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ABSTRACT
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May 2018, 255 pages

Cities operate simultaneously as a presupposition and an outcome of each mode of production in each period of history and hence city is the very first ground where major socio-economic and political relations find geographical materialization. City and its urban forms, then, are closely tied up with dominant strategies of production, reproduction and transformation of space. In this regard, modernization strategies of ruling powers are of significant importance that lay foundation for further urban development. If modernization programs of the city are mainly favorable to be implemented in the areas with high rate of profit and are oriented to serve the needs of specific interest groups rather than rest of the society, they can bring about uneven urban development. Indeed, uneven development is social inequality manifests itself at the spatial level. So long as this uneven urban development proceeds and roles as the predominant pattern of development, the socio-spatial disparities between different areas of the urban space will be intensified. The areas with locational advantages will continue to grow at a rate faster than other areas and production of luxury means for consumption of the very high-city residents will be at the agenda; while basic needs of the low-city residents cannot be fulfilled. Consequently, areas of concentrated disadvantages as areas of high poverty and their dwellers as urban poor emerge in the society.

From this it follows that while urban experience of modernization process is not the same for all social classes, sometimes development can produce much more poverty.
High levels of urban poverty concentrate in some parts of metropolitan regions peripheralize the residents of such areas both socially and spatially. The continuation of the production and reproduction of such areas of high poverty brings about rising urban inequality in metropolitan regions, which signifies that marginalization of urban poor is almost institutionalized. Drawing on this, it can be claimed that implementing discriminatory modernization programs through facilitating polarized urban development can generate and exacerbate (rather than reduce) urban inequalities and, actually, can be accounted as one of the mechanisms active in perpetuating spatial distribution of poverty.

In this light, this study aims at conducting a critical analysis of impacts of modernization programs came along with the White Revolution of 1963 on low-income residents of Tehran, focusing on its role as bolstering the degree of socio-spatial segregation. Tehran provides an ideal opportunity for such a discussion as a city that was dangerously divided between rich and poor along north-south urban axis particularly in the 1970s. Production and perpetuation of uneveness under urban development that is driven by the logic of capital, state’s attempts in solidifying socio-spatial segregation of different income groups via legitimized institutions such as development projects, reforms and policies, and alienation of the urban poor from development process that in turn could contest the very process of domination and exploitation will be discussed by contextualizing them in Tehran. Of course, hegemonic power of capital and state generally cause limits on what can be done in preventing growing unequal and exclusionary urban spaces; however, even examining a deepening inequality in an urban setting could lead to challenge executed programs and their impacts, and use them as the basis for inventing future in a different way—a future with a more egalitarian pattern of urban form that produces more inclusionary, fair and free urban life experiences for all city dwellers regardless of their social class.

Keywords: urban segregation, uneven urban development, urban poverty/urban poor, Iranian modernization
ÖZ

SOSYO-MEKÂNSAL EŞİTSİZLİKLER: TAHİRAN KENTSEL MEKÂNI İÇİNDE MARJİNALLİK ÜRETIMI
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Bu kavramsal çerçeveden anlaşılacağı üzere, modernleşme sürecin kentsel deneyimi tüm sosyal sınıflar için eşit değildir, bazen büyume daha çok yoksulluk üretebilir. Metropolün belirli bölgelerinde yoğunlaşan yüksek düzeydeki kentsel yoksulluk, bu bölgelerin yerleşimcilerini sosyal ve mekânsal olarak periferize eder. Bu bölgelerdeki yüksek yoksullugun üretim ve yeniden üretiminin sürekliliği, metropolerde kentsel yoksulun marjinalleştirilmesini işaret eden, gün geçtikçe artan ve hemen hemen kurumsallaşmış olan kentsel eşitsizliği beraberinde getirir. Tam da bu noktada, kutuplaştırıcı kentsel büyüyeyi kolaylaştırarak uygulanan ayrım gözetici modernleşme programlarının kentsel eşitsizliği ürettiği ve hızla artırdığı (azaltmak yerine) iddia edilebilir. Ve esasında, modernleşme programlarının yoksullugun mekânsal aynını sürdüren aktif bir mekanizma olduğu düşünülebilir.


Anahtar sözcükler: kentsel ayrışma, eşitsiz kentsel büyüme, kentsel yoksulluk/kentsel yoksul, Iran modernleşmesi
To those, who experience everyday exclusion of urban life…
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since cities are formed through the dominant mode of production, they can be considered as the visible concentration of surplus capital. That is to say, switching capital into built environment is the most accomplished spatial manifestation of capital. Urban development, then, is contingent upon the accumulation of capital and the mobility of capital is the driving force, which determines the course of development. If the mobility of capital is directed by the rate of profit, so while the areas with high rate of profit will be developed, the areas with a low rate of profit will be underdevelopment. Behind the pattern of uneven urban development, indeed, lies this very logic of the mobility of capital. Concentration of capital in the form of large-scale investments, commercial and economic activities in few urban localities is spatial manifestation of uneven urban development. If this uneven urban development goes on and on and turns to be the predominant pattern of development across the urban space, the areas with locational advantages will continue to grow at a rate faster than other areas; this is what generates socio-spatial disparities across the urban space.

Whereas locational advantage, actually, is a kind of socially constructed value that can easily institutionalize a particular area’s supremacy as compared to other areas. The areas with locational advantages, consequently, absorb more economic growth and urban development and become areas with high rate of profit. The flourishing construction and rising price of property widen the socio-spatial gap between high and low-income residents of the city. This ever-rising property price, in turn, functions as a mechanism enhancing and reproducing class-determined fragmentation of the urban space. With regard to the mobility of capital, it seems fairly clear that responsible authorities’ decision-making process defines the urban
experience of citizens. Meanwhile, executing modernization programs that are not homogenous and are mainly set to serve the interests of higher social classes lay the foundation for further uneven pattern of spatial growth. In this regard, the extant polarized urban development in some metropolitan regions can partly be accounted for the unevenness in implementing modernization programs. The process of modernization and ensuing urbanization as occur in developed regions cannot be experienced in other regions with varying level of development. On the one hand, the degree of socio-economic and technological improvement achieved by a country at the time of initiating urbanization and on the other hand the role that such country will play when incorporating into the system of the world market economy are both of significant importance. The transition to globalization, profoundly, alters dynamics of migration and urbanization especially in developing countries. Expansion of each new phase of global capitalism brings about new mode of socio-economic regulations and their outcomes such as uneven spatial development.

As an inevitable stage in the process of urbanization and in order to introduce capitalist relations of production, decomposition of rural society and its related agrarian economic system (Castells’ so-called rural push), very often, occurs in the developing countries. This restructuring of rural society has been achieved through different mechanisms such as transforming means of production and even means of consumption, forced relocation of tribal population, land reforms and so on, all of which lead to influx of migrants into the urbanized areas. Then, the concentration of working-class, labour, means of both production and consumption, services, activities and capital absorb more and more population.

Despite an absolute rise of employment in the service sector, the growing urban labour force could not be fully absorbed into the modern urban economy, since this rural-urban migration is the product of the breakdown of the rural society. The surplus urban labour force (mostly uneducated and unskilled rural migrants who are detached from pre-capitalist forms of production) has to reside on the fringe of the urban areas. This leads to the emergence of urban poor comprised of rural migrants who are now urban unemployed and underemployed. That is to say, the nature of capitalist economic development, decomposition of rural society, and capital-
intensive industrialization in developing countries produce a kind of dependent urbanization; so that one of the negative sides of this dependent urbanization is widespread urban poverty and proliferation of informal settlements.

Within this context, the area that a population lives is closely tied up with the degree that residents can benefit from public infrastructure and services. Living in urban fringes, hence, brings about other deprivations, such as ill-conditioned housing, limited access to public infrastructure, insecurity, unemployment, lack of policing and exclusion from socio-cultural structure of the society. These shortcomings in the equally distribution of means of collective consumption namely housing, transportation, welfare, education, health and so forth are, indeed, direct outcomes of a particular form of spatial organization: uneven urban development. The differential access to public services, the rise in deteriorating living conditions of lower social classes, inflation, inequality in job and income distribution, oppression and poverty are not long-term objectives of development programs; but constitute concrete realities of low-city residents.

This inequality of living standards between low- and high-city residents can be considered as one of the most visible impacts of the uneven development expressed itself at socio-spatial level. Therefore, it can be said that modernization and ensuing urbanization processes if not execute homogenously can have a negative side as well. Ever-rising socio-spatial disparities across the urban space and subsequent distinct experience of urbanism by different income groups are the end product of the mechanism which uneven urban development is its predominant pattern of growth. Such process of urbanization leaves its profound impacts on the most vulnerable class of the society, urban poor, and leads to claim that the urban poor’s alienation in terms of what the process of development is about has the potential to manifest itself at the spatial level as an urban revolt.

In this light, this study aims at conducting a critical analysis of the impacts of modernization programs came along with Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi’s implemented White Revolution in 1963 on low-income residents of Tehran, focusing
on its role as bolstering the degree of socio-spatial segregation. Such a discussion is going to be developed in Tehran, as the city that had borne intense socio-spatial segregation based on economic status of residents within its urban context in the late 1970s and the city that was a very first site for massive anti-state demonstrations that resulted in the 1979 Revolution.

Interestingly, the main route of million-person demonstrations against the state that led to the triumph of the 1979 Revolution was a horizontal urban axis segregating the rich north and poor south across the urban space of Tehran—Shahreza Street. The million-person demonstrations of the 1979 Revolution majorly accomplished along the Shahreza Street toward the Shahyad Square under the grand arch of the Shahyad Monument. Manifestation of the urban discontent of crowds of deprived masses in the Shahreza Street as an edge segregating the rich north and poor south within the larger urban context of Tehran and beside the Shahyad Monument as the spatial manifestation of the Shah’s implemented White Revolution and developments that came along with it, demonstrate that the spaces that have been fashioned as outcomes of dominant structuring can be refashioned and reimagined as main arenas of urban uprisings against the very domination.

The myth of the White Revolution as a reform package and the state’s showcase development projects that had nothing to do with social well-being of lower social classes by modernizing the image of the city, indeed, perpetuated uneven urban development across the urban space of Tehran. That is to say, neither rapid modernization, nor incompatibility of modernization process with the traditional Iranian society, rather this very produced and reproduced uneven development played a crucial role in the 1979 Revolution. Accordingly, it can be claimed that the unjust urban space of Tehran in the 1970s that was fashioned by capitalism, in turn, fashioned an urban revolt against the very produced unevenness.

---

1 The process of modernization under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi reign was majorly associated with Westernization, so that he aimed at modernizing the country in the image of the West. Since throughout the modernization process, the image of the West was considered as the sign of modernity, Western architects and urban planners were commissioned to design and prepare urbanization projects for the capital city, Tehran.
In this perspective, the temporal aspect of the study is chosen regarding the year that Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi launched his White Revolution, 1963, to the 1979 Revolution. The significance of choosing this time span, 1963 to 1979, is in that the White Revolution of 1963 was a series of reforms that had been designed to preempt a Red Revolution; however as the 1979 Revolution occurred, then, clearly this means that advantages brought about by reforms and development programs regardless of the fabric of the society, merely improved the living standards of upper classes. On the other hand, the formation and proliferation of informal settlements on urban fringes of Tehran within this time period signify the deteriorating living conditions of lower classes and the role of the state’s implemented reform package in producing urban crisis in the city.

Hence, within this context, Tehran presents an ideal opportunity for analyzing how legitimizing the marginalization of the lower social classes under the state’s implemented modernization and ensuing urbanization programs could have been done and consequently how the urban poor’s alienation in terms of what the process of development is about could manifest itself at the spatial level as an urban revolt, since the city was dangerously divided between rich north and poor south during the years of turmoil, 1978 and 1979.

1.1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This study aims at conducting a critical analysis of impacts of modernization programs of Tehran on low-income residents, focusing on its role as bolstering the degree of socio-spatial segregation. The main claim of this study is that modernization process under hegemonic command of capital and the state through facilitating polarized urban developments can generate and exacerbate urban inequalities. Indeed, modernization can operate as means to produce and reproduce uneven urban development, which leads to maintenance (and even intensification) of existing socio-spatial segregation. The produced uneven urban development after the modernization scheme is put into effect results in alienating the urban poor in terms of what the process of development and its related advantages is about. The urban poor’s alienation from the promise of development has the potential to manifest itself
at the spatial level as an urban revolt. Accordingly, the aim of this study is to raise a discussion on how modernization programs following the White Revolution of 1963 worsened living conditions of lower social classes in Tehran, which in effect intensified class-determined fragmentation of the city. It is going to be showed how the state via its implemented the White Revolution (as a reform package toward modernization of the country), in fact, brought about production and reproduction of unevenness under urban development; how employing legitimized institutions namely development projects, reforms and policies by the state solidified socio-spatial segregation between different income groups; and how the alienation that the urban poor had to experience regarding development process and its advantages, manifested spatially as an urban uprising with revolutionary potential.

