



|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Title      | Structural Changes and Formation of Rusta-shahr in Post-Revolutionary Rural Society in Iran |
| Author(s)  | Suzuki, Hitoshi   |
| Citation   | IDE Discussion Paper. No. 19. 2004.12   |
| Issue Date | 2004-12   |
| URL        | <a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2344/187">http://hdl.handle.net/2344/187</a>                 |
| Rights     |   |

**IDE-JETRO** 日本貿易振興機構 (ジェトロ)  
アジア経済研究所

Discussion Papers are preliminary materials circulated  
to stimulate discussions and critical comments

DISCUSSION PAPER No. 19

Structural Changes and Formation  
of *Rūstā-shahr* in Post-Revolutionary  
Rural Society in Iran\*

Hitoshi SUZUKI\*\*  
December 2004

**Abstract**

The following paper is based on the author's two-year research and fieldwork in Iran and examines the process of political and social changes since the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and the subsequent impact of the Iran-Iraq War of 1980-88. This paper focuses on the transition of traditional, small villages into *rūstā-shahr* or small rural cities and the first and second nation-wide elections of *shourā* or councils which were the first steps toward self-government. The author is guardedly optimistic regarding this democratic process but warns of possible future social unrest if changes are not more "balanced" between cities and rural areas and if the employment needs of the burgeoning younger generation are not met, political and social consequences may be catastrophic.

**Keywords:** Iran, rural society, social transformation, local election.

---

\* Persian Version of of this paper will soon be published in *Iran-nameh*.

\*\* Assistant Director, Middle Eastern Studies Group, Area Studies Center, IDE  
(h\_suzuki@ide.go.jp)

The Institute of Developing Economies (IDE) is a semigovernmental, nonpartisan, nonprofit research institute, founded in 1958. The Institute merged with the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) on July 1, 1998. The Institute conducts basic and comprehensive studies on economic and related affairs in all developing countries and regions, including Asia, Middle East, Africa, Latin America, Oceania, and East Europe.

---

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute of Developing Economies of any of the views expressed.

---

**INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPING ECONOMIES (IDE), JETRO**  
**3-2-2, WAKABA, MIHAMA-KU, CHIBA-SHI**  
**CHIBA 261-8545, JAPAN**

©2004 by Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO

## Foreword

The last election of Iranian National Congress (*Majles-e shourā-ye eslāmī*) clearly proved to be one of the main turning points in Iranian political process in recent years. President Khātāmī's seven year-old mission for Iranian democratization process by their own finally lost its effectiveness and ended its historical role.

Referring to the past, Seyyed Mohammed Khātāmī was elected as President of Iran in May of 1997 with a sensationally high percentage of support (about 60%) of the Iranian people, which apparently showed that the Iranian people were eager for political reform and even four years later the support of the people was proven again when he was re-elected for a second term.

Was this process for democratization only a superficial phenomenon or did it reflect some drastic changes from deep inside Iranian society?

During these twenty five to thirty years which included the era of the 1979 revolution, the eight year-long war against Iraq, and the reconstruction and democratization processes in its aftermath, Iranian society has experienced a kind of drastic transformation, which completely changed its traditional urban-rural structures. In the traditional Iranian society, typical landlords (*mālek* in Persian) were the ones mostly residing in cities, and they were free to sell their village lands and the people together as an organic unit of their wealth.

After two years of recent field research, I am now confident that the recent formation and articulation of small rural cities, which I would like to refer to as *rūstā-shahr*<sup>1</sup>, meaning village-city, have made the traditional village society and local system mostly outdated.

The word *rūstā-shahr* is a newly introduced word to the Persian language which

---

<sup>1</sup> About this term of *rūstā-shahr* I was first suggested by Dr. Mohammad Javād Zāhedī of Payām-e Noor University when I was just starting to carry out a series of fieldworks in Iran from 1999 to 2001. Also I want to express my gratitude to Prof. Mohammad Rezā Nasīrī and other staffs for accepting me as visiting fellow and making my field study possible.

was originally a translation from the French corresponding most probably to *cit  rurale*, which is used in contrast with *cit  urbaine*. Although basically a sociological term, most Iranian speakers tend to comprehend its meaning as a situation in-between a city and a village. The term *shahrak*, meaning small city, could also be used, but as *shahrak* includes newly constructed areas inside big cities like Tehr n, Mashad, or Esfah n, I prefer to use the word *r st -shahr* here.

