State Population Council) takes these factors into account. This resulted in a change in land use, as urbanization made it necessary to develop urban settlements to provide housing for the constant migration from the countryside to the city.

Regarding the origin of the urbanization process in the State of Mexico, it is noted that:

It originated in the production model that developed in the country until 1970, which generated a great boost to industry based on the import substitution model, leading to the concentration of economic activities in the population. (2017, p. 8).

This model required labor for factories, the construction of offices and housing, and the provision of services; therefore, large flows of people from the countryside to the city were constant, giving way to the urbanization of the State of Mexico and the decline of ejido lands.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the analysis carried out in this research, the Agrarian Distribution Process in the Mexican Republic and the State of Mexico (1915-2007), which was carried out to distribute the land (owned by a few large landowners) among the numerous peasant families, changed land ownership from large estates to ejido. This process was not linear (as some authors point out), as it took place over several periods and was not carried out in the same way in the Mexican Republic as in the State of Mexico; in the former, there were three periods, and in the latter, four, with their respective similarities and differences between periods.

Agrarian distribution in the Mexican Republic began with the enactment of the *Ley Agraria* (Agrarian Law) in 1915. The first distributions took place between 1916 and 1930, with consolidation between 1935 and 1940, when ejido land increased from 7.38% to 22% of the total area (an increase of 14.62% in just five years, or 2.92% per year), finally culminating in slow growth from 1941 to 2007 with 59.6% (a growth of 37.6% in 66 years, representing 0.56% per year).

Unlike the Mexican Republic, the State of Mexico had a later start, in 1920, but faster growth, since in 1930 the country had 6.35% of ejido lands while the State of Mexico had 21.83% (a difference of 15.48%), reaching 45% of ejido lands distributed in 1940, continuing its growth and reaching its peak in 1960 with 56.74%.

At the state level, there was a decline in ejido land area in the State of Mexico between 1970 and 2007, from 69.12% in 1970 to 61.55% in 2007 (a decline of 7.57%), with rapid urban growth in the state being a factor in this decline.

However, when reviewing this decline by region, it can be seen that four regions increased their ejido area between 1960 and 1970: the Mexico Valley region grew by 1.01%, the Toluca Valley region by 11.88%, the Southwest region by 10.79%, and the Northwest region by 2.07%. but the situation changed between 1970 and 2007, as only two regions continued to grow: the Mexico Valley region with an incipient growth of 1.74% and the Northwest region with a growth of 4.55%, unlike the Toluca Valley and Southwest regions, which saw a decline in their percentage of ejido lands of 8.24% and 12.98%, respectively.

In the State of Mexico, there was a significant decline between 1960 and 1970, greater than 30% of the ejido land area, in two municipalities: Jaltenco with 48.4% and Villa de Allende with 37.66%; Similarly, between 1970 and 2007, 10 municipalities saw a decline of more than 30% in the area of ejido land: Amecameca with a decline of 42.87%, Atlautla with 34.85%, Chiconcuac with 64.45%, Chimalhuacán with a decrease of 51.16%, Coacalco with 31.55%, Naucalpan with 61.64%, San Mateo Atenco with 40.51%, Ocoyoacac with 44.94%, Xalatlaco with 76.97%, and Villa Guerrero with 37.54%.

The decline in the area of ejido land in the State of Mexico took place between 1970 and 2007, falling from 69.12% in 1970 to 61.55% in 2007. Some of the factors that explain this decline in ejidos are: a) the industrialization of the State of Mexico, b) migration from the countryside to the city, and c) the subsequent urbanization of the State of Mexico, as part of the rapid population growth in cities.

The process of agrarian distribution in the Mexican Republic and in the State of Mexico shows how the economic power held by a few large landowning families was progressively distributed between 1915 and 2007 among numerous peasant families, shifting from land ownership centered on large estates to ejido land ownership. Land is the basis of economic and political power in post-revolutionary Mexico.

In conclusion, this study makes an important contribution to the literature by recognizing that the PRA went through different stages at the national and state levels, which helps to identify periods and determine that the process was not linear, contributing to clarifying with clear data (taken from official sources) the debate between those who argue that the process was linear and those who argue that it was not. In addition, the decline in the area of ejido lands in the State of Mexico between 1970 and 2007 was identified, due to the factors mentioned above.