Beyond discussions that mainly revolve around the state’s implemented modernization programs that perpetuated uneven urban development as the predominant pattern of development, introducing a broader understanding of the form that urban discontent of the masses could take, the urban settings that majorly accommodated mass anti-state demonstrations and active agents behind it during the 1979 Revolution are likewise among objectives of this study. Furthermore, association of modernization with westernization as contributed largely to intensify the socio-cultural gap between the urban poor and the rich in Iranian society of 1970s will be also discussed. Modernizing the society in the image of the west and in particular the United States that majorly fascinated the upper classes (since they could afford living in the promoted way), and the more their fascination with westernized way of living developed, the more they became alienated from the rest of society will be examined. In this regard, this study is also concerned about modernizing the capital in the image of the west and its representations across the urban space of Tehran.

In general, such a critical, analytical and descriptive study is going to be built on analysis of socio-political, historical and economic context of the Iranian society in the 1960s and 1970s. The transformation of Tehran into a modern capital that was envisaged by the ruling power via a wave of modernization programs and reforms is to be analyzed with examining involved socio-political agents, which will help to
locate it in its changing context and develop a boarder understanding. In this context, the study will discuss the following questions: How changes subsequent to the modernization process operate within the city bring about urban inequality? What particular spatial patterns and processes characterize uneven urban development across the urban space of Tehran? How modernization programs and reforms implemented by the state function as means to intensify existing socio-spatial segregation? How development process can deteriorate living conditions of lower social classes by producing more socio-spatial constraints? Is it right to concentrate major parts of urban development in few urban localities? Who in society benefits and who suffers from this way of organization of urban space? How alienation of the urban poor in terms of what the process of development is about could manifest itself at the spatial level as an urban revolt? How an urban space that has been fashioned as an outcome of dominant structuring can be refashioned as a main site of urban uprising against the very domination? How an urban setting can be more conducive to mass demonstrations rather than other sites in the city? Is there any socio-spatial organization that helps to bring about equality in the urban space? Is it possible to expect just outcomes to be attained via unjust means? How an alternative urban space with more humane consequences for life can be constructed?

These questions are exceedingly important to be face up to and to be answered. Since if these kinds of questions are answered they lead to reveal hidden facets of modernization and its impacts on further pattern of spatial development that sharpens the existing socio-spatial segregation. Moreover, understanding of one of the mechanisms that produces and reproduces urban inequality in the city is what can hopefully assist in controlling it and achieving a far more egalitarian pattern of the urban form. The understanding of the issue that how the process of modernization and the socio-spatial transformations that come along with it can bring about urban inequality is one significant attempt toward controlling and reducing the extant sharp urban inequalities; producing more just forms of urban development; and integrating urban poor in the society.
1.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study is to be mainly based on Manuel Castells’ standpoint toward the process of urbanization in developing countries, William Julius Wilson’s thesis on correlation between major shifts in socio-economic structure and urban poverty, Neil Smith’s discussion of uneven development and the ‘see-saw’ movement of capital behind it, Andy Merrifield’s arguments about contemporary novel mode of urbanization and David Harvey’s analysis of space, city urbanism and continuous production of uneven geographies under capitalist form of urbanization. Alongside the above-mentioned theoretical bases that form major theoretical frame of this study, analyses that correlate dominant socio-political and economic relations with changing spatial structures such as Henri Lefebvre, Marshall Berman, and Edward Soja’s discussions in this regard will be taken into consideration as well.

One of the major theoretical bases of this study is grounded over what Castells asserts as distinguishable characteristics of the urbanization process in developing countries. Drawing on Castells’ work, examining patterns of urbanization in developing countries must be integrated into the analyses of the degree of dependent development and the role of these countries as incorporating into the system of world market economy. Related to dependent urbanization, concentration of mass of population in the urbanized areas without integrating them into the urban system, lack of employment and public services for new urban masses are of significant important factors that lead to uneven urban hierarchies and highly visible levels of urban inequalities.

Castells argues that one of the main dynamics of urbanization of developing countries is industrialization; but it is not labor-intensive rather capital-intensive industrialization, which is highly dependent upon multinational corporations. Subsequent to urbanization and industrialization started in Iran, a number of modern factories were established in specifically Tehran, then, working class employed in such factories emerges. The state’s strategies of decomposition of rural society and
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the related agrarian economic system in order to introduce capitalist economic system accelerated exodus of rural labor forces to urbanized areas who were mainly attracted to the employment opportunities created by establishing industries. The growing urban labor force could not be fully absorbed into the capital-intensive industry sector and related modern urban economy. Castells considers this surplus urban labor force in the developing countries as “a reserve army for a non-existing industry.” Capital-intensive industrialization results in urbanization without growth, dependent urbanization. Within this context, urbanization continues its pace in spite of soaring urban unemployment, prices and falling real wages, indeed, the significant agent behind it is enforcing policies of agricultural deregulation and de-peasantization. The price of continuation of urbanization in this order will be production of more and more slum areas.

The positive urban population growth when there is a negative urban economic growth indicates that the process of development in the country has not been the outcome of socio-economic and technological progress, so objectives normally expected by industrial development could not be achieved. If there is a correlation between degree of urbanization and economic and technological developments in the developed regions; the same cannot be valid for Iran and in particular Tehran. In the same vein, Castells mentions to a classic analysis which “showing the dependence of the level of urbanization on industrial diversification (indicator of the division of labour), technological development and the plurality of the societies’ external exchanges. The higher these variables, the higher, too, is the percentage of the population in the metropolitan zones.” All of this cannot simply be seen in the process of urbanization of all regions with varying degree of development.

Moreover, the above-mentioned analysis cannot explicate the issue that rate of urban growth in some of the underdeveloped regions is higher than the very rate in the developed regions. Observing the process of urbanization of Iran, also, gives rise to much controversy. “Urbanization changes in Iran have not been caused by the improvement and betterment of economic and social functions and the methods of production; rather they have been caused by the high income gap between economic

sectors and the unavailability of work to rural dwellers.” Inasmuch as, urbanization in Iran has not been occurred subsequent to the socio-economic and technological developments, it concretely invalidates that urbanization is an outcome of economic growth. The same process of urbanization as occur in developed regions cannot be experienced in other regions with varying level of development.

Drawing on Castells’ discussions, then, there can be assumed some common features for the process of urbanization occurs in underdeveloped regions. The concentration of mass of population and major socio-economic activities in urbanized areas, significant social, cultural and economic cleavage between urban and rural societies, confrontation of tradition and modernity even at the spatial level through close location of traditional and modernized areas across the urban space, all are some common features of the urbanization process in underdeveloped regions. Analysis of the process of urbanization in Tehran indicates that Castells’ above-mentioned features could be accounted for Tehran as well. Despite the existence of the common features, however it is necessary to note that the urbanization process of each region is highly influenced by its internal socio-economic, cultural and political agents. This is what Castells refers to as he writes: “At such a level of complexity, it is no longer possible to make general statements and, even for a simple statement of perspectives, we must address ourselves to an analysis of concrete situations.” To this end, throughout the critical analysis of the impacts of modernization and urbanization processes of Tehran on low-income residents, the study’s emphasis will be more on the internal factors as more influencing agents involved in such processes.

In connection with the above-mentioned major changes in the structure of economy as to be accounted for increase in concentration of urban poverty, William Julius Wilson’s thesis will be referred. As one of the most influential theories on urban poverty, he states that shifts in socio-economic structure are of key factors
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6 Op. cit. Castells, Manuel, 1977, Chapter 3, pp. 39-63. Here it is worth mentioning that at the core of the Pahlavi project of modernity was creating images of modernity, which were confronted by some traditional cultural patterns.
7 Ibid, p. 49.
responsible for deteriorating living conditions of lower social classes. He argues that ensuing major shifts occur in public policy and economic base such as transition from manufacturing to the service sector, or decreasing need for low-educated and low-skilled labor force, the standards of living for low-income groups will be worsened. Such deteriorating living conditions of poor residents contribute to the concentration of urban poverty in their neighborhood. As one of the effects of this concentrated poverty is isolation of urban poor socio-spatially from the rest of society.

Delving deeper into Wilson’s argument, he defines two concepts of ‘concentration effects’ and ‘buffer effects’. He argues that concentration of impoverished families in a neighborhood constrains the advantages and opportunities so that the population remains overwhelmingly disadvantaged. A neighborhood in which the impoverished families live is more isolated from rest of the society and is more vulnerable to the impacts of further socio-economic changes. Hence, Wilson states that poverty concentrated in a particular neighborhood highly influences residents’ life chances regardless of their individual characteristics. The urban underclass that he defines as ‘truly disadvantaged’ by living in impoverished neighborhoods could not have ‘equality of life chances’ and this is what criminalizes them more.

In step with Wilson, it can be said that the urban areas of concentrated poverty, inadequate socio-economic conditions of residents of such areas together with their marginalization within the socio-political system of the society, all lead to even predict criminal exposure of dwellers, particularly the youth. Concerning rising crime rates in areas of concentrated disadvantages as areas of high poverty in large cities in Iran, Abrahamian writes: “The abrupt, unplanned and uncontrolled influx of young migrants into the cities had created sprawling shanty towns. These, in turn, had produced a vast social problem with its typical symptoms—prostitution, alcoholism, drug addiction, delinquency, suicides, and of course, a crime wave.”

---

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid, p. 144.
While, according to Wilson’s defined buffer effect, the presence of both middle- and working-class families in a neighborhood (mixed-income neighborhood) through absorbing the full impact and shock of uneven growth and recessions act as an important social buffer.\(^\text{13}\) Thus, economic-based segregation of social groups across the urban space of Tehran that was implemented as a part of development policy of the city by diminishing presence of middle- and upper-income families, in fact, weakened the aforementioned ‘buffer effect’ and made it more difficult for low-income families to maintain the basic amenities within their own neighborhoods. In this light, gradual deterioration of lower-class neighborhoods (southern Tehran) and continuation of the growth of higher-class neighborhoods (northern Tehran) were inevitable, which in turn widened the existing inequality between two poles of the city. Wilson’s work states that marginalization of disadvantaged groups occur because of the ruling power’s employing structural changes and public policies, also his study assists in better comprehending how concentration of advantages, capital and power in specific urban localities and disadvantages in the other ones contribute to produce inequalities, poverty and exclusion.

Smith’s theory of uneven development creates another pillar of the theoretical frame of this study in discussing the logic behind the spatial pattern of uneven development.\(^\text{14}\) His ‘see-saw’ movement theory provides a comprehensive framework based on which understanding of the creation of uneven geographies under capitalist laws of space production can be accomplished. Uneven urban development of Tehran particularly following the White Revolution of 1963 until the 1979 Revolution, will be discussed in this study from Smith’s standpoint that affirms there is a logic behind the produced unevenness within the space production process of capitalist system and it is the logic of mobility of capital. From Smith’s point of view, the main agent lies behind the uneven development can be linked to the logic of mobility of capital toward the areas with high rate of profit. As long as this mobility of capital is the driving force that determines the course of development, spatial pattern of uneven development can be witnessed across the urban space.

In the context of Smith’s ‘see-saw’ theory of uneven development, he argues that this is the logic of mobility of capital that determines the course of capitalist developments. Capital has a tendency to move toward the areas with high rate of profit, which leads to development of those areas; while the areas with low-rate of profit, remain underdevelopment. He states that this very growth that capital brings to the developed region, on the other hand could decrease the profit rate via increasing labor costs, ground-rent and so forth, then, another movement of capital is necessary.\textsuperscript{15} Since capital is inclined to move toward an area that can exploit the opportunities of development and not enduring the high costs, deserts the developed area and moves toward the underdeveloped area, in time, again moves back to the deserted developed areas as it is underdeveloped.\textsuperscript{16} In this regard, Smith writes: “With everything it can muster, this is what capital strives to do: it strives to move from developed to underdeveloped space, then back to now underdeveloped, and so on. If it can but move with sufficient alacrity, capital can remain one step ahead of falling rate of profit.”\textsuperscript{17} This pattern of capital movement that is like a ‘see-saw’ movement, Smith calls it as the ‘see-saw’ movement of capital.