### 1. Statistical facts showing new trends

Now I would like the reader to take a glance at some statistical data of Iran which point out some overall trends of long-term changes in Iranian population structure. **Tables 1 and 2** show some aspects of the city-village structure of Iran in 1956, at the time of the 1<sup>st</sup> national census of Iran. Needless to say, at this time in history Iranian society was clearly divided between cities and villages, plus there was a rapidly declining nomadic society.

In other words there was a clear definition of cities and villages at that time, having a borderline of 5,000 inhabitants. This means that the places with more than 5,000 inhabitants were nominally called cities (*shahr* in Persian), and others were defined as villages (*r st *). But as early as 1976, there appeared six cities with the populations between 2,000 and 5,000 (See **Table 3**). The definition of the cities (*shahr* in Persian) at that time was “places with a population greater than 5,000, or the administrative center of township (*shahrest n*).” The main trend at this stage was the increase in the number of the relatively big cities exceeding 20,000 inhabitants, together with the increase of population itself in those cities. But as the year 1976 was just three years before the revolution, unfortunately the census results of that year were not completed precisely enough.

Next we can see in the 1986 census results (See **Tables 4 and 5**) that seven years after the revolution there is already appearing a new trend, bringing about some obscurity and ambiguity in the division and definition of city and village. Now there is

no clear distinction between small cities and big villages, and it is becoming only a matter of administrative decision. At the time of this census the definition of cities according to the size of population was abandoned, and a city is a city only because it is the place where the mayor and municipality are appointed.

This trend is becoming more apparent in the recent census of the year 1996 (See **Tables 6, 7, and 8**). Now in the 1996 census we find 1727 villages with more than 2,000 inhabitants, and ten villages with population of more than 20,000. In the category of a city also there are 83 cities with less than 5,000 inhabitants, and thirteen so-called cities with less than 2,000 inhabitants, which are located mostly in the borderland areas.

So today the number of cities and villages with a population of 2,000 to 20,000 is over 2,000, and the inhabitants of those places are numbering well over 9 million, constituting some 15.6% of the whole population in Iran and far surpassing the population of Tehran (11.3%). Without a doubt, this newly appearing element of population is strongly affecting the whole structure of Iranian society, and here I want to refer to this stratum of society as the *rūstā-shahr*.

Of course in the use of such statistical data we must be as careful as possible because the reliability is not so high especially in the early census results, but still general trends can be traced from them, and we must not neglect the social facts which are reflected and indicated in these numbers. Also it has always been pointed out that there exist some serious difficulties in using these data for deciding the real sizes of each village community, because in some cases the census workers may treat several villages as one village.

## **2. Some field study findings**

While staying in Iran for two years from 1999 till 2001 with this general view of the Iranian society in mind, I conducted extensive field research on small rural cities which we call *rūstā-shahr* in the provinces of Ardabīl, Āzerbāijān-e Gharbī,

Āzerbāijān-e Sharqī, Būshehr, Esfahān, Fārs, Hamedān, Hormozgān, Khorāsān, Khūzestān, and Sīstān va Balūchestān. I basically omitted the coastal area of the Caspian Sea, because these provinces have relatively different social and structural conditions from other places.

At the first stage I visited more than 160 small cities to get some general views and ideas on *rūstā-shahr*, or newly emerging village-cities in Iran. Then I selected about ten points in three regions of the provinces of Esfahān<sup>2</sup>, Āzerbāijān-e Sharqī<sup>3</sup> and Khūzestān<sup>4</sup>. In this second stage I conducted additional intensive field studies, and tried to comprehend the reasons, ways, and conditions in the development of the *rūstā-shahr*.

