CHAPTER V

MIGRATION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION

The analysis in the last Chapter has pinpointed the impact of industrialization on education. The aim of this chapter is to investigate and analyse the impact of industrialization on migration in Iran.

EXPLANATION OF THE TERM MIGRATION

Migration is one of the main social phenomenon and has been in existence for a long time in human history. This is perhaps because man has always tried to better his living, so he kept migrating from one area to another. This can be seen in the life of primitive man too who lived on hunting and a nomadic life.

Industrialization and development in the subsequent centuries created a different type of migration. Industrialization is the cause of migration from rural to urban and densely populated industrializing cities.

Migration is the cause of the increase or decrease of population in an area, and has a consequent affect on fertility
and mortality rate. So it is a significant phenomenon for the inquiry of sociologists and anthropologists.

In sociology and anthropology the twin phenomena of migration and mobility is differentiated from each other and each one is a specific subject of inquiry. In mobility the people involved usually go to a particular area and come back to their original homes after a while. For example they would have summer quarters and winter-quarters. On the other hand in migration the people leave a place with no intention of coming back.

Nels Anderson defines mobility and migration thus:
Any moving about may be identified as mobility, such as movement from village to city or city to city, involving change of residence and change of place of work. It is migration, to move from one country to another, especially if it results in change of citizenship. It would be mobility if families change residence from one part of the city to another, but it would not be migration, and it is not usually regarded as migration if moves are from one part of a metropolitan area to another, as from city to suburb. The two terms, mobility and migration, in social-application are sometimes used interchangeably, which is not a fault if the meaning is made clear."1
Migration, especially in modern times, is a major symptom of basic social change. In most countries, industrialization is accompanied by huge movements of the population from rural to urban, between towns within the same country, and also between countries.

Migration may be defined as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence.²

A person is usually considered a migrant if he moves from one point to another point which are separated by distance, but are connected by some kind of communication and transportation network.

Migration can be divided into two parts:

1. Internal migration, or the migration of people within a nation or community.

2. International migration, or the migration of people between countries.

Throughout the world, international migration has not played a major role in population redistribution in recent decades. On the other hand, internal migration has always been the most significant factor in inter-regional population shifts.
C. J. Jansen in his book 'Reading in the Sociology of Migration' quotes from Ravestein and discusses: 'Laws of Migration' in the following terms:

"1. A universal shifting or displacement of population, which produces "currents of migration" setting in the direction of the great centres of commerce and industry which absorb the migrants......

2. It is the natural outcome of this movement of migration, limited in range, but universal throughout the country, that the process of absorption goes on in the following manner: The inhabitants of a country immediately surrounding a town of rapid growth, flock into it; the gaps thus left by the rural population are filled up by migrants from more remote district, until the attractive force of one of our rapidly growing cities makes its influence felt, step by step, to the most remote corner of the kingdom. Migrants enumerated in a certain centre of absorption will consequently grow less with the distance proportionally to the native population which furnishes them ......
3. The process of dispersion is the inverse of that of absorption and exhibits similar features.

4. Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter-current.

5. Migrants proceeding to long distances generally go by preference to one of the great centres of commerce and industry.

6. The natives of towns are less migratory than those or rural parts of the country.

7. Females are more migratory than males.\(^3\)

Conditions of migrants in the large cities of many less-developed countries today by no means conform to Ravenstein's statement written in the 19th century, "Migration means life and progress: A Sedentary population, Stagnation."\(^4\) This statement was true for the situation in England during the industrial Revolution, the industrial establishments needed labour and more important, they could absorb the unskilled and semi-skilled labourers as well, a farmer could quickly find a job in the city which paid him much more than his income on the farm. In contrast, industrialization (if any) of today's less-developed countries is not
revolutionary in form but is relatively a more long-term process. However, there is not generally enough industry to absorb the incoming unskilled labour force, and a resulting major problem of less-developed countries is urbanization accompanied by industrialization and economic growth. Mass migration into metropolitan areas disturb the economic system of a nation, disrupting activity in the villages, and creating unemployment in cities.

Migration as explained by sociologists, is based on two criteria mainly - "Push" and "Pull" forces or factors. Unfavourable socio-economic and physical factor tend to push people from their homeland, while favourable conditions tend to pull people toward another geographical location.