Smith’s ‘see-saw’ theory of uneven development presents a concrete understanding of the logic lies behind the uneven development patterns in capitalism without considering it as a natural and historical account within this system. He emphasizes that there is the logic of mobility of capital that guides the direction of development. Drawing on his ‘see-saw’ movement theory, he also assumes a continuous movement for capital, then, all areas will experience both growth and decline waves. While Smith’s theory provides powerful insights into understanding the process in which uneven development as outcome and premise of capitalist development is produced, his approach is not complete.

The urban experiences of some areas demonstrate there is no inevitability that capital leaves an area and then moves back to the very abandoned area. In the aftermath of the 1963 White Revolution, large-scale urbanization projects were planned, designed and implemented in the northern areas of Tehran and these areas were locus of

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, pp. 148-149.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, p. 150.
accumulation of capital and advantages. The flow of capital was never toward the southern areas of the city and southern Tehran was remained marginalized and excluded from the development and accumulation processes (unless accumulation of rural migrants and urban poor as labor forces). That is to say, the over-accumulation of capital at the northern Tehran was matched by the over-accumulation of labor at the southern Tehran and never this direction was changed.

Massey in her seminal book ‘Spatial Division of Labour’ develops and completes Smith’s theory of uneven development by arguing that it is not merely the logic of capital responsible in shaping the flows of capital, political agencies and activities are also involved.18 In this light, state’s policies, development programs, reforms and investments are of importance in growth or decline of a specific area. Massey emphasizes the need to take into consideration the significant role of state and powerful agencies beside the logic of capital as active factors guiding the flow of capital. Within this context, the growth or decline of many urban areas could better fit. Thus to examine produced unevenness between northern Tehran as developed regions and southern Tehran as declining regions, employing the political-economy approach will be more comprehensive. In Tehran of the 1960s and 1970s, flow of capital, of course, had a see-saw movement; but this continuous movement of capital was confined to the northern part of the city due to the state’s implemented development programs. Since the state attempted to modernize the image of the city and not the city itself, executed large-scale urbanization projects in the northern Tehran and the southern Tehran as problematical areas remained out of development process.

In general, Smith’s discussion over uneven development offers a powerful framework based on which systematic production of uneven landscapes in capitalism can be better comprehended. He is more concerned with stating that “[U]neven development is the concrete manifestation of the production of space under capitalism.”19 Ultimately, for Smith “[U]neven development is social inequality blazoned into the geographical landscape, and it is simultaneously the exploitation of
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that geographical unevenness for certain socially determined ends.” Building on his own definition of uneven development, he pleas for an end to the uneven development pattern and for the possibility of spatial equilibrium by social choices superseding economic logic of capital guiding direction of developments. To put this in Smith words: “It is not that our goal is some rigidly conceived ‘even development’. This would make little sense. Rather, the goal is to create socially determined patterns of differentiation and equalization which are driven not by the logic of capital but by genuine social choice.”

A deeper insight into the process of producing socio-spatial inequalities across the urban space can be achieved through Merrifield’s arguments that urbanization should be conceived as a process that produces skyscrapers as well as slum areas. His discussions in his book The New Urban Question provide information on how the urban space could be utilized by wealthy elite as an accumulation strategy and how this in turn leads to produce inequalities in socio-spatial dimensions. He believes that understanding of how this process of socio-spatial inequality production works help to find a way of dealing with its produced urban crises. Merrifield asserts top-down modernization of urban space causes that cities become parasitic rather than generative and so major activities operate there associate with value extraction not value production. Accordingly, in this context the urban space not as use-value; but as exchange value, as a commodity and as a pure financial asset functions, which is dangerous. He makes connections between Paris of 19th century and other urban societies across the globe. His employment of the term ‘neo-Haussmannization’ helps to conceptualize the transformations of urban space from the 20th century onward like that of the second half of the 19th century Paris are accompanied by socio-spatial segregation, marginalization and polarization, producing superficial modernity.

He argues that as in Paris of 19th century that Haussmann’s large-scale urbanization projects led to dispossession and marginalization of the urban poor, similar force relocations still happen in different urban societies and hence he calls these very

21 Ibid, p. 159.
23 Ibid, p. xiv.
practices as neo-Haussmannization. His analysis assumes that physical organization of different classes and economic status still happens to many cities and it was not just Paris, where he writes: “Neo-Haussmannization now tears into the whole planetary urban fabric, and fronts the progressive production of core and periphery, of centers of power and wealth as well as spaces of dispossession and marginalization; and this everywhere, with little concern for either city or countryside.”

It is not only large-scale urbanization projects that lead to expulsion of the poor from specific urban localities, rather socio-economic and political forces, namely, state development policies and reforms, setting high standards for development plans and class-monopoly rent are among active agents involve in peripheralizing the poor population. The only way to see end of neo-Haussmannization, believes Merrifield, may be reached by those who live on the periphery. The urban poor should stand up for transforming the structure of power—the whole economic, political, social, spatial and cultural fabric of global capitalism—in order to repossess the urban space that has been plundered. Generally, urban analyses of Merrifield help to better understand negative sides of urbanization processes, formation and proliferation of informal settlements of urban poor on Tehran’s margins and the state’s practices of neo-Haussmannization lie behind it. Moreover, building upon his interpretations, it can be said that during the urban-based Iranian Revolution of 1979, the alienated urban poor that gathered in the ‘urban agora’ were united to regain the urban space as their own living space, via which the passivity of urban space was rendered as a lived realm for participatory instead of representative democracy.

Merrifield’s discussions in his book *Dialectical Urbanism* also will be used throughout this study to broaden and develop a perspective from which two-fold urbanism and its link different urban experiences come more clearly into view. His discussions over the process of urbanization, experience of urbanism, fetishism of urbanization and role of city-dwellers as active citizens not passive consumers contextualized in cities such as Baltimore, Los Angeles, New York and so on reveal
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24 Ibid, p. 10.
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some connections between these cities and their residents’ urban experiences and Tehran and urban experiences of its residents. Drawing on these connections, it can be claimed that there is dialectic between the urban experiences of city-dwellers and the ways through which urban space is produced as an outcome of space production process under capitalism. According to Merrifield, “cities are gigantic exchange value entities wherein the process of urbanization is inextricably wedded to the ‘general law of capitalist accumulation’.”

Then, considering the urban built environment as a socio-political product that intervening actions would be needed in order to produce more socio-spatially just cities is one fundamental theoretical basis of this study. His examinations of different cities unveil the role of state and its urban development policy in plundering the urban space and promoting speculative investments that, in effect, encourage purification of problematical urban localities. Indeed, Merrifield’s emphasis on assuming the urbanization process as a two-fold process that produces different experience of urbanism for different social classes and subsequently understanding of how growth and improvements of cities that accompany with progress of capitalist accumulation can worsening living standards of the poor by producing much more poverty will be reflected throughout the study.

This study will, mainly, observe the city from Harvey’s standpoint that assumes a more dynamic quality for it. He regards the city as “a complex dynamic system in which spatial form and social process are in continuous interaction with each other.” He emphasizes that spatial forms and social processes have interpenetration so that spatial forms contain social processes and social processes are spatial. From this it follows that any attempt on analyzing the city is contingent upon integrating the social processes occur in the city with the spatial form that the city takes on. Hence, the analysis of modernization processes of Tehran between the White Revolution of 1963 and the Iranian Revolution of 1979 is tied up with analysis of socio-political and economic context of this specific time period, which causes that the study proceeds with simultaneous concentration on social processes operated in

the city and their reflections at spatial level. The role that Harvey considers for the city is a site of production rather than reproduction. In contrast to Castells that regards city as a framework for reproduction of labor-power and public services, Harvey is concerned to stress city as commodity, as exchange value and particularly land as a pure financial asset. His theory of the ‘spatial fix’ assists in comprehending the process of production, reproduction and reconfiguration of space in capitalist development, which entails continuous production of uneven geographical development. Then, existing conditions of uneven landscape can be considered as the product of these specific processes of the production and reconstruction of space.

Under political economy of capitalism, fixing capital spatially in order to create new geographies for capital accumulation is inevitable. Based on Harvey’s theory of ‘spatial fix’ while capitalism fixing capital in the built environment to secure itself in space, this is also a temporary resolution for its overaccumulation crisis. “Overaccumulation, in its most virulent form (as occurred in the 1930s, for example) is registered as surpluses of labor and capital side by side with seemingly no way to put them together in productive, i.e. “profitable” as opposed to socially useful ways.” If capitalism could not solve overaccumulation crisis this will lead to capital and labor devaluation and threatens its survival. The overaccumulation crisis will be resolved through the spatial fix.

Therefore, production of space through fixing capital in the built environment to secure itself—most safe ground for surplus capital is to invest on property and land—occurs as for example building highways. On the other hand, production of space to resolve overaccumulation crisis manifests itself as suburbanization to absorb surplus capital and labor. Interestingly, these two ways of fixing capital feed off each other very well. For instance, constructing highways and transportation system is necessary to facilitate suburbanization. In this light, Harvey’s analyses can explicate the state’s attempts in constructing extensive network of highways in Tehran after 1963 and at the same time directing development plan of the city toward its northern and northwestern fringes. Here the state’s employed two kinds of spatial fixes feed
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off each other in a way that one requires the other and vice versa. Building on Harvey’s discussions it can be argued that there is a never-ending tendency in capitalist developments for a spatial fix as a part of its functioning and as a solution to its overaccumulation crisis, both of which bring about space production necessary for capital accumulation. “The accumulation of capital has always been a profoundly geographical affair.”\textsuperscript{33} That is to say, capital is in a perpetual movement and major part of this movement occurs at the spatial level. Since changing location of capital is in such a way as to be more profitable, it is coupled with the production of uneven landscapes—rich areas with high rate of profit grow richer while poor areas with low rate of profit grow poorer. In the absence of the state’s regulatory controls these capitalist relations of producing uneven geographical development will be deepened and solidified. Urban crises such as socio-spatial polarization of a city and marginalization of the lower social strata are inevitable consequences of uneven capitalist urban development.

Harvey argues that to pursuit of evenly created spaces and of more just forms of uneven urban development, it is necessary to understand forces that guide urbanization processes in directions alien to the urban poor and in concert with interests of wealthy elite.\textsuperscript{34} High levels of fixed capital investments concentrated in some areas and poverty in the others and capital mobility pattern that rests upon exploitation stem from inherent dynamics of capitalism.\textsuperscript{35} Ultimately, he asserts that cities founded on capitalist urban development patterns inevitably will be based in exploitation, then, to confront capitalist urbanization that produces a class-based fragmented city is to remind Lefebvre’s conception of ‘right to the city’, which is a starting point and a way toward an urban revolution.\textsuperscript{36}

In this regard, the active participation of low-income groups in Iranian Revolution of 1979, their shouted demands of equality and the promises of the revolution all show deprived and exhausted peoples’ collective decision to regain the city from the urbanization processes that attempted to monopolize and privatize the city for the rich and to marginalize the poor. This is what Harvey calls it as the revolutionary

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
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practice that could bring humanizing urbanism into being.\textsuperscript{37} On the discussions over Iranian modernization, Tehran’s urbanization processes and socio-political and economic context of the society between the state’s White Revolution of 1963 and the Iranian Revolution of 1979, scholars that have special interest in Iranian studies such as Ali Madanipour, Mohammad Chaichian, Ali M. Ansari, Asef Bayat, Homa Katouzian, Ervand Abrahamian and so on will be used as references. In general, the theoretical framework of this study is composed of discussions revolving around interweaving of dominant socio-political relations in the society and changing spatial structures. Therefore, alongside the mentioned theoretical bases other analyses that could strengthen the theoretical pillars of this study will be used as well.

\textbf{1.3. GENERAL EXPECTATIONS}

The main concern of this study is the analysis of the impacts of modernization and further urbanization processes of Tehran on the low-income groups as one working mechanism generated and enhanced urban inequality. There, of course, has been made attempts to examine such development processes of cities in the recent past; but, this study has the privilege of critically analyzing their impacts directly on poorest and most vulnerable residents of the city, examining the state’s interventions into urban development programs, large-scale urbanization projects and planning strategies via which monopolized specific urban localities across the urban space of Tehran, and eventually locating these discussions in theoretical framework.

The significance of this study lies in its specific concern in analyzing modernization and ensuing urbanization processes of Tehran focusing on their impacts on the most vulnerable classes. Since very little is known about how the low-income groups resided in areas with low rate of profit have been affected throughout the implementation of urban development programs of Tehran. Particularly this examination that will be done in a period between two revolutions—the first one, the White Revolution of 1963, was launched by the state from above with defined promises in order to preempt the probable revolution from below which failed and the 1979 Revolution occurred—will provide an opportunity to better understand that

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
state’s top-down modernization by shaping spatial hierarchy of wealth and poverty in the urban space could stimulate movements of those experience disadvantages, demanding socio-spatial justice.

