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Eric J. Hooglund’s _Land and Revolution in Iran, 1960-1980_, 1960-1980 is a valuable addition to the growing literature on the Iranian countryside. Few western authors have undertaken the research demanded to write an up-to-date, comprehensive account of the Iranian peasantry. Only studies by A.K.S. Lambton, _Landlord and Peasant in Persia_ (1969) and _The Persian Land Reform, 1962-1966_ (1969), Nikki Keddie’s _Historical Obstacles to Agrarian Change in Iran_ (1960), and a few articles in edited collections, have been written on this important subject.

Hooglund’s stated objective is to evaluate “the land reform’s social, economic, and political impact upon rural Iran in general” (p. x). The introductory chapters provide the non-specialist with an introduction to the rural setting and the many divisions within agrarian society, while also examining the actual implementation of the land reform law of January 9, 1962. In Part I Hooglund identifies different layers of authority. At the top there are large landowners, whom he subdivides into individual and institutional owners and renters. Next are the large landowners’ representatives, the Mubashirs and village headmen Kadkhudas, who were “relatively free to behave arbitrarily with the peasants” (p. 16), and who were generally supported by the government. He divides villagers into two main categories: peasant villagers who possessed the right to cultivate (the Nasaq), and the Khwushnishins, a heterogeneous class comprising some forty percent of the villagers. Hooglund subdivides the Khwushnishins into a group of tradesmen and creditors, a larger group, which provided non-agricultural products; and a majority, which constituted the rural proletariat. (pp. 17-22) Hooglund believes that the elite of Khwushnishins held an intermediate position between the landlords and the peasant villagers who had the Nasaq. He concludes that all peasants were relatively powerless and that their major concern was to avoid a worsening situation. (p. 35)

An important feature of this volume is Hooglund’s brief survey of the historical background of Iranian land reform. He points out how such reform was advocated as early as the Constitutional Revolution of 1905-1911, but was successfully resisted by powerful landed interests. Hooglund makes plain in his central thesis that what made the 1962 land law possible was the deliberate effort of the central government to break the power base of the large landlords in order to extend effective governmental authority to the countryside, and to create a new base of popular support for the regime. A second major area explored by the author concerns the actual implementation of the program of land reform.
Hooglund offers an analysis of the difficulties and ultimate failure of the program. The majority of peasants (75%) obtained less than enough land for subsistence living. Hooglund argues that as a result of the failure of the land reform program, the government did not achieve its political goal of gaining rural support, and ‘‘the majority of villagers were unprepared to support the Shah’’ in 1978 and 1979. (p. 148)

Although few will disagree with Professor Hooglund’s conclusions, his writings contain a discrepancy. In Land and Revolution he identifies three phases of land reform (pp. 55-73), but in his earlier article, ‘‘Rural and Socio-Economic Organization in Transition: The Case of Iran’s Buneh,’’ in Continuity and Change in Modern Iran (Suny Press, 1981), p. 161, he mentions four distinct phases. He provides no explanation for the revision in his more recent work. Furthermore, the preface, contents, and illustrations of the volume suggest that Hooglund concentrated his field research in central and southwestern Iran where the agricultural patterns differ from those in the North, particularly in the Caspian Sea strip. His generalizations may therefore not apply to the country as a whole. Nevertheless, the primary sources and field research that Hooglund does include make Land and Revolution a much welcomed study.

Farrokh Moshiri
University of Kansas


Perhaps no area of medieval studies has been as neglected over the years as women’s history. Despite increased interest during the past decade, the fundamental economic and social status of women, particularly in the early Middle Ages remains largely unknown. Angela Lucas’ survey attempts to remedy this problem in several areas, among them, religion, marriage, and letters. It is unfortunate, however, that the book is largely derivative in nature, betraying the promise of its title by focusing primarily on women in English vernacular literature.

Important weaknesses of the book lie in the author’s prejudices in subject and sources. In the preface she admits that her fundamental focus on England and its vernacular literature serves as the paradigm for discussion throughout the work (p.xi). Continental sources, such as Gregory of Tours, do appear from time to time, but always as a sidelight to England. The author also juxtaposes sources as if historical context