Now as a part of my initial two year field study, I would like to indicate several points I recognized during my fieldwork. The first point is the main reasons and conditions for the shaping of these *rūstā-shahr*'s or rural small-size cities as we observe them today. Two things were obviously crucial to this effect: namely the 1979 revolution and the nation-wide war against Iraq. The origin of the major changes of Iranian rural societies are generally said to go back to the 1960's<sup>5</sup>, when the late Mohammad Rezā Shāh conducted the so-called "White Revolution," of which the land reform was the most important part.

But if there had not been the revolution in 1979, or the following war which had an enormous effect on the whole state and society of Iran, it would never have been possible that the following social process should lead to the situation as we see today. These days in every *rūstā-shahr*, which are cities and villages with the population of

---

<sup>2</sup> Lenj, Khūlenjān and Ādergān, which were recently integrated into one city of Zībā-shahr, located near the city of Mobāreke, plus Varzane which is located near Gavkhūnī region.

<sup>3</sup> Torkamanchāy and Some`-oriyā, located near the city of Miyāne.

<sup>4</sup> Qar`e-Seyyed, Shamsābād, Shahrak-e Towhīd and Anjīrak, all located near the city of Dezfūl.

<sup>5</sup> About main discussions on Iranian rural society in Japan, see my "Book Review on Akira Goto's *State and Rural Society in the Middle East: Villages in the Light of Modern Iranian History* (in Japanese)," *AJAMES*, 19-1 (2003), pp.207-212.

2,000 to 20,000, you can hear people saying that the situation has drastically changed during these twenty to thirty years, intending to say that their life has changed from traditional village life style to a cleaner, healthier, easier, or overall “better” life. In other words their life style has gradually shifted in these twenty to thirty years to a more urban life style. Probably the most significant changes in Iranian rural society may be that there can hardly be found any traditional village life represented by *qal`e* or castle-like walls surrounding and defending villages<sup>6</sup>.

The only typical *qal`e* from among the places I visited which was more or less still in use was Qal`e Qūrtān near Varzane, where only two or three families were living inside. The wall remained in relatively good condition, but one part was seriously damaged. According to its inhabitants, the wall was broken in early 1960’s by Shah’s army. The situation is completely different in Afghanistan, where *qal`e*’s are mostly still in use as the general living places for villagers. If we take into consideration the increase of population which is much the same pace as in Iran, this contrast is all the more striking.<sup>7</sup>

The second point is the diversity of the background situation of each of the *rūstā-shahr*’s. It seems that there is some diversity according to vast regions on the national level, but even in small regions the diversity is very wide in some cases. Here I would like to use the example of the three villages near Dezfūl. As this region was near the war-front with Iraq, the damaging effect from the war-time is still observable everywhere. For example, there are still a number of refugee camps from the time of the war against Iraq. During Shāh’s regime, several villages surrounding Dezfūl were integrated with governmental programs and developed as model regions of large-scale farms. These villages are still continuing their development by themselves.

The component of four villages of Qar`e-Seyyed, Shamsābād, Shahrak-e Towhīd

---

<sup>6</sup> See for example A.K.S.Lambton, *Landlord and Peasant in Persia*, London, 1953.

<sup>7</sup> I visited Afghanistan in November 2003 and observed several *qal`e*’s which are completely in use in a way between Chārikār and Bāmiyān

and Anjīrak which I visited are located very near to each other in such a region. But although recently there are discussions about the integration of three villages excluding the neighboring Anjīrak, their historical, economical, and cultural backgrounds are seemingly very different. We can see how different these villages are from the short chronology (**Table 9**) which I made during my stay in January 2001.

*Rūstā-shahr*'s near Ahwaz and Bushehr also have their own character according to their locations. Some *rūstā-shahr*'s surrounding Būshehr are cropping *khormā* (date) or *tanbākū* (tobacco for water pipe) as a single crop, or rather cultivate several crops according to their conditions. There are also several *rūstā-shahr*'s growing as bed-towns of central cities, or becoming small centers themselves in other cases.