This work will mainly speak of producing and perpetuating unevenness under capitalist urban developments; state’s utilization of modernization programs and reforms in order to solidify extant socio-spatial segregation of different income groups; and alienation of the urban poor from the promise of development that in turn could challenge the established order and processes of domination and alienation. To expand on major expectations of this study, it will begin with Mohammad Reza Shah’s launched White Revolution in 1963 as a giant step toward modernization of the country. The White Revolution was a six-point reform series that implemented by the state and heralded a new era has begun for the country. Here, it is expected that out of reform package lies at the heart of the White Revolution, role of land reform policies as one important factor actively involved in transforming socio-spatial organization of the capital and producing urban crisis to be analyzed and interpreted.

Discussing the state’s implemented land reform policies that resulted in introducing capitalist development patterns, encouraging foreign (specifically the United States) capitalist investments and emergence of a poor urban social class will shed light on how the White Revolution (from above) not only could forestall the possible further revolution (from below), but also paved the way for it. In order to demonstrate how dominant strategies around which the White Revolution revolved, found spatial manifestation in the urban space of the capital, large-scale urbanization projects, the international (usually American) firms that directed them and their proposals—mainly obtained from archival documents and architectural journals of the second Pahlavi era—will be examined. Through this analysis, it is expecting to reveal that the state aimed at modernizing Tehran in the image of the west and actually the form of urbanization that the city underwent following the White Revolution, was in concert with the changes of the socio-political structure of the society.
How development programs and urban planning strategies under modernization of Tehran were employed as means by the state to solidify class-based fragmentation of urban space is another issue expected to be covered throughout the study. Investigating the state’s interventions in urban planning through implementing income-based segregated neighborhoods as a part of development policy, setting standards for the urban development plans as high to be out of capacity of low-income urban dwellers to fulfill, resolving the urban poor housing problem while pursuing the same pattern of socio-spatial segregation and the like will help to comprehend how monopolizing the city for particular interest groups and marginalization of the urban poor were embodied in the state’s modernization attempts.

Beyond the discussions going around the impacts of modernization programs on the lower social strata, different experiences of urbanism by the new urban rich also will be examined. It is expected that by discussing the new urban rich’s new urban experiences, their relocation from court-yard houses to high-rise apartments, a wider perspective over the growing gap between high-income residents of the north and low-income residents of the south Tehran will be developed. Furthermore, building on the new urban rich’s move to high-rise apartments, fetishism of urbanization that was produced due to market-led urbanism and association of modernization with westernization as contributed in division of lifestyles which in turn exacerbated the class divisions will be studied. By the same token, the state’s aim that was to modernizing the image of the city and not the city itself and led to perpetuating uneven development as the predominant pattern of urbanization is expected to be discussed as well. Since, this discussion over constructing an image of modern country through executing showcase development projects in the capital will show pseudo-developments of the pseudo-developer (Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi) that was only intent on showcasing Iran’s development to the world and had nothing to do with social well-being.

Finally, in order to comprehend the effect of this growing socio-spatial inequality across the urban space of the capital in stimulating urban uprisings with revolutionary potential, the Iranian Revolution of 1979 will be analyzed. The
expectation is majorly to demonstrate uneven development brought about by capitalist form of urbanization of Tehran was one significant motive lies behind the 1979 Revolution. Accordingly, active participation of dwellers of impoverished southern neighborhoods of the city, main arenas accommodated mass demonstrations and appropriated by large crowds to display collective urban discontent, significances of these key urban sites, and their transformation from highly protected state sites into public spaces of democratic participation of dissatisfied masses are major issues expected to be discussed.

Beside studying specific spatial qualities of the Shahreza axis toward the Shahyad Square that made them conducive to accommodate mass protests during the revolutionary period, the presence of the Shahyad Monument at the center of the square was of great import and hence needs to be discussed as well. Examining state’s presentation of the Shahyad Monument by relying on the official newspapers of the period that served as the state’s leading propaganda tool will unveil ideological stances and implicit objectives aimed to be represented through this monument at both national and international scale. The conflicts between the state’s projection of this monument’s representations upon the public at large and realities of everyday life experienced by the fabric of the society was involved in mobilizing and gathering discontented masses around this monument, which turned its surrounding space as a site of collective actions against the ruling power.

Studying the ways that the Shahyad Monument were projected to the public through official documents published in the state media of the related time will help to read them in their socio-political context, which leads to introduce a new understanding of exactly how it was supposed to serve the state. Through this examination, it is expected to show the state’s aim at representing Shahyad as a new birth certificate for modern Iran that has achieved developments under the White Revolution and became a developed country; appropriating Shahyad by dissatisfied masses and its role as a significant arena mobilizing demonstrators against the state during the 1979 Revolution is an important part of history of this country indicates that it is the urban experience of urban dwellers that ascribe real meaning to a monument and/or place; and ultimately, uneven urban space of Tehran that was fashioned by the logic of
capital and state power, fashioned an urban revolt against the dominant structure produced it. In sum, it can be said that the main expectation of this work is a critical socio-spatial analysis of regulations, reforms and growth programs that while causing developments on few particular urban localities bringing about underdevelopment of other areas. The purpose is to demonstrate that this form of uneven urban development leaves its profound effects on the most vulnerable class of the society and indeed state plays an active role in turning it into a predominant pattern for development or intervening before it becomes solidified.

1.4. METHODOLOGY/METHODS

Since the main concern of this study is analyzing impacts of modernization programs of Tehran on low-income groups, focusing on its role as sharpening socio-spatial segregation, it will employ a method that could combine spatial analysis and socio-political and historical context of the city in the discussed theoretical framework. This dissertation will challenge and rethink modernization process of Tehran to demonstrate implicit attempts lay at the core of implemented development projects, which needs a critical reading. The major method will be a critical analysis departing from Tehran and findings will result in discussions on the basis of the theoretical framework of the study. The twin processes of modernization and urbanization of each region is greatly influenced by its internal socio-economic and political relations, then, instead of making general assessments, the study’s emphasis will be rather on the internal factors as more active agents in such processes. To this end, throughout the study arguments will draw on Tehran’s modernization process for its historical and spatial analysis.

While, meaning, value and within the frames of this study ‘space’ are socially constructed, then, there is not a single uncritical truth but many possible truths exist that can be critically discussed and reinterpreted in order to reveal the complexities of dominant social, historical and spatial processes. Moreover, drawing on the focus group of this study, urban poor, it can be said that their marginalized position is also socially produced. The marginalized urban poor as populations that are socially situated in that position possess unique status that enable them to have unique
experiences. Accordingly, when dominant group due to their privileged class are unable to understand socially underprivileged groups’ experiences, providing the position that deals with subject matters through taking marginalized groups’ experiences into account leads to understanding of something different than what is already existed of what has been disregarded because of their voicelessness. The urban poor that are socially situated in the marginalized position and their experiences that are specific to their particular position entail a narrative of their situation more than neutral traditional science, which can be reached via qualitative methods. This narrative of the urban poor’s situation will be structured on historical and spatial body of modernized Tehran under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi develops the study in a descriptive and analytic approach.

Examining inter-relationships between different involved factors in marginalization of the urban poor of which power of the state and capital are of great import, and revealing new insights into the issue that is often embedded in the poor populations’ particular underprivileged situation and related experiences can be accomplished if employing constructionism, interpretivist tradition, and critical historical and spatial analysis to approach the problem. Then, as this study holds a constructionist epistemology, interpretivism and critical inquiry constitute its theoretical perspective, and applying qualitative methods to address the problem area will be appropriate approach providing concrete and novel insights into the subject matter. Hence, historical and spatial analysis, critical while descriptive reading, and archival research will be mainly utilized to study the problem.

The modernization process of Tehran from the 1963 White Revolution to the 1979 Revolution that will be narrated during the study, is considered here as a socio-political, historical and spatial subject. Tehran’s modernization was not only the construction of an image of modern city, but also of contradictions that such development programs produced among different social classes, socio-political and ideological structure of the society, and concrete realities and myths. For this reason, this dissertation will also examine development programs, reforms and policies, and their socio-spatial impacts on urban structure of Tehran. In line with this, study will focus on Tehran as the first city that underwent modernization process and became a
model for rest of the country likewise as an intensely polarized city that turned to be
the first site of urban uprisings led to the 1979 Revolution. Therefore, besides
investigating dynamics of urbanization of Tehran, dynamics of socio-spatial
segregation came along with them will bring to the fore to demonstrate other face of
that new urban order was increasing urban inequality within the city. Since the
state’s political and economic agendas were usually found reflections at the spatial
level in the capital, their examination will also help to unveil the role of ruling power
in facilitating uneven development and maintaining produced unevenness.

In this regard, this work will discuss space and its reconfigurations ensuing
modernization scheme was put into effect in an interdisciplinary manner; thus, to
keep linkage between study’s different but interconnected dimensions and to provide
a wider perspective that it requires, archival research, development plans,
photographs, and base maps as well as political and historical reports, office
documents, and state media will provide best sources of information. Particularly in
order to establish a broader spatial, social and political context, archival documents,
newspapers, art and architecture journals published during the 1960s and 1970s are
informative and will be used extensively.
### FIG. 1. 1: GENERAL TABLE OF THE DISSERTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
<th>KEYWORDS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT (Methodic Tools)</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. THE WHITE REVOLUTION: INTRODUCTION OF CAPITALIST URBAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS OF UNEVENNESS AND SEGREGATION</td>
<td>Modernization, Land reforms, Urbanization, Westernization, Capitalist development patterns</td>
<td>To demonstrate how socio-spatial organization of Tehran underwent major socio-spatial transformations following modernization. To show how the ruling power aimed at modernizing the capital city in the image of the west mainly the United States.</td>
<td>Out of reform package lies at the heart of the White Revolution, role of land reform policies, as one important factor involved in transforming socio-spatial organization of the capital and producing urban crisis is to be discussed. The Tehran Comprehensive Plan (first master plan) of 1968, and the Shahrestan Pahlavi project of mid 1970s that were two mega-scale urbanization projects prepared for the capital city to be implemented are to be analyzed.</td>
<td>The spatial reconfiguring that Tehran underwent ensuing the White Revolution was in perfect concert with the shifts happened in the socio-political and economic structure of the society. At the core of major mega-scale urbanization projects proposed for the capital, tendency to pursue capitalist urban development patterns exist. The myth of reforms and development programs of the White Revolution produced and solidified pattern of uneven capitalist development could not forestall rather paved the way for the 1979 Revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UNEVEN URBAN DEVELOPMENT: SPACE PRODUCTION UNDER HEGEMONIC COMMAND OF CAPITAL AND THE STATE</td>
<td>Planning spatial segregation, Improving place-image, Westoxification, Fetishism of urbanization</td>
<td>To understand how development programs and urban planning strategies under modernization of Tehran were employed as means by the state to solidify class-based fragmentation of urban space.</td>
<td>The first master plan of Tehran and its defined regulations, standards and criteria for urban development plans is to be taken into consideration. The state-run projects particularly in the domain of</td>
<td>The state’s employed planning strategy that clearly aimed at income-based segregation of social groups across the urban space of Tehran, and regulated high criteria for the urban development plans beyond the capacity of lower social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban discontent</td>
<td>To state that particular urban spaces that are constructed as showcases of state power are more susceptible to become sites of struggling against the ruling power.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban uprising</td>
<td>The form that urban discontent of the masses took and active agents behind mass demonstrations during the 1979 Revolution is to be discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas of power struggle</td>
<td>Building on the role of urban space not only as the precondition and outcome of dominant power relations rather as the arena to form revolutionary struggle against the existing dominant structure, Shahreza axis toward the Shahyad Square as the main site of urban uprising during the 1979 Revolution is to be analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classes to afford them colonized specific urban localities and excluded the urban poor from those very spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The market-led urbanism and westoxification of Iranian society as contributed in division of lifestyles exacerbated the class divisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing implemented within the study's specified time period is to be examined.</td>
<td>The uneven urban space of Tehran that was fashioned by the logic of capital and state power, fashioned an urban revolt against the dominant structure produced it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alienation of the urban poor from the development process and its produced advantages could manifest itself spatially as an urban revolt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban process, urban experience and quality of urban life under capitalism through constructing structures of disadvantages and deprivations, together with structures of advantages and exploitation bring about its own overthrowing condition as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5. RESEARCH STRUCTURE

Inasmuch as the position of this study regarding the conception of space is to define it as a social product that its production, reproduction and transformation is highly dependent upon dominant socio-economic and political relations in the society, analyzing the urban space should be integrated with the social processes occur in the city; this study will examine the spatial forms that the city takes on due to the social structure in which it exists. In this light, the time span of the on-going study will start from 1963 to 1979, when perfectly in concert with the changes happened in the socio-political and economic structure of the society, wave of modernization programs executed that brought about major transformations in spatial organization of big cities, specifically Tehran.

