fully to sharetenancy by utilizing capital resources forwarded to them in the form of stipends sent by relatives abroad. However, those constituted only a minority of tenants with access to credit. Sharab's study of tenancy in the Valley points out that slightly over half the tenants surveyed (56 percent) received credit. Of those, 43 percent acquired credit from commission agents, 26 percent from their landlords, 26 percent from "relatives and friends," and only 7 percent from governmental credit cooperatives (Sharab, 1975:50, Table II-19).

The main impact of the new capital intensive agriculture has been to reinforce the differentiation between two categories of farmers: those sharetenants and "middle peasants" who are capable of going into partnerships over the considerable capital investment needed on the one hand, and those tenants and small peasants who could contribute only marginally to these inputs. As long as the new investments involved relatively low amount of capital (e.g. for insecticides and fertilizers), there was a considerable amount of circulation of peasant households between the two categories. However, ever since the return on such investment increased substantially with the newer methods of irrigation and cropping (six to ten times the crop yield under traditional cultivation techniques) both the big landlords and the wealthier sharetenants benefited cumulatively from this limited Green Revolution, while the lesser peasantry -- including those with title deeds to their plots -- became increasingly tied to their commission agents. Meanwhile, the only source of credit which is capable of breaking this deadlock -- low interest government loans -- has in fact been working in favour of the landlords since real estate collateral is needed for the approval of these loans (Sharab, 1975:49). The alternative requirement for these loans is a written lease from the landlord "certifying that they have the farm management responsibility on the farm." (Dajani _et al_.,