### 3. Categorization of several *rūstā-shahr*'s

In my observation, we can categorize several types of *rūstā-shahr* according to their origins and characters. First, we can recognize places which have more or less the character of a historical city and are somewhat different from original villages. Then among historical cities also there seems to be two types, one being developing cities and the other being declining ones.

But here we include only developing historical cities and original villages in the category of *rūstā-shahr*. Now we are re-defining the term *rūstā-shahr* excluding the declining historical cities, although they also have a population of 2,000 to 20,000. Of course there must be some clear-cut differences between developing historical cities and cities recently developed from villages.

Next we can recognize again those *rūstā-shahr*'s according to their main factors in the increase of population. Here I propose to categorize them into four "ideal types." (1) Agricultural *rūstā-shahr*'s, (2) Commercial *rūstā-shahr*'s, (3) Industrial *rūstā-shahr*'s, and (4) Governmental *rūstā-shahr*'s.

(1) Agricultural *rūstā-shahr*'s are the places which have developed because of their superior conditions for agriculture, especially water-supply. (2) Commercial

*rūstā-shahr's* have locational advantages, in most cases access to main roads. This advantage is always crucial for trade activities. (3) Industrial *rūstā-shahr's* must have some industrial facilities for some reasons, which are in most cases due to investment by governmental or semi-governmental institutions. (4) Governmental *rūstā-shahr's* are also places where some governmental or infrastructural facilities are located, like regional governmental offices, post offices or telephone offices.

This categorization mostly refers to factors or triggers for the development of each *rūstā-shahr's*, but of course the individual process of population shifts and the shaping of small, regional center-periphery relations are much more diverse and complex. In most of the cases several factors are mixed and inter-related in specific ways. Lastly, it must be emphasized that in my observations the factor of personal leadership seemed to be crucial in each of the cases of the development of *rūstā-shahr's*.

#### **4. Some observations on the second local *shourā* election**

In February of 1999, the nationwide local election for committees of cities and villages (*shourā-ye eslāmī* in Persian) was held for the first time in the modern history of the Iranian state. This was in a sense a conscious response from Iranian government towards changing social conditions, and in my observation it has proved to be very meaningful and influential at least for a number of cities and villages although several limitations were also apparent.

As to the second nationwide local election held in 2003, I have some different impressions from general analyses by major Iranian newspapers which were mainly based on results in Tehran and other big cities. I had a chance to observe this election in the two *rūstā-shahr's* of Varzane and Zībā-shahr near Esfahān, and my general impression was that the smaller cities and villages you visit, you can find that the election was conducted more seriously. In a sense it is very natural because from the outset, the elections were targeted for the development and well-being of small and remote cities and villages.

Here I wish to elaborate more on the details of the second *shourā* election in Zībā-shahr (meaning “beautiful city” in Persian), a typical *rūstā-shahr* situated near Mobāreke, Esfahān Province. I don’t think anyone would identify this small city by name because it was only formulated on the 24th of July, 2002, integrating three former villages of Lenj, Khūlenjān and Ādergān.

Recently in these years there is some tendency towards formulating new cities by integrating nearby villages in Iran because by becoming cities they can get several privileges including an official budget offered from government. But here in the case of Zībā-shahr, the second election became all the more serious because the five seats of *shourā* means only one third of fifteen seats for the three former villages. The corresponding three districts (*mahall* in Persian) which constitute this city are still rivals and are competing keenly with each other for political leadership in every decision of this newly-born city. For years there have existed serious discussions and disputes on the name of new city. In Khūlenjān the strong opinion among its people was to attach its “historical” name to the new city, but people in Lenj and especially in Ādergān were generally against it. At one time they proposed to choose “Zāyande-shahr” as an alternative, but it was officially rejected by the regional government “because the name of the river Zāyande Rūd is not to be used only for one city.” At last, the very simple and ordinary name of Zībā-shahr was offered from above, and for the villagers there was no other choice but to accept it.