This time span (from 1963 to 1979) starts with the White Revolution—series of reforms that had been designed to preempt a possible revolution by dissatisfied masses—launched by Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi in 1963 and ends in the 1979 Revolution to stress the highlighted role of reform package in producing urban crisis in Tehran as the city that was dangerously divided between rich and poor. That is to say, the myth of reforms and promise of development that worsened living conditions of low-income groups triggered the 1979 Revolution. Accordingly, the 1963-1979 time period (between two revolutions) presents an ideal opportunity for analyzing dominant mechanisms in producing, restructuring and monopolizing urban built environment for the wealthy elite and in effect alienation of the urban poor that could be expressed as an urban revolt.

The study will begin with the White Revolution of 1963 and provide information on the context of this reform package that the state implemented as a giant step toward modernization likewise a solution from above to forestall a revolution from below. At the center of this six-point reform series was land reform policies that transformed socio-spatial organization of the big cities, in particular Tehran, and consequently this pillar of the White Revolution mainly will be discussed. Within this chapter, the way that land reform policies affected socio-spatial organization of Tehran and led to the emergence of the urban poor as a new social class will be examined. The stress
here will be on the transformations of spatial organization of Tehran in the post-land reform years. Analyzing the large-scale urbanization projects planned and designed for the capital following the White Revolution will reveal the state’s attempts in modernizing the city in the image of the west mainly the United States as the leading power in the world capitalist economy. Then, the uneven development that was stretched along the north-south axis of the city of Tehran as the outcome of the state’s tendency to follow capitalist development patterns will be focused in this chapter.

The study will continue with the uneven urban development of Tehran as a part of the state’s modernization programs under the White Revolution. Throughout this chapter, the state’s employed planning strategy that clearly aimed at income-based segregation of social groups across the urban space of Tehran, and its regulated high criteria for the urban development plans beyond the capacity of lower social classes to afford them, both of which led to colonize specific urban localities and to exclude the urban poor from those very spaces will be examined in detail. Since the most crucial spatial materialization of the uneven urban development can be expressed itself in the domain of housing, the study will focus on the housing problem engulfed the city especially in the 1970s. Relocating the new urban poor and the new urban rich to apartment blocks with different qualities will best depict the widening urban inequality across the urban space of Tehran; while also informing of the fetishism of urbanism that the mode of urbanization shaped by the free market economy produced it in the society and of the way it was experienced by both the low- and high-income groups.

Modernizing the image of the city and not the city itself will be explained in this part of the study to demonstrate the tragedy of developments and how development cannot always result in improvements. The state-run projects that were disconnected from the needs of the majority of the society and, indeed, were aimed to be just highly visible symbol of developments will be used as examples of showcase development projects under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi reign. Moreover, through analyzing different experience of urbanism by different income groups, it is aimed to put emphasis on different conditions of class polarities in the society
forming distinctive urban experiences and to state that the city can become a growth machine, but for whom. The last chapter will include discussions over the Iranian Revolution of 1979 in terms of the form that urban discontent of the masses took, the urban sites that mainly accommodated manifestation of the uprisings and active agents behind it. Within this chapter, uneven development and its produced widening socio-spatial gap among different social classes in the society as one important motive behind the 1979 Revolution will be examined. The role of uneven development in stimulating the revolution will show if the urban space is fashioned by dominant power relations, in turn, can fashion an urban revolt against the very established order and its produced unevenness.

Building on the role of urban space not only as the precondition and outcome of dominant power relations rather as the arena to form revolutionary struggle against the existing dominant structure, Shahreza axis toward the Shahyad Square as the main site of urban uprising during the 1979 Revolution will be studied in this part. The certain qualities of this axis within the larger urban context of Tehran that turned it into the major site for demonstrations against the state will be discussed with materials that represent its appropriation by deprived and dissatisfied masses and likewise its accommodation to large crowds of protestors during the years of turmoil, 1978-1979.

Since the presence of the Shahyad Monument at the center of the Shahyad Square and as the epitome of the Shahreza Avenue was involved in making this axis as the main urban setting to shelter mass protests, it cannot be disregarded and hence its significances (majorly imposed by the state from outside) will be examined as well. In so doing, archival documents that show the widespread representations of Shahyad in different state media will be used to provide information on the function of this monument for the government. Analyzing the important role of the Shahyad Monument for the state and its appropriation by large crowds on the eve of the 1979 Revolution will demonstrate that even urban spaces that are served as the seat of the state power through collective urban practices of masses could transform into the spaces of the nation. That is to say, if the urban space is fashioned by dominant power, it can be reclaimed, regained and refashioned by collective common good.
Discussions revolving around the 1979 Revolution will show alienation of the urban poor from the development process and its advantages could manifest itself spatially as an urban revolt. The urban setting that was important site served for the state’s interests and appropriated as the main arena for displaying urban discontent by the large crowds of demonstrators during the years of unrest has been analyzed to show as the urban space has been fashioned it could also be refashioned. The impacts of uneven urban development solidifies as the predominant pattern of growth in the society on the most vulnerable social class that have been examined throughout this study, will be used to comprehend that in order to control and to reduce stark socio-spatial disparities between the poor and the rich, more egalitarian pattern of the urban form, equilibrating processes and distributive justice should be put at the top of government’s agenda.

Ultimately, the conclusion part will be constructed on the analyses, interpretations and discussions that have been done throughout the study. In fact, this study will illuminate a neglected aspect of the changes that subsequent to the modernization process operated within the city brought about intense socio-spatial segregation. Analyzing spatial patterns characterize uneven urban development and processes that perpetuate produced unevenness across the urban space of Tehran will shed light on understanding how development can produce more socio-spatial constraints; deteriorate living standards of the lower social strata; and intensify disparities between the have and the have-nots. Indeed, through examining the production and persistence of uneven development via modernization programs, urban development planning and policies and land reforms in the context of modernized Tehran under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi reign, the role of state in authorizing marginality of the urban poor will be revealed.
CHAPTER 2

THE WHITE REVOLUTION: INTRODUCTION OF CAPITALIST URBAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS OF UNEVENNESS AND SEGREGATION

In 1963 Mohammad Reza Shah launched a six-point reform series called the “White Revolution” as a step toward modernization that heralded a new era. Nevertheless, there is a contradiction implicit in the Shah’s White Revolution and it was the tradition of monarchy itself. The ‘White Revolution’ was aimed to be the Shah’s bloodless solution (from above) to the crisis of the society that might result in a bloody revolution (from below). “However, domestic and international pressures gradually convinced the Shah that if he did not lead the reform, he and his dynasty might be overcome by revolution from below. This view was confirmed by the anxiety caused by the overthrow of the Menderes regime in Turkey in 1960.”

Mohammad Reza Shah’s note on his ‘White Revolution’ could be an indicator of the existing unrest in the society of Iran during that period, as he writes: “The realization came to me that Iran needed a deep and fundamental revolution that could, at the same time, put an end to all the social inequalities and all the factors which caused injustice, tyranny and exploitation, and all aspects of reaction which impeded progress and kept our society backward.”

Thus, the public’s demand for reform was deemed to be fulfilled by the White Revolution; although revolutionizing the tradition of monarchy was seemed inconceivable. In short, the dominant factor motivating the Shah to launch the White Revolution conflicts with the ideology of monarchy and could not legitimate the Pahlavi monarchy as was intended.

---

The name of “White Revolution”, then, attributed to the issue that it was bloodless and, indeed, was designed to forestall a ‘Red Revolution’ from below; however, it failed and in turn contributed to the 1979 Revolution. The six pillars of reforms called for land reform programs, nationalization of forests and pasturelands, sale of state factories to private entrepreneurs, profit-sharing for industrial workers, formation of the literacy corps, extending the right to vote to women.\textsuperscript{40} The reform package majorly aimed at Iran’s peasantry as a class that the Shah hoped to gain their support against the middle-class opposition. Hence, “[T]he White Revolution in Iran represents a new attempt to introduce reform from above which, it is hoped, will preserve traditional power patterns.”\textsuperscript{41}

To this end, at the centerpiece of the White Revolution was land reform that radically changed pre-capitalist relations of production and encouraged foreign private capitalist investment. Among foreign investments in Iran, the United States’ influence as the major leading power in the world capitalist economy was the most. Based on governmental data in 1976, the United States’ share of foreign investments in Iran was almost 50 percent of it and the remained 50 percent was divided between other countries such as Germany, England and so forth. This increasing foreign capitalist investment in Iran following the land reforms in turn contributed remarkably to uneven urban development. It is fairly clear that decentralized urban development that would serve the Iranian society’s interest would not serve the interests of foreign investors, then, was not preferred by them.

The White Revolution and in particular land reform, however, faced significant shortage of institutionalized and rationalized processes and long-term supporting policy so resulted in unexpected outcomes. With the implementation of land reforms number of landless peasants was increased who instead of allying with the Shah, became disenchanted landless agricultural laborers resented the reform programs. The landlords were also angry about the new reform package since they were dispossessed of large lands at the inauguration of the White Revolution. The clergy were not satisfied with the reforms too because ensuing the implementation of


reforms their influence and traditional power bases in some domains such as education and family especially among rural families were undermined. On the other hand, since the White Revolution was designed to mainly aim at the country’s peasantry, the professional middle class was discontented with the reform program from the outset. “In general, the members of the new middle class believe that they have been deliberately bypassed in the reform program. They point to the list of reforms and argue their interests have been considered only as afterthought.”42 In light of this issue, Abrahamian states that “[T]he White Revolution had been designed to preempt a Red Revolution. Instead, it paved the way for an Islamic Revolution.”43

Accordingly, the time span of the on-going study starts from 1963, as a turning point, to put emphasis on the role of this reform package in producing urban crises in Tehran—the city that was dangerously divided between the rich and the poor, manifested in the north-south dualism. The process of implementation of land reform laws in the 1963 played a crucial role in transforming socio-spatial organization of both the rural and urban system, which is the main concern of this study.

2.1. LAND REFORM POLICIES AND EMERGENCE OF A POOR URBAN SOCIAL CLASS

The Shah’s reform package, specifically land reforms, radically modified (and gradually eliminated) pre-capitalist relations of production in rural society, introduced capitalist economic relations and encouraged foreign capitalist investment. The main concern of this study here with the Shah’s proclaimed reform package is the way that implementation of land reform laws modified socio-spatial structure of the Iranian society. Therefore, more than other aspects of the White Revolution, the way that land reform policies affected socio-spatial hierarchy of the Iranian cities, in particular Tehran will be examined (Figure 2.1-2).

At the center of Mohammad Reza Shah’s reform package was land reform policies that disintegrated pre-capitalist relations of production and introduced capitalist

42 Ibid, p. 35.
economic relations. “The land reform laws were envisioned based on at least two political objectives: 1) to destroy the power base of the major landowning families in rural areas; and 2) to gain the support and allegiance of peasants and hence forestall a mass-based uprising and possible revolution in the countryside.”44 The first goal was achieved; but the second one encountered structural problems and failed. To achieve the above-mentioned political goals, land reform laws pursued four main objectives that Chaichian identifies as:

1) Limiting the size of individual holdings to only one village, where landlords were required to sell their excess village holdings and land to the government.
2) Allocating land holdings among peasants without any changes in the field layout.
3) Making membership of peasants in rural cooperatives as a necessary means for their eligibility to receive land.
4) Redistributing land among those peasants who had cultivation rights on feudal lands (“nasaq” holders).45

In the absence of a long-term supporting policy, major segment of peasants could not benefitted from land redistribution. There was not enough land to be redistributed so even those who received land, it was not enough for subsistence. “It was true that the White Revolution provided some farmers with land, cooperatives, tractors, and fertilizers. But it was equally true that the White Revolution did not touch much of the countryside. Most peasants received no or little land”, says Abrahamian, “what is more, government-imposed prices on agricultural goods favored the urban sector at the expense of the countryside. This lowered incentives—even for those farmers who had benefitted from land reform.” 46 Meanwhile, liquidating lands of feudal landowners resulted in deteriorating living conditions of agricultural laborers that formerly worked for them to earn wage. Landlords were deprived of their holdings of land and large lands were divided into smaller parts, so there were no fields that wage-earner peasants could work on it.