REFERENCES

- Consejo Ejecutivo (1915, octubre 26). Ley Agraria [Agricultural Law]. <https://emiliano-zapata.scjn.gob.mx/sites/default/files/objetivos/2019-08/06.%20OPTIM%20Ley%20agraria.pdf>
- Consejo Estatal de Población (COESPO) (2017). *Proceso de urbanización en el Estado de México. Una visión cuantitativa*. [Urbanization process in the State of Mexico. A quantitative view.] Toluca, México. https://coespo.edomex.gob.mx/sites/coespo.edomex.gob.mx/files/files/2017/proceso_urb_edomex.pdf
- Consejo Estatal de Población (COESPO) (2017). *Proceso de urbanización en el Estado de México. Una visión cuantitativa*. México. [Urbanization process in the State of Mexico. A quantitative view. México.] Coespo.
- Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo (CONEVAL). (2013). *Programa de Apoyo para los Núcleos Agrarios Sin Regularizar (FANAR)*. [Support Program for Unregulated Agricultural Centers (FANAR for its initials in Spanish)] https://www.coneval.org.mx/Informes/Evaluacion/Ficha_Monitoreo_Evaluacion_2013/SEDATU/15_U001.pdf
- Diario Oficial de la Federación (1940). Código Agrario de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. [Agrarian Code of the United Mexican States.] http://www.ran.gob.mx/ran/dgaj/Normateca/Documentos/Leyes/Abrogadas/CODIGO_AGRARIO_1940.pdf
- Diario Oficial de la Federación. (2008). Comisión para la Regularización de la Tenencia de la Tierra. Regla 2/07 para la enajenación de superficies desocupadas. [Commission for the Regularization of Land Tenure. Rule 2/07 for the alienation of unoccupied land.] [http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Federal/PE/APF/OD/SEDESOL/Reglas/18012008\(2\).pdf](http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Federal/PE/APF/OD/SEDESOL/Reglas/18012008(2).pdf)
- Dirección General de Estadística. (1910a). Número de habitantes de la República, por entidades federales, sexos y edades, según las diferentes clasificaciones anotadas al margen. *Tercer Censo de Población de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 1910*. [Number of inhabitants of the Republic, by federal entities, sex, and age, according to the different classifications noted in the margin. Third Population Census of the United Mexican States, 1910.] <https://www.inegi.org.mx/programas/ccpv/1910/>
- Dirección General de Estadística. (1910b). Número de habitantes de la República, por sexos, clasificados por grupos de idiomas y proporción por ciento entre estos con el total. *Tercer Censo de Población de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 1910*. [Number of inhabitants of the Republic, by gender, classified by language groups and percentage proportion between these and the total. Third Population Census of the United Mexican States 1910.] <https://www.inegi.org.mx/programas/ccpv/1910/>
- Flores Rodríguez, Carlos Enrique. (2008). Suelo ejidal en México. Un acercamiento al origen y destino del suelo ejidal en México. De lo comunal agrario a lo privado urbano, *Ciur Cuadernos de Investigación Urbanística* (57). [Ejido land in Mexico. An approach to the origin and destination of ejido land in Mexico. From communal agrarian to private urban, Ciur Urban Research Notebooks (57)]. <https://polired.upm.es/index.php/ciur/article/view/272>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI) (1970). *V Censos Agrícola – Ganadero y Ejidal 1970*. [V Agricultural, Livestock, and Ejido Census 1970]

- https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/productos/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvini/egi/productos/historicos/1329/702825111144/702825111144_1.pdf
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI) (1930). *Primer Censo Agrícola-Ganadero 1930*. [First Agricultural and Livestock Census 1930]. Ciudad de México, México: Talleres Gráficos de México, 46-51.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (2007). Censo Agropecuario. [Agricultural Census.] <https://ceieg.bcs.gob.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Estadisticas/Taller.%20La%20Presentaci%C3%B3n%20de%20Datos%20Estad%C3%ADsticos%20en%20Cuadros%20y%20Gr%C3%A1ficas/9.%20Ejemplos%20de%20cuadros%20y%20gr%C3%A1ficas/Gr%C3%A1ficas/AtlasagrMex1.pdf>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (2009). *Censo Agropecuario 2007, IX Censo Ejidal*, [Agricultural Census 2007, IX Ejido Census.], Aguascalientes. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/programas/cae/2007/tabulados/CA2007_1.pdf
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (1935). *Primer Censo Ejidal 1935*. [First Ejido Census 1935] Ciudad de México.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (1940). *Segundo Censo Ejidal de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 1940*. [Second Ejido Census of the United Mexican States 1940.] Ciudad de México, México. <https://www.inegi.org.mx/programas/ccpv/1940/>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (1960). *IV Censos Agrícola, Ganadero y Ejidal*. [IV Agricultural, Livestock, and Ejido Census] Ciudad de México, México. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/productos/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvini/egi/productos/historicos/1329/702825110772/702825110772.pdf
- Instituto Nacional del Suelo Sustentable. (2022). *¿Qué hacemos?*. [What do we do?] <https://www.gob.mx/insus/que-hacemos>
- Lizcano Fernández, Francisco (2007). Clasificación de las experiencias democráticas de la historia universal, *Contribuciones desde Coatepec*, [Classification of democratic experiences in universal history, Contributions from Coatepec] 13 (61-76). <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/281/28101303.pdf>
- Lizcano Fernández, Francisco (2017). *Estado de México: una regionalización con raíces históricas*. [State of Mexico: a regionalization with historical roots.] Toluca, Estado de México, Gobierno del Estado de México. <http://ri.uaemex.mx/handle/20.500.11799/68238?show=full>
- Monreal Ávila, Ricardo (2018). *Iniciativa con Proyecto de Decreto por el que se abroga la Ley Agraria y se expide la Ley para el Desarrollo Agrario*. [Initiative with Draft Decree repealing the Agrarian Law and enacting the Law for Agrarian Development] http://sil.gobernacion.gob.mx/Archivos/Documentos/2018/10/asun_3760776_20181023_1540294536.pdf
- Morett Sánchez, J. Carlos & Cosío-Ruiz, Celsa (2017). Panorama de los ejidos y comunidades agrarias en México. *Revista Agricultura, sociedad y desarrollo*, [Overview of ejidos and agrarian communities in Mexico. Agriculture, Society and Development Magazine], 1 (4). https://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1870-54722017000100125
- Morett Sánchez, J. Carlos. (2006). *Reforma agraria del latifundio al neoliberalismo*. [Agrarian reform from large estates to neoliberalism]. Ciudad de México, México: Plaza y Valdés.
- Nieto Nava, Nicolas. (2018). “Las tensiones del reparto agrario: la justicia y la vida institucional. Una perspectiva desde el juicio de amparo en Michoacán (1917-1921)”, en Tapia, Regina & Andrews, Catherine (coords.) *La Reforma Agraria desde los Estados. Ensayos en conmemoración del centenario de la Ley Agraria del 6 de enero de 1915* (“The tensions of agrarian distribution:

