the development and extension crops. The nationalization of water resources pushed up agricultural and industrial development plan.

The land reform, whatever be its socio-economic benefits for the people, proved politically rewarding for the Shah in several ways. He liquidated the large holdings of major landlords thereby undermining their power-base. In this way the Shah had direct access to the majority of the population in the countryside. In this way he was able to meet one of the popular demands of his political opponents, the land reform as a popular and democratic measure. Thus the Shah could claim to have abolished the traditional land base feudalism in Iran and revolutionised the life of the peasantry. As a result, a large number of rich peasants submitted themselves to the Shah in the hope or a better life. The land reform thus opened a potential source of rural support for the Shah's leadership and rule.

But the Shah neither wished to alienate the landlords altogether nor to have a prolonged confrontation with them. The Land Reform was thus balanced by the public.

sale of state owned factories to private shares. This reform aimed at enriching the Government with an additional source of revenue, so that it could finance the land reform effectively, and at providing the former landlords with stimulus to re-invest in industry the money which they had received by way of compensation for their lands. Many former land-lords thus soon managed to become industrial lords.

The White Revolution programme stressed the rapid industrialisation of Iran, an improvement in the working and living conditions of the country's industrial labour force. It sought direct investment to establish heavy industry such as steel and petrochemicals. It promoted light industries such as manufacture of consumer items, and sought to protect and strengthen traditional industries such as textile, carpet and food industry. In the mean time, the government legislated a minimum wage and worker's social insurance policy. In each factory, up to 20 percent of the profit was to be distributed among the workers. The profit sharing law was put into execution in June 1963. It was hoped that the law would ensure workers' reasonable wages and increase employment and welfare incentives. All this
created some improvement in the working and living conditions of the workers. It also provided some basis for the growth of an urban working class, largely under the leadership of the Shah. Thus it provided a source of support for the Shah's rule.

The agrarian and industrial measures were accompanied by the Shah's efforts to mobilize women and youth behind his regime. In 1963 the Shah amended the constitution: allowing the women to play an increasingly important part in the political and social life of their country. The women's response to this 'emancipation' was immediate and highly enthusiastic. Soon they took up the challenge and entered nearly every field of social and political activities.

There were women lawyers, judges, parachutists, policewomen, literacy corpswomen, high ranking government officials including a minister, women parliamentarians and many others engaged in various social and political activities. They gave conclusive evidence that, given suitable opportunities, women could be effective members.


2.
of the society and thus play a significant part in the social and economic reconstruction of their country.

A by-product of the women’s emancipation was the enactment of the family protection law. This law aimed at preventing family life from breaking up because of the ease with which some men could marry more than one wife or divorce their wives to marry again.

The emancipation of the Iranian women, supplemented by the family protections law, was hailed both at home and abroad as a very significant social, economic and humanitarian measure. It helped to free the Iranian women from the prejudice-ridden shackles to which they had been subjected, and enabled this very significant portion of the country’s population to occupy its rightful place in the Iranian society, a right to which they were fully entitled if by no other reason than their being members of the human race.

For the educated youth the Shah instituted the literacy Corps, Health Corps, Development and Extension Corps and Houses of Equity. Under the first three schemes