Here, it should be mentioned that although liquidating landowning of landlords following the implementation of land reforms worsened the living conditions of wage-earner peasants; by destructing former peasant-landlord relationship undermined the authority of the landowning class in rural Iran. Therefore, reform laws in pursuing this issue (eroding the power basis of the landlords), as one of the political objectives of the program was successful. In connection with this, Arjomand writes: “The destruction of the peasant-landlord relationship was completed in the 1960s, during the second and third phases of the reform, with the schemes for division of land between peasants and landlords. Though the redistributive effect of these phases was negligible, their sociopolitical effect in breaking the traditional links between peasants and landlo\[\ldots\]rs was profound.”47 On the failure of land reforms Bill says: “The lack of institutions and rationalized processes results in the insecurity and inefficiency that are already evident in many areas of rural Iran. This has begun to alienate many of the villagers who are told that they are to begin new lives but who in fact see themselves victimized by government agents.”48 Consequently, agricultural proletariat along with dispossessed and landless peasants were rural emigrants who went to urban centers.

Fig. 2. 1: Mohammad Reza Shah speaking to people about principles of the 'White Revolution' in 1963.
Source: https://www.pinterest.fr/ (Last retrieved on 21 October 2017, at 12:05)

Fig. 2. 2: Shah distributing land ownership documents to peasants during the 'White Revolution' in 1963.
Source: http://www.iranchamber.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 October 2017, at 12:20)
Implementation of land reform laws, indeed, detached peasants from their means of production, land, and turned them into landless peasants who inevitably came to large cities (especially Tehran) in search of employment. In the developing nations, the ruling powers in order to undermine pre-capitalist forms of production and introduce new capitalist relations, detach producers from their means of production (mainly land). “Historically, this has been achieved by a variety of mechanisms such as taxation, land reform, forced migration and settlement of tribal populations.”49 In Iran, this is done through land reform laws. Concerning Mohammad Reza Shah’s land reform policies, Chaichian writes:

Shah’s land reform policies in Iran during the 1960s contributed to rural-urban migration that continued in the 1970s. The main objective of the land reform was to undermine the rural class base of feudal landowners in Iran, in the hopes of redirecting capital investment from rural areas to urban-based industrial activities. Lack of a long-term policy to support the newly emerging small landowner-peasant population in the countryside eventually led to the demise of independent peasant producers. Declining employment opportunities for landless peasants and rural wage earners gradually forced them to come to cities in search of employment. Even those peasants who benefited from land redistribution were not able to subsist, and eventually followed the wave of landless peasants and rural wage earners to the cities. As the evidence for Iran indicates, rural-urban migration especially after the implementation of land reform laws was migration of the poorest and the most destitute strata of peasants in the countryside to urban centers.50

As Chaichian mentioned above, Mohammad Reza Shah’s implemented land reform policies initiated in the 1963—due to the lack of a long-term supporting policy—failed and turned to be one major motive led to rural-urban migration, particularly migration of the unemployment and poorest rural population to the capital, Tehran. “For instance, during the 1900-1956 period about 61 percent of

internal migration movements were intra-urban, with only 39 percent caused by rural-urban migration. But rural-urban migration during the 1956-1966 period alone comprised 64.6 percent of all migratory movements in Iran.” 51 Subsequent to this migratory movement, Tehran experienced a significant growth in urban population.

This population movement from rural areas to urban centers, actually, is more forced by transformations occurred in means of production and even means of consumption, rather than lure of better-paid jobs and higher standards of living. “The rush towards the town is, in general, regarded much more as the result of a rural push than of an urban pull, that is to say, much more as a decomposition of rural society than as an expression of the dynamism of urban society.” 52 Ensuing breakdown of the rural society and its relevant agrarian economic system as the so-called rural push, unemployment in the respective place of origin majorly causes rural-urban migration. “In Tehran’s case, almost all the surveys conducted related to this matter indicate that unemployment at the place of origin was the prime factor for its migrant population. Obviously, those migrants who later joined their families who were already settled in Tehran have to be considered as an inseparable part of the first-wave migrants who came to the Capital in the search of jobs.” 53

The execution of land reforms through eliminating pre-capitalist relations of production and introducing new capitalist relations, actually, prepared the ground for private capitalist investments especially in industries. From 1968 to 1972, the push for rapid capital-intensive industrialization was at its high. Concerning the issue that why popular destination of the extensive rural-urban migration was Tehran, in fact, “capital-intensive industrialization in its spatial dimension has resulted in an increasing concentration of economic activities and population over the past few decades, limiting the spread of growth impulses to the capital city of Tehran and a few other major cities, and leaving the rest of the country untouched with the fruits of modernization.” 54 Enforcing policies of agricultural deregulation and de-peasantization (so-called rural push) in one hand and the growing number of capital-

51 Ibid, p. 103.
54 Toshtzar, Manoochehr. “The growth and development of the urban system in Iran, the period: 1900-1976”, A dissertation in city and regional planning presented to the graduate faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy, 1985, p. 272.
intensive industries concentrated in Tehran (so-called urban pull) on the other hand, accelerated exodus of rural migrants to the city. Former rural agricultural laborers—agricultural proletariat—became poor landless peasants migrated into urban centers looking for urban employment. Subsequent to urbanization and industrialization started in Iran, a number of modern factories were established in specifically Tehran, then, the rural population that was forcibly deprived of their means of production was mainly attracted to these employment opportunities. While a small portion of rural migrants is employed as wage-laborers, the rest is engaged in service-related activities. Drawing on the employment data of this period, the service sector that has been a major source of employment for rural migrants was the fastest growing sector; while, there was a significant loss of jobs in the agricultural sector.

Despite an absolute rise of employment in the service sector, the growing urban labor force could not be fully absorbed into the modern urban economy. Castells considers this surplus urban labor force in the developing countries as “a reserve army for a non-existing industry.”55 This surplus urban labor force could not be fully absorbed into the capital-intensive (rather than labor-intensive) industry sector. Hence, many of them in order to earn minimum income for subsistence became peddlers, street hawkers and vendors. It can be said that the increase in number of petty retailers in turn contributed to the development of the capitalist system since they facilitated distribution of produced commodities in a cheap way.

Unfortunately, due to the aforementioned attempts on decomposition of rural society and capture capital investments from rural areas to the urban centers, the rural-urban migration continued in spite of soaring urban unemployment. In other words, rural push sustained urbanization even when the urban pull was weakened. The growing number of the urban poor mostly comprised of the impoverished rural immigrants resided on the urban fringe; deprived from the benefits of the cities; and integrated very marginally into the social and urban system. The continuing deterioration of the employment conditions in Tehran alone indicates that the process of development in the country has not been the outcome of socio-economic and technological progress, so objectives normally expected by industrial development could not be achieved.

Within this context, continuation of the urbanization processes—rapid urban growth—leads to production of slum areas. Large parts of rural migrants as surplus urban labor force dwelled in these zones of highly marginalized informal urban peripheries comprised the new urban-based class of ‘urban poor’. Bayat describes the urban poor’s informal settlements as ‘unused or cheap purchased urban lands’ on the southern margins of the capital, built as shelters by their own hands.56 Settling in informal settlements established illegally on illegal sites deprives them from their very basic rights of provision of urban public amenities as citizen, so again they have to find their own solution. “The squatters got together and demanded electricity and running water; when they were refused or encountered delays, they resorted to do-it-yourself mechanisms of acquiring them illegally.”57 This act of utilizing public amenities illegally as a kind of urban disorder cannot be tolerated by the state so long, then in some cases state obliged to provide their informal settlements formal urban facilities. However, in general the state’s approach toward the urban poor was not changed. One clear indication of the state’s way of dealing with the urban poor is a regulated municipality law in the mid-1960s, based on which destroying all informal settlements whether located in the city or on its margins was allowed.

Due to the Castells’ standpoint, marginalization of the urban poor in the developing city can be anticipated. “Since the migration towards the town is the product of the breakdown of the rural structures”, says Castells, “it is normal that it should not be absorbed by the productive urban system and that, consequently, the migrants are integrated only very partially into the social system.”58 Accordingly, one of the motive forces behind ‘marginalization’ of the urban poor (not all, but rural migrants constitute a great proportion of the urban poor) reaches back to the very breakdown of the rural structure that was occurred ensuing the process of industrialization and urbanization. Concentration of the population in some particular areas is accompanied by concentration of capital, labor power, means of production and commercial activities. The land reform policies that led to restructuring of agriculture subsequently changed both means of production and consumption.

57 Ibid, p. 2.
Thus, displacement of rural population toward urbanized areas seems as an inevitable movement. In accordance with the population changes in areas of Tehran between 1956 and 1966, it is well referring to Bahrambeygui, as he says:

Between 1956 and 1960, population increase in northern Tehran was only 56.4 per cent but between 1956 and 1966 this increase was 172 per cent, an indication of northward movement, especially after 1960. The population movement in the eastern part of the city during the four years of 1956-60 is not so significant but the increase of 116 per cent between 1956-1966 is very great, and is a direct result of the construction of low and middle class buildings in this part of the city. The quantitative change of population in the western part of Tehran as a whole seems to be less important than that in other parts. During the period 1956-60 this part (western part) increased by about 6.8 per cent and from 1960 to 1966 by 43.6 per cent. [...] Turning to the southern part, this area had a relatively slow growth of 77.5 per cent during the 1956-60 period, but from 1960 onwards it showed a rapid increase of 301.8 per cent over the 1956 population. Such an increase which has been created mainly by new migrants, resulted in this part of the city becoming the most densely population area of Tehran.59

With regard to the above-mentioned data, it is apparent that from the 1960s onward, ensuing industrialization and urbanization, and particularly Shah’s land reform policies to help the very process of development, rapid increase in Tehran’s population, particularly southern parts (where rural migrants as new urban working class resided) occurred. As Tehran lacked the required infrastructure to respond the sudden wave of migration, the urban crisis happened and the urban poor emerged in the society.60 The emergence of a growing class of the urban poor, then, dates back to the early 1960s and as one major urban-based class can be identified especially after the implementation of land reform laws. Indeed, the land reforms that was planned to facilitate living conditions of rural population and enable the state to gain

60 It is worth mentioning that Tehran did not face any major problems until, approximately the early 1950s, so that “at the outbreak of the Second World War, Tehran had expanded without any serious difficulties and had managed to absorb its population growth. There had never been a period of acute shortage of housing.” Op. cit. Bahrambeygui, H, 1977, p. 130.
the support of them against other discontented segment of the society, rather increased the number of landless peasants. Their state of landlessness and increasing rural poverty acted as one major ‘push’ factor for rural population migration to Tehran, and poor urban social class grew—who in turn were as a source of socio-political unrest challenged the state.

Ultimately, the nature of capitalist economic development, decomposition of rural society, capital-intensive industrialization and internal socio-economic reforms that encourage private capitalist investments produce dependent urbanization. The emergence of urban poor and the spatial distribution of poverty across the urban space represent one negative sides of this dependent urbanization. Since mostly impoverished rural migrants who were forcibly detached from pre-capitalist forms of production and who turned to be urban unemployed and underemployed comprised a great proportion of the urban poor, it could, therefore, be said that “urban poverty is, for the most part rural poverty refashioned within the city system.”

The change happened in the class structure of urban population subsequently changed the spatial structure of Tehran as well; next sub-chapter provides a closer look at this issue.

2.2. TRANSFORMATION OF URBAN SPATIAL HIERARCHY IN THE EARLY POST-LAND REFORM YEARS

The implementation of land reform laws as a major part of the state’s modernization project led to transformation of existing class structure, which in turn transformed spatial hierarchy of urban areas as well. The spatial transformations that produced following the implementation of land reform in the 1960s contributed to the development of the dependent urbanization. Although the land reform was executed in the countryside, the program’s effects were not confined to the rural area and immensely affected the urban centers. It was in the aftermath of land reform in Iran that major urban centers particularly Tehran underwent severe uneven urban development and related consequences. As Katouzian mentions, Tehran of the mid 1960s turned to be “[T]he central core of the urban conglomeration and the chaotic fringes of growth of the city sprawling outward covered an area of 180 square

---

After the land reform laws were implemented, a massive wave of rural migrants came to Tehran. This extensive rural-urban migration drastically transformed former class composition. A poor urban class mainly comprised of impoverished rural migrants, actually, was a new social class created after the land reform. The growing number of urban poor that turned to be a part of urban system could not be fully absorbed into the urban employment. The increasing rural migrants in the city without a viable way to integrate them fully into the urban system and failure of the state in provision of the very basic urban services to benefit the lower social strata compelled them to find their own personal solutions in order to be survived in daily life. While the very basic demands of rural migrants, such as housing, could not be met within the formal markets, spontaneous settlements in limited areas of the city (southern parts) and on the margins are their own housing solutions. “The southern part of the city has had a relatively slow growth of 77.5 per cent during the 1956-60 period,” says Bahrambeygui, “but from 1960 onwards it showed a rapid increase of 301.8 per cent over the 1956 population. Such an increase which has been created mainly by new migrants, resulted in this part of the city becoming the most densely populated area of Tehran.”