Helen I. Safa's discussion of migration is also meaningful, when she quotes from B. M. Dutoit. She writes: "Migration is normally viewed as an economic phenomenon. Though non-economic factors obviously have some bearing, most studies concur that migrants leave their areas of origin primarily because of lack of employment opportunities and in hopes of finding better opportunities elsewhere.

However, the wider economic ramifications of migration are often overlooked. Migration can no longer be viewed as simply a question of individual choice, though this may still
have some bearing on selection in a migrant population."\(^5\)

She continues her explanation in the following manner:

"The massive movements taking place today within as well as across national boundaries are due to major structural transformation in the economies of developed and Third World countries. Migration is a manifestation of a world-wide shift from a rural agrarian base to an urban-industrial base in the economies of most Third World countries."\(^6\)

M. Hemmasi in his book 'Migration in Iran' lays emphasis on industry as a factor of migration and says:

"Technological change and mechanization of agriculture may cause unemployment or underemployment among farmers."\(^7\)

Therefore density of the unemployed population in the village may cause migration to the cities. Besides the above discussion, decrease in cultivable land, the development of transportation facilities, spread of mass media, high birth rates may all join hands together for migration. But as we want to show the impact of industry on migration in Iran, we do not wish to probe further into the causes of migration.

It may be mentioned here that some of the Asian countries have formulated two policies to control and regulate their migration influx. These policies are basically divided into two kinds:
1. Direct encounter with the utilization of law and army pressure.

2. Indirect encounter with the utilization of social and economic planning.

In China during 1969-1973, 10 to 15 millions of graduate students were forced to migrate (with pressure and utilization of law), and were transferred to rural areas, and at the same time migration from rural to urban area needed authorisation.

This policy however was later changed, but we have to keep in mind that such policies which violate the social freedom of the people is condemned by the world.

In another example in Indonesia to prevent the migration of the people to Jakarta, in 1970 the Governor of Jakarta passed a resolution in which entrance into Jakarta was based on a short-term visit card and the deposit of some amount of money to support their visit. In the event of the visiting person within six months of the entry date, getting a job and accommodation, then the deposit money was returned to him. But if he was unable to fulfill the necessary requirements, a return ticket was issued to him. Besides this policy the government of Indonesia formulated other policies to prevent
illegal jobs of migrants, like beggary, idle wandering, and hawking on the streets without licence. Utilization of this programme besides creating many problems, caused the increase in corruption of the government staff. In one night 13,000 persons without the necessary identity card of Jakarta were rounded by the police, were sent to their original cities. Contrary to the government's claim the subsequent study indicated the increase of rural migrants to Jakarta. Therefore, we may say that unless proper planning like decentralization of industries, providing facilities in the rural areas, giving privileges to the rural people, providing land and income for the landless rural people, etc., to settle the unemployed farmers and villagers in their areas of origin, migration cannot be stopped at any cost.

One of the major policy of decentralization of industry should be to help progress not only in the major cities but also in smaller towns. Thus people will not find it necessary to migrate to the big cities. For example, we may obtain from M. Alizadeh and K. Kazerouni writings that with the highly increased growth of industry from 1950, the country's all round development was considerable in the field of technology, development programme, production and employment of manpower in some of the developed areas, like Tokyo and Osaka in Japan.
Hence there was a big difference between the earning and standard of living of people in the developed areas and those in under-developed areas. Therefore in 1962 Japan started making industrial and economic progress in all the areas not just in the urban ones. Thus, Japan had a co-ordinate national progress plan. Again this policy was reviewed in 1969 specially with regard to decentralization of industry. One of the basic aims of the 1969 plan was the growth of towns and small cities, which encouraged rural people to seek jobs in their own areas rather than migrate to other parts of the country. This policy resulted in the proper economic condition as well as end of migration of the people to other developed parts of the country.\(^8\)

Therefore as a result of the above discussion decentralization of industry would help in reducing the rush of the people to big cities. However, there will not be enough industry to absorb all the new unskilled comers from the rural areas, in less-developed and under-developed countries. Hence it results in disturbing the economic system of a nation due to rural migration. The existing situation in large cities of less-developed and under-developed countries is well expressed by Ibrahim in the following passage:
"As a result of the uncontrolled and uncoordinated movement from the villages to the towns the worst features of urbanization manifest themselves - lack of housing and therefore over crowding, slum and squalor; lack of drainage and therefore filth; lack of play grounds and gardens and therefore delinquency; lack of health and hospital facilities and therefore sickness; lack of water supply and therefore disease; lack of roads and other facilities and therefore discomfort; lack of employment and therefore poverty and destitution. There is increase in drinking, gambling, prostitution, crime and violence."