1. Ibid. p. 8.
2. Ibid. p. 9.
thousands of unemployed University and High school graduates drafted as trained cadres to work in rural areas in lieu of the part of their three years' military service. The Literacy and Health Corps were to help improve rural literacy and health and sanitation standards. The Development and Extension Corps were to guide and to assist farmers and rural co-operators in new production. These corps were collectively entrusted with the task of propagating the aims and objects of the White Revolution throughout the country from 1963 to 1971. A total of 98599 men and women served in twenty one teams of Literacy corps and educated about 1675000 pupils. By 1972 the corps were active in over 20,000 remote villages. Consequently Iran's literacy rate rose from 15 percent at the end of 1950's to about 25 percent at the beginning of 1970's. The Health corps was established in 1964. By 1972 there were 400 medical groups, each of which covered 20 to 40 villages with a total population of 8,000 to 20,000. The Development and Extension Corps were founded in 1965. By 1972 the number of corps members serving in the scheme was 4692. The Houses of Equity or the village courts of justice were founded in 1963 to deal with petty offenses. By 1973 there were 300 Houses of Equity with 24000 corps members or judges on service in
Through these schemes the government succeeded in the execution of White Revolution and increasing contact between the rural and urban population. Since the corps members were fulfilling part of the military service in civilian form they provided the government with some justification to emphasise the importance of the civilian role of armed forces and thus justified the expansion of Shah's military power base. In addition the scheme created employment opportunities and opened government controlled avenues for political participation of Graduates, a majority of whom had been previously critical of the Shah's regime for lack of job opportunities. Thus the scheme mobilized a good number of educated Iranian youths behind the Shah's leadership.

The Shah declared "National Reconstruction Reform" which was to narrow the gap in the standards of living between the cities and villages, to pay greater attention to less developed areas, to accelerate rural development and to introduce all modern facilities for transforming Iran.
into a prosperous and powerful country in its region.

The administrative aspect of this reform aimed at improving the efficiency and working standard of Iran's public service. It stressed the need for public servants to work honestly and consciously and by accepting the responsibilities of their duty. It promised the decentralization of the administrative system and the protection and public interest as well as improvement in the social welfare and security of public servants. "The educational aspect of the reform was stressed as essential for the continuing successes of administrative and all other introduced reforms. It emphasized need of Iran for trained educational, agricultural, technical and administrative personnel."

The Shah failed to couple those socio-economic reforms with any major political reform. He continued to centralize politics under his absolute control to strengthen his central position in Iranian politics. The people were allowed neither to criticize the government policies nor to seek redress for their grievances. The Shah

1. Ibid, p. 07.
continued to maintain the parliament which was reopened in 1963 after a lapse of three years and the two party system and formally allowed the people to elect the Majlis every four years. But as in the past, party membership and elections were strictly controlled by the government and the opposition was suppressed. In fact by 1964 even the principle of two party system seemed to disappear. The Shah instigated a new ruling party called Iran Nawin which was led by his loyal colleague, Ali Mansoor, the Prime Minister from 1964 to 1965. After his assassination in 1965 he was succeeded by his finance minister and the former critic of the Shah's regime, Amir Abbas Huwaida who was responsible for making Iran Nawin the sole political party elections. The formal opposition party Mardum continued only in name. The opponents were to be effectively suppressed. But despite his promises the Shah virtually did not succeed to democratize the Iranian political system. Initially through his reforms, no matter how undemocratic they might be in eyes of his opponents, the Shah, to a certain extent, improved domestic credibility. He had opened up basis of support among peasants, industrial workers, women and

Youths, and even intellectual, professionals, technocrats and bureaucrats. Thus mass-mobilization improved the prospects of social and economic stability with the result that the people began to hope for a better future. He had stimulated some social and economic bases thereby gaining a reputation for his revolutionary ideas to reform his society and to improve the living conditions of the Iranian people. Thus the domestic image of the Shah considerably improved and he was able to initiate certain changes in his regional policy in order to attain the goal of White Revolution for an independent national foreign policy. This helped the Shah's regime both to strengthen the regional security as well as to gain regional economic and technical support of his reform.