Therefore, the southern part of the city was the most receptive area to the migrants. The poor quality slum-like houses, informal settlements and shantytowns were mainly existed housing pattern in the south of the city. Particularly formation and proliferation of informal settlements on southern urban fringes can be accounted as spatial manifestations of a newly emerged class that was detached from the socio-spatial structure of the society. On the other hand, disintegration of pre-capitalist relations and introduction of capitalism that happened ensuing the land reform led to the city’s development within the context of a dependent capitalist system. Thus, Tehran’s urban growth in post-land reform period was a kind of speculative development mainly based on private capitalist investments. Within this system of space production, albeit surplus labor force and capital is available, housing demand always is greater than supply. Imbalance between supply and demand in housing

64 Afterwards, this marginalized social class found public spaces of the city as a ground to be seen; to resist against existing inequality; and to ask for their right to the city in physical, social and mental terms.
sector following the implementation of land reform resulted in rapid rise in property price. Then, a segment of low-income long-term urban dwellers that could no longer afford high price of land and housing in Tehran inevitably migrated from city to its margins.

Accordingly, in addition to the impoverished rural migrants, long-term urban dwellers that could not cope with the ever-rising property price (as one of the consequences of land reform implementation) were involved in population displacement toward city margins occurred in the post-land reform period (Figure 2.3). Based on governmental data, in the 1960s there was a considerable rise in population resided in informal settlements on the urban margins from 17 to 45 percent of all population of Tehran. That is to say, low-income social classes whether could survived and remained in their former housing in the southern parts of the city, or had to move toward city margins.

Beside this migratory movement, another pattern of migration was also occurred at the city in the aftermath of land reform, an intra-urban migration. The segments of class of businessmen, merchants and traders who were attached to the bazaar as well as the new class of technocrats begun to migrate inside the city. Their movement pattern was from historical (middle and middle-southern areas) parts of the city toward the northern areas. In this regards as Bahrambeygui mentions, specifically after the 1960s, population increase in the northern parts of Tehran was 172 per cent, which was significant comparing to the 1950s.\textsuperscript{65} Then, there was a northward migration of high-income families. The motive behind this pattern of intra-urban migration was concentration of capital investments in the northern quarters of Tehran. Uneven urban development that mostly manifested itself as the concentration of capital investments in northern areas of Tehran was at its peak in the post-land reform period. Since the land reform of the 1960s by gradually eliminating pre-capitalist relations, paved the way for private capitalist investments, and ‘unevenness’ of the capitalist development pattern is a significant characteristic of this system.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid, p. 54.
The northward extension of the wealthy areas means diverting more capital toward the north of the city and the result was nothing but an increase in the contrast as well as in the distance between the north and the south of the city. Contrary to the poor quality of housing in the residential areas of the south, almost most of the houses in the northern parts were new buildings built following the construction boom of the 1960s. The varying qualities of residential buildings in the north and the south are in turn one of the indicators of the city’s sharp north-south duality that will be discussed in detail during the next chapter. Beside this new housing opportunity, the northern part of the city was equipped with modern facilities. Benefiting from the facilities concentrated in the northern parts of the city, then, was of forces behind intra-urban migration of some well-off families. In this respect, Amirahmadi and Kiafar writes: “The privileges offered by modern districts attracted the better-off portion of the population of older neighborhoods: modern bourgeoisie and upper petty bourgeoisie, particularly the new social group of technocrats and educated professionals.”

This upper class that due to its economic power could afford moving toward the better locational choices within the city, the north, favored this movement pattern. As this northward movement of high-income families continued, the lower social classes moved to quarters that were formerly the residences of the well-off families. However, it should be underlined here that the former neighborhoods of the well-off families were to the south of the Shahreza Street, which was a horizontal urban axis at the center divided the city into two parts of the south and the north. Hence, the low-income families who migrated to former residential areas of the well-off families were still remained in the area confined to the south of the Shahreza Street. The houses that were the dwelling of one well-off family were dwelled by several low-income families. The new low-income inhabitants could not afford maintenance payments, resulting in urban decay of the traditional quarters of Tehran.

Building on Wilson, following the intra-urban migration of higher-income families from an urban area to the other one, it would be difficult to maintain the basic public

---

67 Regarding the Shahreza Street, its location within the larger urban context of the city, its function, its significance and the like, there will be provided more detailed discussions in the next chapters.
amenities within the very abandoned area.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, inequality between two urban areas (one abandoned by well-off families and the other as their new neighborhood) will be intensified. Meanwhile, he argues that the low-income families that move out to the middle-class neighborhood lead to increase socio-spatial inequality within their own social group and their former neighborhood as well. Then, gradual deterioration of traditional quarters of Tehran and continuation of the growth of northern quarters accentuated the north-south contrasts. In other words, there was an ever-growing contrast between the southern and northern areas of Tehran.

Attaching to the formation of an enclave of affluence, advantages and power in the north whereas the decay of old Tehran continues, can be intense social dangers. Formation and development of an urban enclave with concentrated advantages despite the ever-growing impoverishment and decadence at the other pole of the city, is the situation that Harvey analogizes it to a ‘sophisticated mask’.\textsuperscript{69} Like any other masks, this mask can invite people to enjoy the advantages concentrated at one pole of the city while concealing the decay and impoverishment of the other pole. Only, at the point that people become curious about what lies behind the mask, the darker side of the city that is concentrated with disadvantages, decay and impoverishment can become manifested.

In general, there was a northward movement of high-income families and the southward movement of the lower income classes. While the northward concentration of modern residential areas, facilities and institutions attracted high-income families to reside in the north; “the southern location of much industrial activity and its association with cheaper low class housing, close to the place of work, has contributed to the further southward movement of this type of land use.”\textsuperscript{70} In this connection Der-Grigorian also writes: “The south included the industrial area and cemetery of Ray and the ex-fortified old Tehran; the north consisted of Shemiran and areas up to the slopes of Alborz mountain range. The poor south, with the dense bazaar and needy residential quarters was the binary opposite of the rich north, with

new villas, modern mini-markets, and fresh air and water.”\textsuperscript{71} Although, major heavy industries were concentrated in the south, there were also several industries constructed along the main western entry of the city, Karaj road (Figure 2.4).

Drawing on the map, it can be noticed that industrial activities in the south are much more closer to the southern urban margins of the city, than those located in the west. The concentration of heavy industries and their proximity to the southern residential quarters in one hand, and the lack of open spaces in this segment of the city on the other hand caused that pollution was always a problem of the south. Then, uneven spatial distribution of activities became more significant in the lower income segments of the city, the south. Upon this issue, Bahrambeygui writes: “Pollution is less intense to the north as a result of the presence of large planted areas which include parks, gardens and open spaces but in the south, because of the lack of open spaces, and the concentration of industry, pollution is very severe.”\textsuperscript{72}

The congestion existed in the south and capability of expanding over a large area could be accounted as the most important factor behind construction of several industries in the west. This westward expansion of several factories was in favor of the residents of the impoverished southern neighborhoods in terms of alleviating noise and pollution in the south. However, the land price in the west that compared with the south was much higher and did not allow the labourers of these industries to be resided close to their working place (unless they could be dwelled in the southwestern areas). This distance between the industries and labour forces was a significant problem that had been tackled by providing bus services in order to bring labourers from their residential area in the south to their working place in the west.\textsuperscript{73}

Although bus services helped the industry owners to handle the problem of distance between labour force and working place, the rising migration of the workers attracted to the job opportunities in the capital could not be responded.


\textsuperscript{73} Ibid, p. 120.
As the reflections of this north-south bipolarity of urban fabric of Tehran it can be referred to the pattern of population distribution and density. This is the land price mechanism as the most important barrier that confines spatial mobility of lower-income classes to particular urban localities. Accordingly, it can be derived from the population distribution of Tehran map that the areas of the highest congestion and density correspond with the impoverished southern neighborhoods (Figure 2.5). “This can be seen in an extended area from the bazaar southward to the railway station and including the two densely populated areas of Javadiyeh and Naziabad, between the railway station and Qaleh Morghi military airport and to the eastern part of Maidan-e-Shoosh. Here density exceeds 600 persons per hectare.”

On the contrary, in the northern parts of the city particularly from the Abbasabad northward population densities suddenly drop down as low as 50 persons per hectare, which indicates the larger plot size for housing units and the scattered nature of these housings because of existed unbuilt areas between them. The spatial segregation of different income groups also affected land use patterns of Tehran, so that examining its land use map will also reflect the north-south duality. Relying on the map, it can be observed that in the micro level, mixtures of land uses exist; however, in the macro level, generally concentration of favorable activities in the north and middle-northern areas and unfavorable ones in the south can be seen (Figure 2.6). The major concentration of industrial activities in the southern segments of the city is one of its most dominant use. Since in addition to the heavy industries that were majorly concentrated in the south, small industrial establishments were also located to the south and the middle-southern areas in a way that were mixed with residential quarters.

Regarding the lands used as gardens and parks, Abdollah-Khan Gorji writes: “The northern areas had various parks and playgrounds, mostly larger than those in the rest of the city. One park (Imperial park) alone, in the north, was much larger than the total parks and playgrounds of the city and almost six times the city park in the

---

74 Ibid, p. 51.
75 Ibid.
Although the southern areas of the city compared to the western and eastern parts can be considered as better provided with open spaces, the high population density of the south and its close distance to the industries whether heavy or light necessitate more gardens and parks than the rest of the city. Apart from the central area that devoted to governmental and commercial activities, particularly toward the north, there can be observed expansion of avenues with commercial activities. This expansion of commercial activities toward the northern areas is actually a respond to northward housing movement of high-income groups.

The location of royal places in the extreme north of the city can be observed in the land use map. Actually, during the 1960s the Shah also had a relocation from the Marble Palace in the center of the city to the Niavaran Palace in Shemiran in the north. This northward movement of the royal palace, in turn, enhanced the north-south duality. Beside royal palace and foreign institutions, educational establishments and hospitals regardless of the fact that highest population density corresponds with the southern areas of the city majorly concentrated from central areas northward. Ultimately, that is to say “[T]he difference between income groups clearly affect land use pattern and result in the southern part of the city being characterized by a congested and poor environment with a high density of population and housing whilst in the north the obverse is only too apparent.”

Hence, in this context it can be said that the spatial pattern of north-south polarization of the city drawing on which the high-income families resided in the north and the low-income families in the south were highly intensified in the post-land reform era. The contrasts between the north and the south of the city went more beyond the topographical factors that cause climatic differences, in population density, in land value, in capital investments, in urban facilities’ distribution, in quality of urban living, and so on there was an ever-growing gap between the two poles of the city. This north-south polarization of Tehran calls to mind what Smith says: “This is nowhere clearer than in the geographical contradiction between

---

development and underdevelopment where the over-accumulation of capital at one pole is matched by the over-accumulation of labour at the other.” 78 Then, he expresses that underdevelopment area is where massive unemployment and low productivity of labour existed. 79

The north-south dichotomy in Tehran that so vividly manifested itself as the contrast between concentrated poverty and wealth could be accounted as the most striking characteristic of this city’s urban form during this period. “The continuation of the general north-south dichotomy in the urban form of Tehran,” writes Abdollah-Khan-Gorji, “aside from the effects of deliberate actions, seems to be an outcome of spatial determinism of the existing segregated pattern of favorable and unfavorable areas and the power of the upper socio-economic groups at any given time, in enforcing their locational choices.” 80 Indeed, upon this accentuated north-south polarization of the city, the state’s employed planning strategies, development programs and policies produced stark socio-spatial disparities between the rich north and the poor south, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

79 Ibid.
Fig. 2. 3: Map of Tehran, showing the development of the city from 1881 to 1996. Particularly from the mid-1960s onward, fragmented developments around the city margins can be noticed. These fragmented developments on the periphery of Tehran were informal settlements of impoverished rural migrants and long-term urban dwellers that could not provide their housing need within the city, so they built their houses illegally on illegal sites outside the city limits. The concentration of these fragmented developments mainly in the southern and southwestern areas is an indicator of the lower property price of these parts.