Seemingly positive forces such as the spread of literacy, and innovation in the mass media, communications and transportation have raised the aspirations and expectations of urban dwellers who are also suffering from national economic stagnation. Under these circumstances of high expectation, migration may not be "progress" but a catastrophe.

In the light of the above discussion of world wide migration now, we are attempting to examine the impact of industrialization on migration in Iran.
MIGRATION IN IRAN

Basically industrialization in any country brings a change in the social life of the people. In a society where technology is an external factor, inadequate intensive changes come along with that.

In rural societies where social relation is based on customs and traditions, new technology will be the cause of the breaking down of these social relations. In societies where the total rural population is involved in agricultural activities, introduction of advanced agricultural machinery cause unemployment, because there is no need for so much manpower.

Industrialization of a society requires skilled manpower. Therefore, in a society where more than half of its population is occupied in agriculture the rate of illiteracy is very high. Thus peasants who are usually illiterate are classified as unskilled labourers in an industrial society.

In an industrializing society many of these illiterate peasants migrate to cities and industrial centres in search of a better job situation, and a better future. So we may conclude that industrialization is a significant factor in rural migration into cities. These rural migrants in the cities form a group of unskilled workers in low jobs
such as construction workers etc.

Now we shall study the impact of industry on migration in Iran. At the outset of this study we shall very briefly review the background of migration and settlement of the population in Iran till 1956, which shows the low stage of industrialization in Iran. And then we shall concentrate on the 1962 Land Reform and rapid industrial growth in big cities of Iran.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE PROCESS OF MIGRATION IN IRAN

In the past there has been a tendency to think of migration as a simple rural-to-urban move. J. Momeni has shown that in Iran the movements are far more complex, and that the concept of a rural urban continuum is only part of the pattern. By taking the total urban population increase, which was 10.5 percent between 1900 and 1950, he argues that any individual town or city which had an increase above that figure had net-in-migration only 25 of the 100 existing towns of 1900 had net-in-migration, well above this figure, totalling approximately 728,000 persons, and in fact Tehran's total net-in-migration was greater than into all other receiving areas. Bharier has calculated from an analysis of the relative significance of natural increase and migration
that the total rural-urban migration during the period 1900-1956 amounted to 685,000 and that 61 per cent of the internal population movements were between urban areas and 39 percent between rural and urban centres. J. Momeni quotes from Bharier who has made a study on the process of migration in Iran which can be placed in a wider context by looking at the life time migration figures in the 1956 Census. Of the total population 89 percent had either never moved from their township of birth, or had now returned. Of the remainder, 4 percent had moved to an adjacent township (Shahrestan) and only 7 percent were living in a Shahrestan not contiguous to one of their birth. The greatest volume of migration from townships was Tabriz to Tehran - 94,306, Arak to Tehran - 78,318, Tehran to Karaj - 62,303, Ardebil to Tehran - 53,033, and Esfahan to Tehran - 50,882. Tehran as expected experienced the largest gain with a total net-in-migration of 690-778.

Largest net-out-migrations were from the townships of Esfahan 134,161, Tabriz 118,148, Arak 88,578, Hamadan 75,651, and Ardebil 66,531. At the province level only the central province, Khuzestan, West Azerbaijan, and Kurdestan had net gains and the rest had a net loss with heaviest losses recorded in East Azerbaijan 287,000, Esfahan/Yazd 190,000,
Gilan 167,000 and Kermanshah (Bakhtar) 94,000. Towns with the highest recorded percentage of migrants in their population were Abadan 52 percent, Tehran 48 percent Ahwaz 45 and Mashhad 25.

From the above discussion we may conclude that Abadan and Ahwaz which had the highest percentage of migrants were due to oil industrial installation, which started after 1900 and absorbed the highest migrations. Tehran which comes second was due to the setting up of many industries which were centralized there, and Mashhad was due to being a place of pilgrimage.