By the beginning of the 1960's it was clear that the Shah's policy of exclusive alliance with the West opposed to communism, had done his regime more damage than good. Thus the Shah found it imperative to effect domestic reforms along with changes in regional policy. He later emphasized the importance of bilateral relationship with other countries on the basis of peaceful co-existence and co-operation and independence. He conducted his foreign
relation with more flexibility within the limits of his regime's alliance within the West and opposition to communism. He stressed that the foreign policy goal of the White Revolution should be of the national independence. He subsequently declared: "Our policy is based on the maintenance and preservation of peace. We in Iran have adopted a policy which we call a policy of independent nationalism. Its essential principles are non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peaceful coexistence. We must go beyond this stage and convert peaceful coexistence into international co-operation and understanding especially to countries with different political and social systems from ours, for without them the basic difficulties facing the world today, such as illiteracy, sickness and hunger, cannot be solved. We believe that the way to safeguard the real interest of our country is by coexistence and sincere co-operation with all countries.......... on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty........... At the same time........... the establishment............understanding and peace cannot be achieved without sincere respect for the principle of coexistence between different ideologies and systems of government or without respect for the principle of
noninterference of countries in the internal affairs of others." 

To conclude, let us recapitulate the reforms envisaged in the White Revolution. It was in the year of 1334 (shamsi) that the bill for the distribution of the crown properties was passed and in the year 1337 it was actually put in practice. According to this law, every farmer could hold not more than 10 hectares of irrigated or arid land. Hence the crown land was distributed among hundred thousand farmers. But the big land owners, despite this law, were still holding lots of land and the average income of small farmers was not more than fifteen thousand Rials per annum. Keeping this disparity in mind, the Shah introduced a "Land Reform Bill" in the parliament in Khurday of 1339. But this bill, when passed by the parliament, lost many of its reformatory points and was not more than an artificial aid to the farmers.

In Di Mah of 1340, another bill was passed putting a ceiling to the property owned. According to this, an Irani land owner could not possess more than one tenth of his entire land.

In 1343, another Land Reforms Bill was passed and put into practice. The first township that was affected by this was Maragheh; and after that, it was applied to the entire country.

The third stage of land reform was mechanisation of farming and increase in the agricultural output with the help of modern techniques. A 20 point programme was evolved, consisting of:

1. Acquiring best means of irrigation.

2. Increasing and popularising the use of chemical manure.

3. Mechanisation of agriculture, according to the needs and demands of different agricultural zones in the country.

4. Protection of agricultural product from natural calamity and disease in fields of storages.

5. Technical training of the farm-workers.

6. Proper transportation of the agricultural produce from the farms to the market and
7. Expansion and reinforcement of the network of cooperative associations and various other agricultural units.

8. Establishment of economic unit in agriculture.

9. Joining animal husbandry with agriculture.

10. Encouraging investment of capital in agricultural ventures.

11. Encouraging capital investment in animal husbandry and farming.

12. Joining agricultural programmes with industrial Ventures.

13. Cultivation of arid land.


15. Formation of special co-operatives for agricultural products.

For implementing this Programme, it was necessary
to form rural cooperative associations. Therefore, simultaneous with the introduction of this programme, many cooperative associations were founded to help the farmers. These cooperatives gave loans to them, provided them with chemical fertilizers, and arranged irrigation for dry lands. By the end of Mehr Mah, 1345, more than 7,000 cooperatives consisting of 9,000,000 units all over the country were established. More than 16,000 villages were included in these corporations. The capital invested was about 800 million Rials.

In the middle of 1342, the Central Organisation for Rural Development was established under the auspices of the Agricultural Ministry. A Bank of credit for Rural and Agricultural Development was also established. The basic functions of this organisation were:

1. To specify the ways of working of these co-operative associations.

2. Expansion of the co-operative network.

3. Advancing credit to these co-operatives.

4. To find market for dispensation of the agricultural produce.
5. Advancement of cottage industries.

6. To establish contact with international co-operative.

The Bank of Credit and Rural Advancement gave loans to the farmers. About 4 hundred million Rials was given as loan to farmers during the last four years. The bank also gave loan for the drought hit lands.

Modification in Land Inheritance

According to the new law, the lands of the deceased cannot be distributed among the inheritors if it is less than 10 hectares.