- justice and institutional life. A perspective from the amparo trial in Michoacán (1917-1921),” in Tapia, Regina & Andrews, Catherine (eds.) *Agrarian Reform from the States. Essays in commemoration of the centenary of the Agrarian Law of January 6, 1915* (pp. 93-140) Centro de Estudios Constitucionales de la SCJN. <https://www.sitios.scjn.gob.mx/cec/sites/default/files/publication/documents/2019-05/LIBRO%20LA%20REFORMA%20AGRARIA-INTERNET.pdf>
- Patino Flota, Elena del Rosario y Espinoza Vilella, María de Jesús (2015). *Ley Agraria del 6 de enero de 1915: semilla de la propiedad social y la institucionalidad agraria en México*. [Agrarian Law of January 6, 1915: seed of social property and agrarian institutionality in Mexico] *Estudios Agrarios*, (58) (17-39). http://www.pa.gob.mx/publica/rev_58/analisis/ley%20agraria%20del%206%20de%20enero%20de%201915%20Elena%20del%20Rosario.pdf.
- Procuraduría Agraria. (2009). *Glosario de Términos Jurídico-Agrarios*. [Glossary of Legal-Agrarian Terms] <http://www.pa.gob.mx/pa/conoce/publicaciones/Glosario%202009/GLOSARIO%20DE%20T%20C3%89RMINOS%20JUR%20C3%8DDICO-AGRARIOS%202009.pdf>
- Ramírez Valdivia, Alfonso. (2003). Comisión para la Regularización de la Tenencia de la Tierra (Corett), [Commission for the Regularization of Land Tenure (Corett, for its initials in Spanish)] *Revista Colaboraciones Jurídicas*, 28 (130-133). <https://revistas-colaboracion.juridicas.unam.mx>
- Registro Agrario Nacional. (2012). *Registro Agrario Nacional. 20 años. Edición Especial de Aniversario 1992-2012*. [National Agrarian Registry. 20 years. Special Anniversary Edition 1992-2012.] *NotiRAN*. <http://www.ran.gob.mx/ran/20aniversario/revista.pdf>
- Registro Agrario Nacional. (2017). *Nota técnica sobre la propiedad social*. [Technical note on social property.] http://www.ran.gob.mx/ran/indic_bps/NOTA_TECNICA SOBRE LA PROPIEDAD SOCIAL_v26102017
- Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales. (2022). *Superficie ejidal según clase de tierra, del PROCEDE*. [Ejido area by land type, from PROCEDE] http://dgeiawf.semarnat.gob.mx:8080/ibi_apps/WFServlet?IBIF_ex=D2_AGRIGAN01_01%26IBIC_user=dgeia_mce%26IBIC_pass=dgeia_mce&NOMBREANIO=* &NOMBREENTIDAD=Guerrero
- Torres Mazuera, Gabriela; Fernández Mendiburu, Jorge & Gómez Godoy, Claudia. (2018). *Informe sobre la jurisdicción agraria y los derechos humanos de los pueblos indígenas y campesinos de México*. [Report on agrarian jurisdiction and the human rights of indigenous peoples and peasants in Mexico]. Fundación para el Debido Proceso (Due Process of Law Foundation, DPLF), Washington, D.C. https://www.dplf.org/sites/default/files/informe_jurisdiccion_agraria_version_final.pdf