As a result of industrialization of the country, peasants were uprooted from their fields, craftsmen had to give up their crafts and become wage earners in the cities, living in slums. Urban people become victims of mass culture generated by the gigantic means of communication. Thus while modernization redeems the individual from the restraints of feudalism, it also produces a new type of conformism which militated against the real freedom of man—the attainment of excellence by each person.

However there has gradually been an increase in the rural population, due to high birth rate and sanitation, at the same time there has been an increase in the rural population
migrating to urban areas too.

Table 5.1: PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF TOTAL POPULATION OF IRAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population (in Million)</th>
<th>Urban (%)</th>
<th>Rural (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Plan and Budget Organization.

After 1956 was the beginning of the second development plan (1956-1962). The aims of the Plan were generally to resume development operations and assist economic growth by improving the nation's transport and communication, and development and expansion of industrial and mining sectors. It paid a great deal of attention to both public and private industry.

As is discussed by Raventein's theory of "Laws of Migration", industrialization attracts the rural inhabitants towards cities.12
According to this law the Iranian society has shown a high rate of migration from rural areas to the industrial centres in the cities after 1962, Land Reform Programme, and along with rapid growth of industrial development.

Francis Cherunilam distinguishes five important factors as the main causes of migration in any society:

I) Economic Factors

II) Social and cultural factors

III) Demographic factors

IV) Geographical and physical factors

V) Political and institutional factors.

He lays most emphasis on 'economic factor' as the major forces behind migration. He says: "In most cases, the important factor stimulating migration, is the economic motive. Migration usually takes place from an economically depressed or suppressed region to an economically prosperous region. In other words, the migration flow is usually pronounced from backward and stagnant regions, characterised by inferior economic opportunities to advanced and prosperous areas, characterised by superior economic opportunities."
He continues that: "The most important economic factors that motivate rural-urban migration are:

I) Poor agriculture conditions or primarily "push" factors.
II) Urban economic conditions or primarily "Pull" factors.
III) The general economic conditions."

How push and pull factors work in Iranian Society?

The 'White Revolution', or 'Shah and People's Revolution' was introduced on January 20, 1962. In the beginning it announced six principles. Land Reform was the first principle out of the six principles of the revolution. Its purpose was introduced as 'Emancipation of the peasantry through a programme of land reform and the abolition of the feudal landlord - peasant relationship.

There is much controversy about the causes of migration. Everything cannot be attributed solely to the classical effects of structural changes in the economy, the transformation of labour power from agriculture to industry. First because the real mechanization of agriculture have not yet begun on a large scale, and second, because the new industries are so capital - intensive that it is difficult to see any chance now or in the near future for the bulk of real labour power
to be absorbed in the industrial sector of urban areas.

H. Golabian quotes from Bharier and mentions how push and pull factors have affected migration in Iran. He says: "Opinions vary greatly, whether it is "push" or "pull" factors which play the most decisive role .... In the 1950s it is likely that decision to move were based to a large extent, on "pull" factors, particularly the concentration of large-scale manufacturing industries in the towns and the rapid expansion of urban construction activities. The widening income gap between the urban and rural areas led to a belief, not always substantial, that employment in certain towns offered immediate the prospective higher wages. During the 1960s, however, it appears that "push" factors were more influential .... the 'Land Reform' of 1962-66 had the effect of displacing many hired workers, tenants, farmers, share-croppers and non-agricultural rural workers."\(^{15}\)

Factors which caused the push and pull of the rural population into industrialized cities could be classified as follows - Push Factors are:

1) Agricultural and productive co-operatives.

2) Agro-business.

3) Protection of Industrial Products against agricultural produces.
Agricultural and productive co-operatives were the main cause of breaking down the traditional agricultural production. For example the aim of these co-operatives, which usually were conducted by an agricultural engineer was to produce on the basis of new technology and new agricultural machinery. This did not help the peasants to produce more agricultural products as its goal, but instead forced them to become seasonal workers in the cities, because the utilization of the new technology did not need huge manpower.

Most of these co-operatives suffered losses due to lack of skilled workers to repair different machines, corruption within government staff, lack of engineer's knowledge about the geographical conditions of the area.

This made the poor farmers poorer, and stimulated them to leave their land and home and shift to cities. This was the main reason behind the migration of the most of the peasants to urban areas after 1966.