In the second election from the starting point it was clear that Khūlenjān was at an advantage, because of the size of its population. So several residents of rivaling Ādergān district got very serious, and at last they organized a kind of political group with the name of *e`telāf`e sabz*<sup>8</sup>, meaning “Green League,” in cooperation with some Lenj inhabitants. Their tactic for election was to campaign for their supporters to vote for all five candidates from *e`telāf`e sabz*, namely Ebrahim Rahimi, Farj-o-llah

---

<sup>8</sup> They explained to me that the naming of *e`telāf`e sabz* has no relation with a political group in Tehran having the same name at that time.

Nazariyān and Hamādrezā Bakhshiyān from Lenj, plus Mortezā Nāderī and Hosein Mohammadī from Ādergān.

The immediate result of the election is shown in **Table 10**, and it is clear that the Khūlenjān side almost won getting four seats out of five. The only exception was the first winner Ebrāhīm Rahīmī from Lenj district, but he was the core member of *e`telāf-e sabz*, so naturally his position got very serious after the declaration of the result.

At first he pretended to resign, but in the end he accepted to become a member of the new *shourā-ye eslāmī-ye Zībā-shahr*. It is my understanding that he is a typical negotiator and compromiser. The second winner, Mohammad Bāqerī from Khūrenjān, is more straight-forward in character. He was the main person to call for adopting the name of Khūlenjān to the new city. He had been elected as the fifth winner for the first *shurā* election of Khūlenjān, so apparently it was only after that election that he appeared to the residents as an able and anxious leader of the community. He is still young in his thirties, and my personal impression is that if he learns to behave more moderately in accordance with other districts, he will surely become a promising leader for this region in the future.

## 5. Conclusion

Now everywhere in Iran you will find representatives of cities or villages who are directly elected from the inhabitants, namely members of the committee or *a`zā-e shourā-ye eslāmī*. Of course it is true that there existed a previous screening for being the candidates at the time of election, but still we cannot deny the importance of the fact that the direct election was really held in almost every city and village in Iran.

In every *rūstā-shahr* I visited, one of the basic problems they declared was the absolute shortage of employment for the younger generations. We understand that some of the main problems and obstacles of today's Iranian society are clearly seen in the situations of *rūstā-shahr*.

It is my understanding that the difficulties of most of the *rūstā-shahr*'s are deeply

rooted in their basic conditions. In short, they are neither villages nor cities. In other words, they already “grew up from the state of villages,” but they still haven’t reached the level of cities. This means that they are in a fragile situation in the nation-wide transition process which will continue for years.

Generally speaking, after the revolution Iranian policy toward rural society raised the bottom level of the most remote villages. Especially important were the improvements in the fields of education, health, medical conditions, birth-control since the last years of the war against Iraq, pavement of roads, expansion of electricity, water supply, etc.

The most effective policy of the Revolutionary Leader Khomeinī in this regard was the policy toward so-called “depressed” or *mostaz`afān*, including the establishment of the *Jihād sāzandegī* (Sacred Army of Reconstruction), which has now merged with the former Ministry of Agriculture under the name of the Ministry of Jihād Agriculture. Contrary to most of the city dwellers who did not get privileges, we find more popular supporter in the rural areas because they got most of the fruits of the “victory of the revolution.”

But again we must understand that the present government is facing fundamental challenges from the rural societies which they themselves brought about, consciously or unconsciously. The difficulties that Iranian rural society is facing are mostly difficulties of the newly appearing civil society. The central government must truly consider the nation-wide balance in its developments for the future. The huge growing population and employment needs of the younger generation are so urgent that if the present government doesn’t succeed in developing new policies, the results could be catastrophic and counter-effective.

In this regard the recent tendency of the political center in Tehran towards so-called moderate conservatism will undoubtedly bring about some serious tensions with newly appearing political awakenings towards democratization in most of the small centers in rural areas all over Iran, which I call *rūstā-shahr*.