Irrigational Reforms

1. Nationalisation of Water Resources.

2. Water Reservoirs.


5. Cannals.
6. Channelisation of rivers.

7. Procuring technical aids for water supply throughout the year.

8. To tap and utilise underground water resources.

9. To save water in daily consumption.

THE PERSIAN LAND REFORMS

This and the following chapter are based on the book entitled Persian Land Reform (1962-1966) by Ann K.S. Lambton, Oxford, 1969. Its author made a thorough investigation of agricultural problems of Iran during her travel through all parts of the country several times. She was, therefore, very well qualified to discuss the problems of land reforms and she did discuss these problems in her book so thoroughly and so much critical insight that for a long time to come no one will be able to add much to her observations. It is because of this that I have no alternative but to summarise her views with some additions here and there.

The Land Reforms Law of January 1962

On January 1961 Dr. Ali Amini was appointed as Prime Minister of Iran. He belonged to the old bureaucracy. His methods were those of the old fashioned Persian diplomacy but since he was well trained in western techniques he brought new ideas to these old methods. He

was a deputy of the National Consultative Assembly in 1948 and later a Minister of National Economy in 1950 and under Dr. Musaddeq in 1951. From 1953-5 he was the Minister of Finance and in 1955, he was Minister of Justice and from 1956-8 he was an Ambassador in Washington.

In 1960-61 there had been a deterioration in the internal affairs of the country which was due to the neglect of the problems by those in authority. This was fully evident in the conduct of the election in 1960 and 1961 which were highly rigged resulting in generating unrest in the country and creating disturbances with the ultimate result that the government fell. Dr. Amini was asked to form a government but his appointment was perhaps not unconnected with the country's foreign relations.

Dr. Amini's cabinet included ministers who had links in past with Dr. Musaddeq and his Tudeh party. The minister of agriculture was young and dynamic Dr. Hasan Arsanjani. He was a widely traveled man and had sufficient experience of agricultural problems of his country. He was convinced that the agricultural reform was urgently needed in his country and no political reform will be successful without agricultural reforms.
The programme of the new government, though not

different from the old one, had an intention of limiting

land holdings. And on 5 Oct. 1961, a small team of

officials from the ministry of agriculture was sent to carry

out a land survey in the Maragheh area. On 11 Nov., 1961,

the Shah issued a Farman to Dr. Amini ordering the
government to execute if necessary in a modified form the


Amini and some of his cabinet colleagues signed a bill

amending the land reform law of 1960. The former differed

from the latter in respect of the following:

1. It limited holdings to one village only.

2. It fixed the compensations to be given to the land

owners on the basis of the taxation they had paid.

3. It allocated the land to the peasants cultivating the

land.

4. It made membership of a cooperative society a condition

of the receipt of land. The law of 9 Jan. 1962/1

Daymeh 1340 together with the Additional Article

of 17 Jan. 1963/2/ Daymeh 1341, the regulation for

the execution of these two instruments, a number of
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military desert, and decision is the land reform council's job under the law of 1st 9, 1952. To break the legal basis of the land reform. It was intended first to break the political and social influence of the land-owning class and secondly to bring about the emergence of an independent peasant free from the domination of the land-owning class.

The main provision of the law was to limit the amount of land which an individual could hold to one village irrespective of its size. Each village in Iran is divided into 10,000 square meters or parts, and under the law, the landowner could select for his horizon (ه闻言) is the village which he would retain, one whole village or a combination of several villages, the aggregate of which as not to exceed 10,000 square meters. Any land in excess of village was to be transferred by the landowner to the peasants or sold by the landowner to the government and by the government to the peasants cultivating it.

A village (قرم) was defined as a center of population and the place of residence and work of a number of people. For the Persian term occurring here please see "Dictionary of Technical Terms."
of families who were engaged in agricultural operation in the village lands, and the income of the majority of whom came from agriculture and which was by custom recognised as village. The fact that the several villages might be included in one unit (بلد) or in one registration area (منطقة) was the cause of much confusion and gave rise to many disputes between the parties.

The land reform council made the following decisions on 19 Jan. 1963:

1. If several Centres or group of houses, were included in one main registration unit, they were to be considered separate villages.