Table 5.2 indicates the increase in the percentage of urban population due to the impact of industry on rural areas:
### Table 5.2: Change in Population Due to the Effect of Industry on Rural Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>18,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9,795</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>25,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>33,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Rural and Agricultural-Economic Research Centre, 1983 (In Persia)

The rural population has been increasing from 1956 to 1976. The rural population which was 13,001,000 in 1956, increased to 15,994,000 in 1966, and 17,854,000 in 1976.

It means increase in the rural population has been 1.2% between 1956-1966, and 1.1% between 1966-1976. If we consider the birth rate of the rural population by 3%, we can conclude that 1.8% and 1.9% of the rural population had migrated into cities during each year of the decades 1956 to 1966 and 1966 to 1976 respectively.
Urban population has increased about 2.7 times from 1956 to 1976. There has not been an adequate growth over all the cities of Iran, and the growth has been confined over few cities. As it has been pointed out by the Rural and Agricultural Economic Centre of Iran, for example in 1976, Tehran, Mashhad, Esfahan, Tabriz, Shiraz, Ahwaz, Abadan, Kermanshah which constitutes 2.1% of total cities of Iran (i.e. out of 373 cities), had almost 50% of total urban population in the country. In the same year Tehran alone contained 28.6% of urban population. We may conclude that these urban industrialized centres had more migrants than any other cities in Iran.

Due to the samples taken by Census in 1963 the bulk of migration all over the country had been as large as 4,298,000. Table 5.3 indicates the distribution and causes of migration.

In fact in recent years migration has become a family matter in which the migrant has been accompanied by all the members of his family while in the past usually the migrant left some of his relatives or members of his family behind in the village.
Table 5.3: NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF MIGRANTS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY AND CAUSES OF MIGRATION IN THE YEAR 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of Migration</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Migrants</td>
<td>4,287,711</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or better job</td>
<td>2,110,580</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking employment</td>
<td>478,579</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>330,042</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>56,246</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>465,597</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Followers</td>
<td>377,017</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unstated reason</td>
<td>469,650</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(II) AGRO-BUSINESS:

The second model of "push" factor, was adopted as a solution for water and soil management in arable lands under new dams. The lands under the dams or groups of wells, which can be developed through a modern irrigation system, have been
defined as agricultural poles of development. Small farmers had to sell their lands to the government for land consolidation, land-levelling and construction of irrigation canals. Later the government would either rent the land to private agro-business companies or would organize state companies for its exploitation.

Agro-business along with the buying of land from the farmers:

1) employed a small section of farmers as agricultural labourers;

2) demolished the traditional styled villages; and

3) pushed the jobless villagers toward urban areas.

Every year the companies introduced bill of losses and continuously asked for loans from various banks. However, with a simple calculation of their selling products in the market, one can realise the large amount of profit that they got.

S. Zahed defines one of these agro-business company in following terms. He writes: "Khuzestan Agro-business Company was established in the most fertile part of lands around the
Dez dam. There were 99 villages throughout the area which were occupied by the company with a population of 35,000. The land-owners and landless farmers were paid some amount of money by the company and transferred all their rights to the company. Later on five small towns were built up to settle 10,000 land-less peasants employed by the newly emerged Agro-business company. These towns had facilities like health centres, schools, and so on. But the farmers living there were not satisfied. The old villages were all demolished and 25,000 people were forced to leave their home for cities with a meagre amount of money in their pockets.

The small amount of money paid to each peasant was not sufficient to assist him to start a suitable business in the urban areas. Although the socio-economic conditions of the urban areas were not suitable enough to accommodate these migrants, the trend of migration to the cities did not stop and these peasants formed large groups of slum dwellers in the cities.\(^\text{19}\)

Incorrect anticipation of the magnitude of the work, together with non-availability of sufficient water for irrigation purposes were the reasons why the project failed. As a consequence of the project failure, foreign investors withdrew their capital which left the work incomplete.
The government on its own could not continue the project. Eventually the working peasants had to be dismissed from the work and their lands were also not returned to them. It created a new jobless class of peasants who had no other alternative left than to migrate to the cities where they may find suitable jobs and many did not succeed.

(III) PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS AGAINST AGRICULTURAL PRODUCES:

There was protection given to industrial production against agricultural products by the government. For example, in the past production of rice was more than the local consumption. But since the farmers could not compete with the low prices of imported rice by the Government, the amount of rice production fell sharply and consequently brought about an economic break down to the local rice producers. As a result they had to gradually give up farming and leave for the cities. The same policy was applied to wheat and other agricultural products by the government which led to the increase of migration from rural areas to the cities.