**Table 1** Number of "Villages" in 1956 Census

| Population      | Villages | Percentage |
|-----------------|----------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 48609    | 99.03%     |
| 2000-5000       | 445      | 0.97%      |
| 5000-20000      | 0        | 0.00%      |
| More than 20000 | 0        | 0.00%      |
| Total           | 49054    | 100.00%    |

Source: Vezārat-e keshvar-e Irān, *Gozāresh-e kholāse-ye sarshomārī-ye omūmī-ye keshvar dar sāl-e 1335*, jeld-e avval.

**Table 2** Number of "Cities" in 1956 Census

| Population      | Cities | Percentage |
|-----------------|--------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 0      | 0.0%       |
| 2000-5000       | 0      | 0.0%       |
| 5000-20000      | 136    | 73.1%      |
| More than 20000 | 50     | 26.9%      |
| Total           | 186    | 100.0%     |

Source: Same as Table 1.

**Table 3** Number of "Cities" in 1976 Census

| Population      | Cities | Percentage |
|-----------------|--------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 0      | 0.0%       |
| 2000-5000       | 6      | 1.6%       |
| 5000-20000      | 260    | 69.7%      |
| More than 20000 | 107    | 28.7%      |
| Total           | 373    | 100.0%     |

Source: Markaz-e āmārī-ye Irān, *Sarshomārī-ye omūmī-ye nofūs va maskan, 1355*, Kolle keshvar.

**Table 4** Number of "Villages" in 1986 Census

| Population     | Villages | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| 1-2000         | 63850    | 97.70%     |
| 2000-5000      | 1305     | 2.00%      |
| More than 5000 | 194      | 0.30%      |
| Total          | 65349    | 100.00%    |

Source: Markaz-e āmār-e Irān, *Sarshomārī-ye omūmī-ye nofūs va maskan, 1365*, Farhang-e rūstā'ī.

**Table 5** Number of "Cities" in 1986 Census

| Population      | Cities | Percentage |
|-----------------|--------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 8      | 1.6%       |
| 2000-5000       | 64     | 12.9%      |
| 5000-20000      | 225    | 45.4%      |
| More than 20000 | 187    | 37.7%      |
| Total           | 496*   |            |

\* 3 cities with population of less than 100 were omitted. There are 9 cities whose populations are not released. Most of them are situated near the war-front.

Source: Same as Table 4.

**Table 6** Numbers of "Villages" And Their Inhabitants in 1996 Census

| Population      | Villages | Percentage | Inhabitants | Percentage |
|-----------------|----------|------------|-------------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 66395    | 97.46%     | 16648060    | 72.30%     |
| 2000-5000       | 1493     | 2.19%      | 4315859     | 18.74%     |
| 5000-20000      | 224      | 0.32%      | 1723626     | 7.48%      |
| More than 20000 | 10       | 0.01%      | 338748      | 1.47%      |
| Total           | 68122    | 100.00%    | 23026293    | 100.00%    |

Source: Markaz-e āmār-e Irān

**Table 7** Numbers of "Cities" And Their Inhabitants in 1996 Census

| Population      | Cities | Percentage | Inhabitants | Percentage |
|-----------------|--------|------------|-------------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 13     | 2.12%      | 15315       | 0.04%      |
| 2000-5000       | 70     | 11.43%     | 270391      | 0.73%      |
| 5000-20000      | 287    | 46.89%     | 3039008     | 8.25%      |
| More than 20000 | 242    | 39.56%     | 33493075    | 90.98%     |
| Total           | 612    | 100.00%    | 36817789    | 100.00%    |

Source: Same as Table 6.

**Table 8** Numbers of "Cities," "Villages" And Their Inhabitants in 1996 Census

| Population      | C & V | Percentage | Inhabitants | Percentage |
|-----------------|-------|------------|-------------|------------|
| 1-2000          | 66408 | 96.62%     | 16663375    | 27.84%     |
| 2000-5000       | 1563  | 2.27%      | 4586250     | 7.66%      |
| 5000-20000      | 511   | 0.74%      | 4762634     | 7.96%      |
| More than 20000 | 252   | 0.37%      | 33831823    | 56.54%     |
| Total           | 68734 | 100.00%    | 59844082    | 100.00%    |

Source: Compiled from Tables 6 and 7.