2. If one village and several (نواحي) were included in one registration unit (مدينة), the villages and the (نواحي) were to be regarded as forming one village.

1. Art. 2 note 3, Art. 1 para 10
2. The term نواحي is plural of ناحية (a cultivated field), and covers both a hamlet and the cultivated fields belonging to it and also a group of fields without any dwelling houses, which are cultivated by peasants living in a neighbouring village.
3. If each group of peasants residing in each of the several centres worked and cultivated several tracts of land, each centre was reckoned as a village. But if all the peasants in the different centres jointly cultivated all the lands included under main registration unit, it was to be treated as one village.

4. If a centre with separate name and nasaq (نَقَّ) was covered by a subsidiary registration unit (بَلَدَخِصْ) it was to be regarded as a separate village.

5. In the case of registration unit covering a ْمَزَارِعُ having a separate name but with no houses, which was cultivated by peasants from another village, if this village and ْمَزَارِعُ belonged to the same person and two were treated as one, the ْمَزَارِعُ was to be regarded as part of the village in which the peasants lived.

6. An area covered by one main registration unit with a name and several subordinate plaks (بَلَدَك) without names was to be regarded as one village.
Although the land owner was free under the law to choose which village he would retain, some limitations were, in practice, placed on his choice. On 19th Sept., 1962, the land reform council stipulated that a land owner could not retain part only of a village which had been his chosen village. The reform council again decided on 28 Jan., 1963, that the land reform organisations were to recommend landowners to sell to the government the villages which had grown and in which municipality had been set up and to choose some other villages as their "chosen" village. From the date of the passing of the law any transfer or sale by a landowner of land in excess of the holding was forbidden (Art. 4).

Certain categories of land were exempted from the provision of the law. These, called "الشيئات" were as follows.

1. Orchards, tea plantations and woodland with some limitations.

2. All land worked by mechanised means at the date of the passing of the law.

3. Land which had been held on a leasehold tenure on
5 December, 1959, was subject to sale to the government until the lease expired. It was further decided on 19 Jan., 1963, that any lease concluded after 5 Dec., 1959, would be considered null and void. Thus there was no place for the middle man.

In the case of land constituted into a private or personal Vaqf before 5 Dec. 1958, each of the beneficiaries allowed to continue to draw revenue from up to maximum holding permitted by the law of Jan. 9, 1962. Any land excess of this was to be sold and proceeds invested in other property under the supervision of Ouqaf.

The procedure of the transfer of the land was as under: on the decision of the land reform council to put the law into operation, the ministry of agriculture would announce in a newspaper twice that the land reform is to begin in a particular area. Within one month of the second announcement, landowners whose property exceeded the limit laid down in Article 2 of the law were required to declare particulars of their property to the authorities named by the ministry of agriculture. According to Note 3 to Article 1, Article 2 n. 4.
2 of the law of Jan. 9, 1962, in case of land under joint tenure, the land owners were to delimit their land and define the government's share within five days of the declaration of land reform in the area.

A cabinet decree issued on March 1, 1962, authorised the government to purchase the land offered to it by the landowners whose estates were not subject thus to transfer under Art. 2 of the law of Jan. 9, 1962. The land acquired thus by the government were transferred to the peasants living in the village. The price of such land was fixed by the department of agriculture on the basis of taxation paid. The land owner was entitled to appeal for the revision of price within a period of ten days. The landowner received the price of the land in ten annual installments. The land sold by the landowners to the government was to be handed over immediately by the ministry of agriculture at the price for which it was bought with an increase of ten percent to be paid to the central bank, to the people in order of preference in the following order:

1. The peasants living in the village who cultivated the land.

1. Musho meaning "joint tenure".
2. The heirs of peasants who had died within a year of the beginning of transfer.

3. Agricultural labours ¹ who received a share in the crop from the landlord.

4. Agricultural labours ² who did not own or provide an agricultural element and received in cash for the agricultural work.