The general atmosphere in the villages, and inadequate support to the farmers led to a sharp decrease in their annual production and consequently sharp decline in their per capita
income. As a result greater numbers of village inhabitants left their villages and migrated to the cities. On the other hand, this process of migration itself directly affected the level of agricultural produces in general.

Then, we may look at the process of industrialization and mechanization of the agricultural section along with agricultural policies adopted by the Government as the main push factors in the Iranian Society.

H. Golabian quotes from Bharier that, the problem of the Iranian agricultural sector is now an obvious fact. Until two decades ago, it not only produced enough food and agricultural raw material for domestic consumption, but was even able to produce for export. Today's Iranian agricultural sector is unable even to supply half of the domestic consumption. Imports of agricultural products from abroad were increased. In 1971, for example, grain imported from abroad amounted to 964,097 tons (Statistical year-book 1972, P. 272). Four years later (1975) this amount had increased to about 3,510,000 tons (Tehran Economist, No. 110, 1975) an increase of about 26.6% during the five years period. To grasp the importance of this increase for the country's economy, we can compare it with total grain production of the country in 1971, which amounted to about 5,481,000 tons (statistical year book 1972, P. 267).
After the land reform of 1962 the contribution of agriculture to G.N.P. fell drastically from 19.9 in 1970 to 9.4 in 1974 and an increase in the other sectors of oil industry.

Table 5.4 confirms this validity.

Table 5.4: SHARE OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES IN GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCTS

(Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oil</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bank Markazi Iran.

Table 5.5 also prove the same fact. It shows an increasing import of foodstuffs during 1973 to 1978.
Table 5.5: FOODSTUFFS IMPORT DURING FIFTH PLAN (1973-1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuff</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Reviewed from Robert Graham. "Iran: Illusion of Power."

F. Pam (1986), quotes from A. Saikal and writes:
"During 1977 alone Iran had to spend about $20,500 million (10 per cent of its total income) on imports of food."^{20}

As it is stressed, the problem was not confined only to plant production but livestock breeding also suffered. A similar state of severe shortage of meat and dairy products was evident.^{21}

This deteriorating condition of the villages, in general, not only forced the landless farmers known as "Khosh-Neshins" to leave their villages but also drove small land-holders who realized that the peasant's life was becoming harder every day, to the cities. They preferred to sell their
small pieces of land and rush to the urban areas. In this context and on the basis of land reform, F. Cherunilam states: "The break-up of large land holdings decreases the demand for hired labour, which is not fully offset in the new smaller farms, which (though more labour intensive) are predominantly family operated. Those landless labourers who did not gain land from the reform may be forced to migrate, as in several parts of Northern Iran." 22

Whatever was discussed above can be considered as the main forces for the push factor for the large scale migration to the urban industrial cities in Iran.

Migration also occurs due to the forces of "pull" factors which are present in urban areas. Now let us discuss the nature of pull factors which attracted people from rural areas. F. Cherunilam defines this factor for migration and states: "Some of the urbanward migration streams may be regarded as the response to the "pull" exercised by the Better economic opportunities available in the urban areas of an advancing economy. There is usually an exodus population to the cities where a rapid expansion of industry and commerce takes place. "Migration from the countryside to the cities bears a close functional relation to the process of industrialization, technological advancement and other cultural
changes which characterise the evolution of a modern society in almost all parts of the world."23

It seems very likely that the major attractive force behind the pull factor is the glamour of cosmopolitan life, not the actual opportunities the city has to offer.

The increase in literacy rate, spread of mass media, and awareness of a possible better life all seem to play a role in providing the provincial population with a desire for exodus. The positive co-efficient of correlation found here between migration rate and information indicates that this process occurred in Iran.

A partial explanation for the ever-increasing attraction of a large city like Tehran may also be found in the process of information feedback.24 Once a person moved to the capital city he sent information to his friends and relatives remaining behind and encouraged them to migrate also.

The pull factor which absorbed a great number of migrants to the industrial cities of Iran can be classified as:

1. Inadequate distribution of wealth

There was an aim to increase consumption of consumer goods. To achieve this purpose the government tried to
distribute the oil money among the people up to a certain extent. Hence the oil money was distributed but not equally and properly. More was spent on urban areas e.g. roads, incentives to industries, luxuries etc., but less was spent on rural areas which in fact were neglected.