**Table 9** Chronology of Qar`e-Seyyed, Shamsābād, Shahrak-e Towhīd and Anjīrak

| Date                      | Incident   |
|---------------------------|--|
| more than 1,000 years ago | Shaping of village Ein-ol-shams, today's Shamsābād. At that time this region was a center of Medical Science. Ya`kub Re'is dies in this village. Cf. Siyāh Mansūl and Qal`e Robb are also old villages in this region. |
| about 200 years ago       | Islamization of this region.   |
| 1962-63                   | Qal`e Seyyed is settled, named after its landlord's title. Shāh's "White Revolution." Sherkat-e Irān va Āmrīkā (a company from California, USA) enters Shamsābād. Large farming program in Dezfūl region starts.       |
| 1968                      | Village Khalte (today's Shahrak-e Towhīd) with Bakhtiyārī inhabitants is settled.  |
| 1972                      | Last year for rice cultivation in Shamsābād.   |
| 1979                      | Islamic Revolution. Village Anjīrak is settled about this time with Bakhtiyārī inhabitants.  |
| 1980-88                   | War against Iraq. Rapid increase of population, pouring of war-refugees from Dezfūr, especially into Shamsābād. Increase of Arab population.   |
| 1997                      | Discussions about integration of Qar`e-Seyyed, Shamsābād and Shahrak-e Towhīd start.   |
| 2001                      | Discussions about separation of Dezfūl Province from Afwāz Province continue. Integration of 3 villages into a city or their inclusion to Dezfūl is seemingly related to its result.                                   |

Source: Information obtained from inhabitants of the villages and arranged by the author.

**Table 10 Ziba-shahr: Result of 2nd shoura election, 2003.2.28**

| Ranking | Name                                | District ( <i>mahall</i> ) | Poll |
|---------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| 1st     | Ebrahim Rahimi*                     | Lenj                       | 1394 |
| 2nd     | Mohammad Baqeri (son of Fathollah)  | Khulenan                   | 1338 |
| 3rd     | Sadeq Ja`fari                       | Khulenan                   | 1329 |
| 4th     | Vali-o-llah Mo`menzade              | Khulenan                   | 1099 |
| 5th     | Mohammad Baqeri (son of Yad-o-llah) | Khulenan                   | 1055 |
| 6th     | Dariush Ghazanfarpur                | Khulenan                   | 1037 |
| 7th     | Farj-o-llah Nazariyan*              | Lenj                       | 924  |
| 8th     | Hamidreza Bakhshiyani*              | Lenj                       | 827  |
| 9th     | Vali-o-llah Shafi`zade              | Khulenan                   | 804  |
| 10th    | Morteza Naderi*                     | adegan                     | 744  |
| 11th    | Mohammad`ali Musavi                 |                            | 718  |
| 12th    | Rahmat-o-llah Mohammadi             |                            | 636  |
| 13rd    | Ne`mat-o-llah Mohammadi             | adegan                     | 556  |
| 14th    | Hosein Mohammadi*                   | adegan                     | 523  |
| 15th    | Hosein Nazariyan                    |                            | 515  |
| 16th    | Hasan Khademi                       | adegan                     | 499  |
| 17th    | Esmail Mohammadi                    | adegan                     | 477  |
| 18th    | Mohammad Mardani                    | Lenj                       | 333  |
| 19th    | `Abd-o-llah Ebrahimi                | Lenj                       | 331  |
| 20th    | `Abbas Musavi                       | Baghmalek                  | 253  |
| 21st    | Hosein Baqeri                       | Khulenan                   | 201  |
| 22nd    | Hasan Karimi                        | Lenj                       | 136  |
| 23rd    | Mas`ud Ebrahimi                     | Lenj                       | 95   |

\* = members of e telaf-e sabz

Source: Official declaration by shahrdari of Ziba-shahr