5. Those who volunteered for agricultural work ³.

In effect it means that the land subject to transfer went to the sitting or occupying peasants and that agricultural labourers would benefit from land reform indirectly.

The nature of land reform might have discriminated between the different classes of peasants but there were strong reasons for transferring the land to the occupying peasant. If the agricultural labourers were included in the distribution of land, it would have involved a change in the field layout of the village lands. It would have

¹ Barzigaran i.e. men who did not own or provide any of the agricultural elements

² کارگران کشاورزی

³ Article 16.
involved delay and led to conflict in the village. Another important factor not to transfer land to agricultural labourers was that they did not have sufficient means to cultivate the land. However, it is not easy to assess the proportion of occupying peasants in a village to the agricultural labourers.

Under Art. 16 of the law of Jan. 9, 1962, persons living in a village not engaged in cultivation of land were excluded from the categories of persons to whom the land might be transferred. The land reform council in its proceedings of March 31, 1962, stated that in case of an agreement between the peasants of the village and to include the latter among those holding a share in the village ploughlands, there would not be difficulty over their receiving a share of the land. It was permissible by agreement to revise and change the 1 (nasaq) of the village. Irrigated land was to be transferred with the water rights from qanats or rivers etc. belonging to it according to local customs. Art. 19 forbade the fragmentation of the land transferred to the peasants below a certain limit. In the event of 1. Division of the village land into plough land and peasant holdings, maka is holding land jointly.
peasant living and his heirs unable to agree over the administration of the holding they had to sell it to another peasant who would be responsible for the payment of the remaining installments. In the event of a peasant not cultivating the land transferred to him in accordance with the programme laid down by the cooperative society, the latter had right to handover his land to someone else (Art. 19, note 1). If a peasant failed to pay three installments for the land transferred to him with a valid reason, he would forfeit the land and the ministry of agriculture would transfer it to someone else.

Dead land or barren lands were also to be distributed under the law of Jan 9, 1962. The land reform organisation was authorised to sell for agricultural needs or stock grazing any land within the limits of a village subject to transfer under the law other than the land under cultivation, land on which buildings were constructed and the harim of qanat. The land reform council decided on Jan. 19, 1963, that the barren lands within village limits were:

1. Article 28
2. Article 6
3. Article 7
4. Land in immediately surrounding qanats (Canal) paths or roads or pasture lands
to be bought by the government. Barren lands outside village limits could, with the permission of the ministry of agriculture, be bought by the landowner of the "chosen" village.

The price of barren and dead lands was to be fixed by the ministry of agriculture at the rate of 1/20 of the price of the nearest village bought by the ministry under the law of Jan. 9, 1960.

A council called the Council for Land Reform was to be formed to supervise the execution of Land Reform Law of Jan. 9, 1962, under the chairmanship of the minister of agriculture. The decisions of this council were to be referred to an organisation called the land reform organisation, the head of which was to be appointed by a royal farman. The land reform organisation was to have a head and a deputy head and was to consist of the following sections: statistics and information, technical services, law and registration, purchase and transfer, and administration.

The region in which the land reform law was in operation was to have a well equipped organisation for the
provision of seed, good seedlings, good livestock, and necessary facilities for credit etc. In transferred villages agricultural operations common to the whole village were to be carried out through cooperative societies.

The law made provision of the relations between the landowner and the peasant in private owned property and Waqaf land. These provision were also to cover the relation between the landlords and peasants in agricultural lands within the confines of a town.

Under the law a peasant engaged in cultivating the land in a village was to be regarded as residing in that village and no landowner had the right to turn him out of the village or to prevent him from cultivating the land.

Agricultural operations by the landowner on land either a. the disposal of the peasant or in which the peasant had acquired certain right were to be permitted only with the consent of the peasant and after the purchase of his rights.