To sum up, oil money actually, reached the cities and swelled the income of the city dwellers. It actually widened the gap between the urban and rural incomes. This wide gap constituted the basis of economic inequality in Iranian society. A. L. Mabongunje says: "Concentration of employment opportunities in industries, services and other urban institutions widens the economic gap between city and village. Thus, rural-urban migration may be viewed as a two dimensional mobility. Spatial (or vertical) moves involve a permanent transformation of skills, attitudes, motivations, and behavioral pattern." 25

This inadequate distribution of wealth has also brought about a gap between the life style of the rich and poor in the cities itself.

2. Attraction of the rich city and 'City lights'

There is no doubt that the affluence of the city is always a pulling factor in the process of migration of the villagers to urban areas and industrial centres. The oil boom event and
more contract between cities and villages can be considered as another cause to the pull factor in Iranian society. For example Tehran is one of the best example of the world's primary cities; it is the nation's capital and the centre of industries, finance, education, transportation, communication, services and entertainment in the nation. This overwhelming dominance disturbs the national system. Tehran's appeal is strong not only quantitively but qualitatively as well, for it attracts many of the intellectuals and much of the talent of the country's population, doctors, judges, teachers, and other professionals prefer the cosmopolitan atmosphere, for the greater range of amenities it had to offer. Consequently, there is a relative abundance of professionals in the capital city and a scarcity of them in many other parts of the nations. Even though the government offered bonuses to those who work in provincial towns, government employees continue to request transfers to Tehran. Therefore 'City lights' absorbs most of the population. For instance, one report proves this claim and says: "Tehran city alone contains 28.6% of the total urban inhabitants of Iran."

3. Facilities available for self employment like vendors and Hawkers in the cities:

In the cities these emigrants were usually engaged in
non-productive jobs like selling cigarettes, lottery tickets, fruits, and so on. They formed a large number of Vendors in the cities. And since their income was not enough for a standard of living in the city areas they usually took shelter in the slums and poor city quarters.

4. Protection of Urban economy against rural economy

The flow of the money to the cities and industrial centres caused an increasing demand for more development of different economic sectors and services in the cities. The policies of the government strengthened this trend. As a result of development and establishment of more health, educational, cultural, and service centres in cities and more availability of services in urban areas there emerged a wide gap between rural and urban standard of life. This itself became a strong force behind increased migration of rural inhabitants into cities. The rural economy which had been ignored could never provide to peasants those services that were available to city dwellers in urban areas. Therefore many of villagers rushed to the cities for the purpose of enjoying public services in urban areas and also in search of a better life style. Therefore, it is obvious that wrong policies of the government regarding protection of urban
economy against rural economy, inadequate distribution of services between cities and rural areas, and ignoring the rural economy forced many of the peasants to leave their native places and to migrate to cities.

(III) INDUSTRIAL CITY AND THE PHENOMENON OF SLUM AREAS

Migration has brought slum conditions in Iran. The extent and nature of the slum problem can be discussed as follows.

Slum areas are in fact a universal phenomenon in all metropolitan, industrialized, and industrializing cities in the world. It seems that along with the growth and increasing affluence of industrial cities, there is a steady growth of the slum areas also. We are not going to deal with the reasons behind the growth of this universal phenomenon, in this work.

Statistics show that there exists a large number of people who live in slum areas in big cities of other countries in the middle - Eastern region. For example, in 1964, 45% of the population of Onkara, 21% population of Estanbul, and 18% of the population of Ezmir, the three big cities in Turkey lived in slum areas. In the same period in Iraq, in the capital city of Baghdad 20% of the population lived in
slums. One-third of the population of Karachi, one of the big cities of Pakistan lived in shanty towns.\textsuperscript{26}

In Iran also, shanty towns and slum areas are undeniable facts.

In Iran the slum phenomenon has not got a long historical background. Several studies in various cities show that the history of slum areas goes back to 1951 but its intensive growth took place during the period of 1967 to 1971. This was in fact the period of rapid growth of industries in Iran.