1. Article 30.
2. Article 32.
3. Article 22.
4. e.g. of which he own the a'yan (امية) tangible agricultural property.
5. Article 22 v. 1.
6. Article 22 v. 1.
Tangible agricultural property (a'yān) was to belong to the peasant and he had the right to register his ownership but new a'yān could be created by the consent of the landowner.

Article 20 laid down the duties of the landowner and the peasants throughout the country. The duties of the landowners were as follows:

1) To repair qanats, and to pay the cost that needed.

2) To pay the cost of water from rivers and canals.

3) To pay the cost of water ducts, dams, tanks, and cisterns etc.

4) To pay the cost of irrigation by power operated pumps.

5) To provide suitable seeds in areas where this was the responsibility of the landowner.

6) To perform such other duties as might be laid down by future laws and regulations.

The duties of the peasant were as follows:

1) To carry out agricultural operations.

2) To provide suitable seeds in areas where the provision of

1. Article 25.
seed is the responsibility of the peasant.

The joint responsibilities of the land owners and the peasants were as under:

1. To maintain qanats, wells, tanks etc.

2. To pay the cost of chemical fertilizers and pest control.

3. To pay the dues of village headmen, and other officials.

4. To maintain gardens, trees and public buildings.

5. To provide the officials of the ministry with information on the agricultural and social matters of the village.

Article 33 laid down that the differences between the landowner and the peasant about agricultural matters were to be submitted to a special committee for such dispute. A committee was to be set up in each district composed of the district governor, the head of the local department of justice, and a representative of the ministry of agriculture. But the system was found to be cumbersome so it was amended on Oct. 15, 1962, which reads: disputes between the landowners and peasants on matters relating to
agriculture shall be referred to the officials of the land
reform organization.

These were the main provisions of the Land Reform
law of Jan. 5 1962, which was drawn up with an
understanding of local conditions and was thus pragmatic.
It aimed at reform which would bring about change in social,
political and economic conditions of the country. It was
certainly an improvement upon earlier measures of
distribution of Khaliresh1 or the setting up of village
councils. The former had no effect on the relations of the
landowner and the peasant and the latter namely the village
council did not give responsibility to the peasant. The
real control remained with the government official and the
landowner. The law of Jan. 5, 1962 aimed at a major change
in tenurial conditions by breaking the political, social and
economic power of the landowner, and by making the
membership of a cooperative society a necessary condition
for the receipt of the land to give responsibility to the
peasant for running of their own affair.

1. The word ending in has in نام خالیش, is pronounced as
Khalsa or Name in Iran. But in Khalisa and Nama.
The execution of the land reform law of Jan. 9, 1962, the additional articles, the peasants congress

The land reform law was signed on Jan. 9, 1962, and later on it was announced that it would be put into operation in Maragheh in eastern Azarbijan; consequently on Jan. 16 it was notified that the landowners should declare their holdings. The execution of the law of Jan. 9, 1962, came to be known subsequently as the first stage of land reform; while the execution of the Additional Articles passed on Jan. 17, 1963, came to be known as the second stage. There were some valid reasons for the selection of Maragheh as the first place in which the law was put into operation. Maragheh was one of the most fertile districts and had a large export of dried fruits. Moreover, natural conditions in this area were more favourable for agriculture.

With the beginning of the execution of the land reform law, the propaganda campaign was intensified beyond proportion. However, the reform gained some measure of support in urban areas. Even many of the smaller landowners
were in favour of the reform though their holdings was not so large as to bring them within the scope of Article 2 of the law.

The intellectuals, on the other hand were critical of the land reform. They argued that execution was hasty without having been given due attention to detailed planning. The left was also not favourable to reform. They wanted nothing short of collective farming.