Various studies prove that the slum inhabitants are usually the rural migrant families who due to the economic problems or intolerable conditions of the villages had left their homes and came to settle in the industrial cities. The non-availability of facilities and accommodations in the cities forced emigrants to stay in slums in the periphery of the industrial cities.

There were two factors as the main forces behind the growth of shanty towns and slums in the Iranian industrial cities. These two factors are:

i) Constant emigration from rural to urban areas,

ii) the high rate of fertility among slum dwellers.
Alonso discusses, "The mechanism of feed-back and information flow are reflected in migration residential distribution in cities. Rural migrants often settle in clusters in shelters of poor quality on the periphery of cities. "Those who live in one or several of these clusters come from the same village or its adjacent area. They may belong to a tribe, a kinship, or extended family whose members had moved, and their act is followed by others."  

These migrants usually lived in a house which was built in one day with a very poor raw materials like, cardboard, used tins, dust, sun dried bricks. Table 5.6 indicates the number of these houses in some of the industrial cities of Iran in 1976. It is said that usually two families lived in each house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of uncommon residential units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tehran</td>
<td>5,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esfahan</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiraz</td>
<td>1,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahwaz</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerman</td>
<td>1,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore as it is shown in Table 5.6, most of the migrants gathered around the industrial cities of Iran.

It was not only urban industries which failed to absorb the waves of new-comers, but other sectors as well. Housing shortage, for example, was a huge problem in cities yet the building industry was not even able to produce enough new houses to keep the housing situation in cities from worsening. The housing shortage in urban areas at the beginning of the 4th development plan (1967) was about 700,000 units, which 5 years later (1972) increased to 1,100,000 units (5th Development Plan 1973-77), Plan Organization Publication, P. 641). The direct effect of this increase was the aggravation of the existing problem of over-crowding in dwellings.

In 1967 the average number of people staying in one dwelling unit was 7.7, but in 1972 it increased to 8.5 (5th Development Plan, 1973-77 Plan Organization).

In connection with the problem of over-crowding in urban dwellings, one should note, the high rents, which swallow 25% to 50% of the urban household budget (Etelaate, Aban 28, 1973).

The shortage was not confined to houses: There were great shortages in the field of health, education, culture, etc.
SUMMARY:

The preceding analysis deals with the impact of industrialization on the process of migration in Iran.

1. At the outset, we have discussed the meaning of migration, then we have proceeded to the discussion of different push factors affecting migration from rural areas to urban areas. In this context we have analysed the following push factors:

a) Agricultural and Productive Co-operatives, affecting migration.

b) Agro-business affecting the movement of the people from rural to urban areas.

c) Government's protection of industrial products against agricultural produces affecting the physical mobility of masses.

2. For an understanding of the nature and trends of migration in Iran we have also focussed our attention on different pull factors operating on Iranian society. They are:
a) Inadequate distribution of wealth in relation to rural and urban areas.

b) Attraction of the rich city and city lights.

c) Facilities available for self employment, like vendors, hawkers, etc., in the cities.

d) Protection of urban economy against rural economy.

3. We have also analysed one of the major consequences of migration in modern industrial city i.e. the emergence of the phenomenon of slums.
REFERENCES


6. Ibid., P.1.

8. Mohammed Alizadeh & Kazem Kazerouni. 'Mohajerat va Shahrneshini Dar Iran', 'Migration and Urbanization in Iran' Translated from Persian to English, Plan and Budget Organization, 1985, P. 17.

9. A. Rashid Ibrahim. 'The Influence of Industrialization in Developing Countries' (Cambridge University Overseas Studies Committee, 1965), PP. 187.


11. Ibid., P. 106.


15. Hossein Golabian. 'An Analysis of the Underdeveloped Rural and Nomadic areas of Iran', The Royal Institute of Technology School of Architecture Department of Regional Planning, Stockholm, 1977, P. 30.

17. 'Census of 1966', The Statistical Centre of Iran, 1967, Volume 168, Tehran, Iran.


21. Hossein Golabian. 'An Analysis of the Underdeveloped Rural and Nomadic areas of Iran'. The Royal Institute of Technology School of Architecture Department of Regional Planning, Stockholm, 1977, P. 7.

22. Francis Cherunilam. 'Urbanization in Developing Countries' Himalya Publishing House, Bombay, 1984, P. 49.

23. Ibid., P.49.


27. William Alonso. 'The form of Cities in Developing countries'.