The final distribution of title deeds to the peasants of Maraghreh and some other area was made by the Shah on 23rd September 1962, and the landowners were advised to sell to the government the land which they were permitted to retain under article 2 of the law of January 9, 1967. The land reform was extended to various districts of Qazvin in May 1962. These districts were poor because they had been neglected by the landlords. In May 1962 the law became operative in various districts of Gilan which was a rich rice-growing province. And in the same month some districts of Arak were brought under the land reform. A little later the law became operative in Kirmanshah, Fars, Azarbaiyjan and Kurdistan.
When the land reform started, many landlords refrained from submitting a declaration of their estates as acquired under the law. This they did so as to get the reform delayed and they could have their share of the harvest before selling the villages to the government. However, in order to avoid delay in the transfer of villages to the peasants, supplementary regulations were passed by the council. These provided for the transfer to all the peasants of the village on a joint tenure of the scattered parcels of land which had been sold to the government in the same proportion as they held under the existing division of the village into ploughlands.

Upon the announcement of the operation of land reform in a particular region, a group of officials from the land reform organisation was sent to villages to collect the relevant information and check it with information available from the local registration office. For this a meeting of men of the village was held in which the purpose of the collection of information was explained. Then the assembled villagers elected three men who would accept responsibility.

1. Article 2, n. 3 dated 7th August, 1962
2. Dated 02.08.1962
3. حسن بیک خلیل
for the correctness of information. The collection of statistics proceeded satisfactorily. The second stage was the formation of a cooperative society membership of which was a condition for the transfer of land under reform. The formation of the society took place in the same way as the collection of statistics. However setting up societies and having them functioned properly is a difficult task specially in a country where the rate of literacy is low. Membership of cooperative society was pre-requisite for receiving land under the land reform.

The Land Reform Law of Jan. 9, 1962, was not concerned with all classes of peasants. It was restricted to those who actually held and cultivated a part of the village ploughlands. Those who cultivated land in the village which the landowner has retained as his 'chosen village, or land owned by small landowners, continued to cultivate the land on the old crop sharing basis or by payment in cash or kind.

On Jan. 8, 1963, a national congress of peasant was held in Tehran in which 4700 peasants from the different parts of the land drawn from cooperative societies, took part. The participants elected their own managing
committee. The congress was a great landmark in the change in their conditions. It diminished the role of the town community which no longer remained the embodiment of the Perrian people.

The Shih had addressed the congress on Jan. 9 and announced that a six-point referendum would be held for:
1. the abolition of landlord-peasant regime,
2. the nationalisation of forests,
3. the sale of shares in government factories to the landowners as compensation for their land,
4. profit-sharing for the workers in factories²,
5. reform of the electoral law,
6. the creation of a Literary Corp.

On 17th Jan. 1963, the Additional Article to the Land Reform Act of Jan. 2, 1962, were issued. It comprised five articles meant to lessen the disharmony developing between the peasant in the village which were transferred

¹ The National Oil Co. and Government concerns were excluded.
² Four factories.
and the peasants in the chosen village as well as small
landowners. Note 6 to article 1 laid down that in case of
rice growing land, landowners could retain up to 75 acres
while the land surplus was transferred to the peasants at a
nared price.

Article 2 of the Additional Articles concerned the
charitable Oqaf (عطاية). The Article laid down that
the charitable Oqaf were to be left to the occupying
peasant for each rent for 20 years. It also laid down
that personal Oqaf would be bought by the government and
divided among the peasants.

Article 4 of the Additional Articles extended the
period for the payment of compensation to landowners laid
down in the law of 9th Jan, 1967, from ten years to 15
years. This was done because of the financial difficulties
faced by both the land reform organisation and the
government.

Taking in view the situation prevailing in Iran
before the land reform in Jan 1962, the results achieved
by March 3, 1963 were considerable. In the political field
the power of the landowners were broken. However, the gulf
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between the urban and rural population was still wide but there were signs of the beginning of mutual understanding and respect. In the economic field the achievements were not so marked. The emergence of independent peasantry could not be possible without a rise in living standard. The problem of productivity remained to be tackled at a large scale. Besides these, many problems were still outstanding such as minimum size of holdings, scarcity of water and new legislation in the field of irrigation, soil conservation, agricultural wage policy, marketing techniques, political security and administrative reform.