Source: http://en.tehran.ir/ (Last retrieved on 24 October 2017, at 10:30)
Fig. 2. 4: Spatial distribution of industrial activities in Tehran in the late 1960s. 
Fig. 2. 5: Map of population distribution of Tehran, 1966.
Fig. 2. 6: Land use map of Tehran, 1970.
That is to say, in the post-land reform era, uneven urban development of Tehran mostly manifested itself as the concentration of capital investments in northern areas of Tehran was at its peak (Figure 2.7-8-9) Particularly from the mid 1960s onward that capitalist form of urbanization was developed across the urban space of Tehran, unevenness lies at the core of the urban process under capitalism was actively involved in (re)producing dichotomy between the north and the south and in clearly pronouncing it in various aspects of the urban everyday life. As Smith argues: “Uneven development is the concrete manifestation of the production of space under capitalism.”\(^81\) He emphasizes on this view when he says: “And Indeed the most developed pattern of uneven development does occur at the urban scale.”\(^82\) This happens because the driving force lies behind the uneven development is the mobility of capital and the urban space is where capital is in its most mobile form.

Certainly, when major part of private capitalist investments in Iran was done by foreign capitalist investors, urban development should be kept uneven to serve their interests (not the Iranian society’s interest). The patterns of urban development in the capitalist system are driven by the logic of capital—capital always has a tendency to move toward an area where the rate of profit is high. Drawing on this, capitalism fosters uneven pattern of urban development and so do capitalist investors. This can be considered as the most significant agent behind social stratification based on income groups stretched spatially along the north-south vertical axis of the city. “These two urban spaces (the north and the south)—set against each other—soon took acute social symbolisms. Spatial segregation and social struggle came to be embodied in the vertical Tehran.”\(^83\)

Thus, there was an unevenness existed in the development patterns of Tehran that was stretched along north-south axis of the city. Harvey sees the formation of this sort of socio-spatial polarization and ensuing marginalization of the disadvantaged urban dwellers as inevitable outcomes of the process of urban development under

\(^82\) Ibid, p. 150.
capitalism. To cope with this urban polarization and exclusion of the most vulnerable social class, he offers a ‘just distribution’ that could fulfill the needs of all social strata. If there is a just distribution of investments, facilities and socio-economic activities, then, locational advantage will be insignificant. Regardless of the area that people reside, all could benefit from the fruits of development. In the following, Harvey admits that to have such just spatial organization in the city is a great challenge while the patterns of polarization and exploitation are the inevitable products of the capitalist development.

---

The uneven development as an inherent tendency of capitalist urban developments explicitly manifested itself in the urban space of Tehran in the 1960s.

Source: A documentary film by Massoud Bakhshi entitled “Tehran has no more pomegranates!”

Fig. 2. 7: Royal Tehran Hilton Hotel, 1960s.

Fig. 2. 8: Tehran in the 1960s.

Fig. 2. 9: Tehran at night, 1960s.

Tehran was gradually taking on a new character that largely evokes western cities.

Source: A documentary film by Massoud Bakhshi entitled “Tehran has no more pomegranates!”
The concentration of capital investments, modern facilities and commercial activities that were all in the northern part of Tehran caused development of this area in a far higher rate than the southern part. Moreover, the state in concert with its implemented land reforms that aimed at integrating the country into the world capitalist system and encouraging foreign capitalist investments put the great emphasis on infrastructural developments, particularly in the areas of communications and transportation that needs to be mentioned as well. The networks of roads and railways, actually, play a key role in expanding the internal market and opening up new markets for consumer goods. On the other hand, construction of large number of highways in the capital was necessary in order to respond to the machine-tools factories, Iran national car assembly plant, and the like that were all newly erected under industrialization process of the country and produced huge number of cars more beyond the need of Tehran.

The transportation network of Tehran, so, was constructed in order to expand new commercial markets likewise to encourage the use of private automobiles at the expense of socio-spatial integration. At the time that there was a small proportion of the society that could afford private automobiles, constructing highways and transit routes was a part of modernization package of the state bypassing the low-income groups and giving priority to the upper classes. The planned transportation system of Tehran supported and exacerbated fragmented urban space of the city in a way that spatial accessibility of some areas was contingent on the use of automobiles. In other words, constructed highways and use of automobiles gave opportunity to those with economic power to segregate them from the others. As a result of the constructed network of highways and the state’s policy in promoting use of private automobiles, there is a clear rise in car ownership following the White Revolution (Figure 2.10).

Drawing on a note written upon the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of the 1968, it can be understood that the encouragement to use private automobiles and in concert with it high-way oriented development was one considerable bases of the future developments of the capital under the state’s top-down modernization program. In this connection, it is worth referring to a passage that implies the mentioned point. “The habit of the people of the United States of America is that women usually take
their husbands to work, then drop off their children at schools, and go shopping on their way home. The same trend is gradually becoming evident in Tehran, and the degree of its success at the end of the plan depends on the efficiency of the public transportation network. Yet, in terms of planning, the use of private vehicles should be the basis of future developments."  

Considering the United States’ role as the leading power in the world capitalist system and its highest share of investments in Iran in comparison to the other countries, explicate the attempt of the state in modernizing the country majorly based on an American model.

---

**Fig. 2. 10: The diagram above shows the car ownership in Tehran from 1957 to 1967.** Based on the diagram's demonstrated data, from 1963 onward there is a rise in car ownership in Tehran. The photo beside the diagram is derived from an article entitled "Problems of big cities" published in *Honar va Memari* (journal of art and architecture) in 1972. This article mentions to the problems that Tehran was facing during that period of time, of which the rise in using private cars in the city and related problems has been highlighted.


---

Overall, implementation of land reforms as the essence of the White Revolution heralded the beginning of a new era during which socio-spatial hierarchy of the capital was greatly affected. Prior to the land reforms, Tehran was a relatively small pre-industrial town, but in the aftermath of the land reforms the city turned into a metropolis with accentuated north-south polarization. The White Revolution and land reforms at its centerpiece, in fact, paved the way for incorporation of Iran into the global capitalist system. The increasing incorporation of the country into the world capitalist system led to the rising western-oriented bourgeoisie that were aspired to live in a westernized lifestyle as a part of cosmopolitan elite. Their move toward a westernized lifestyle that led to division of lifestyles, in turn, sharpened existing socio-spatial segregation between the bourgeois class and the lower income classes, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

In Tehran of the post-land reform era, capitalism turned to be the prevailing mode of production (including space production as well). With uneven urban development under capitalism came the production and reproduction of socio-spatial disparities across the urban space. The continuing process of capitalist urban development brought about perpetuation of unevenness of the capital’s urban space. It was during this period that uneven urban development in the form of concentration of investments, facilities and socio-economic activities and consequently concentration of capital, labor power and means of both production and consumption in some specific urban areas across the urban space of Tehran was at its peak. The unevenness of the pattern of urban development brought about serious urban problems in Tehran that mainly experienced by the poor strata and not the rich.

2.3. THE LARGE-SCALE URBANIZATION PROJECTS: NEVER FULLY REALIZED YET ULTIMATE MANIFESTATION OF THE WHITE REVOLUTION IN THE URBAN SPACE OF TEHRAN

The White Revolution of the Shah that heralded a new era best manifested itself at the spatial level through extravagant urbanization projects that were planned, designed and directed by International firms, especially American corporations. That is to say, in concert with pursuing the American model of development for the
capital, American architects were mainly executed mega-scale projects. However, the political turmoil and subsequently the 1979 Revolution halted construction and the American firms’ many projects destined to become mirages. The article entitled as “American architects in Iran saw gigantic projects fade away” published in the New York Times in 1979 points out to this issue (Figure 2.11).86

In the mid-1960s, preparing a master plan for Tehran was a project that an American firm in collaboration with an Iranian consultant was responsible for it. The Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968—a plan that was prepared for the next 25 years of development of the city—although was implemented partially, has had greatly affected socio-spatial structure of the capital’s urban space. Its proposed pattern of development and regulatory standards provided the basis for further urban development of the city, so that even after the 1979 revolution, parts of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 were implemented. Indeed, the Tehran Comprehensive Plan as a first master plan that was prepared for the city demonstrates how objectives proclaimed under the White Revolution found spatial representations.

Accordingly, studying the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 will result in illuminating reflections. It is noteworthy that Iranians should have collaboration with foreign firms in development projects in Iran as a requisite imposed from above. Most of the projects executed in this particular period in Tehran had foreign (usually American) consultants or were fully directed by foreign firms. “In Tehran, the Iranian consultant Abdulaziz Farmanfarmaian and his American partner Victor Gruen had produced a comprehensive plan, which was approved in 1968, becoming the most important postwar planning document for the city.”87 Then, Victor Gruen was an American partner of Iranian firm in order to prepare Tehran’s master plan.

Fig. 2. 11: The photo above is the very page of the New York Times newspaper published in 9 September 1979 that the article entitled “American Architects in Iran Saw Gigantic Projects Fade Away” appears on it.

This is an article written by James Barron about the American firms’ large-scale projects in Iran that halted due to the 1979 revolution. It is interesting that one of the halted projects mentioned in the article is the Shahestan Pahlavi project that will be discussed in the following pages.

Victor Gruen was best known as an architect of malls, since he could be accounted as a pioneer architect in designing shopping malls. Hardwick in his book entitled as “Mall Maker: Victor Gruen, Architect of an American Dream” provides insight on Gruen’s designed shopping malls and their role in changing American culture as well as landscape.  

Hardwick states that Gruen through designing shopping malls believed that he was promoting American dream—the dream of shops concentrated in a particular area that by benefiting both the consumer and the businessman would form a community. However, when Gruen returned to Europe (he was an Austrian architect emigrated to the United States), he himself was disillusioned with the American dream. He designed many shopping centers in the United States, but these malls did not form a community between the consumer and the businessman, rather acted as geographical materializations of the existed consumer culture and fostered American consumerism.

As a foreign consultant of Iranian firm in preparing master plan for Tehran in the 1960s, Gruen had a great opportunity to infuse his American dream into a country that was already pursuing American ideal in its path toward development. According to the Gruen and Farmanfarmaian’s proposed plan “[T]he city would be subdivided into 10 large urban districts (Mantagheh) each with about a half million population living in high rise buildings, with a commercial and an industrial centre. Each district would be subdivided further into areas (Nahiye, with 15,000-30,000 population) and neighbourhoods (Mahalleh, with 5000 population), with their associated facilities.” These 10 urban districts meanwhile proposed to be connected to each other through a network of transportation (Figure 2.12-13).

The master plan of 1968 highly emphasizes on commercial centers by defining separate commercial areas at the heart of each urban district. The core of each district is designated for commercial facilities, and other activities as peripheral areas would be formed around them, which evokes Gruen’s believed American ideal. This central position of commercial areas in the proposed urban districts implies the attempts in imposing and promoting the American consumerism in the society. Examining the
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master plan’s proposed shopping mall at the center of each urban district and the envisaged section of the very urban district reveals surprising similarities between them and their American models (Figure 2.14-15-16-17).

The plan’s proposal for transportation network is also worth examining. The massive rapid network of highways, motorways and transit routes proposed by the plan was intended to reach about 150 kilometers in length. As mentioned in a report (published in 1970) regarding the Tehran Comprehensive Plan, this extensive transportation network has the capacity to receive future bulk of traffic.\textsuperscript{90} This transportation network would link proposed 10 urban districts to each other. The network of highways and transit routes were headed toward north-south and east-west axes to cover all parts of Tehran (Figure 2.18). There is inconsistency here. For residential neighborhoods, the Tehran Comprehensive Plan proposes residents’ income level to be defined as a base drawing on which neighborhoods should be separated from each other. This strictly income-based segregated urban space that was envisaged for Tehran leads to deprivation of low-income families from spatial freedom. While there is a planned socio-spatial exclusion in the Tehran Comprehensive Plan, the massive network of transportation could not provide more accessibility, vice versa as a mechanism could intensify urban fragmentation.

Therefore, it can be said that this proposed extensive transportation network in the master plan of Tehran is consistent with the role that it will take on due to the country’s move toward integrating into the world capitalist system. Since investment in transportation is one of the inherent tendencies existed in the capitalist development process and so its improvement is inevitable. The proposed transportation network of Tehran could result in expanding the city’s internal market and opening up new markets, as well as supporting the use of private automobiles promoted by the state. That is, the proposal for expanding the network of highways and transit routes in the Tehran Comprehensive Plan is in effect a productive of value than a spatial accessibility for all (whether low- or high-income) residents. Besides, when an American woman’s everyday life that takes her husband to work, drop her children at school and then goes shopping on her way back home described in the

\textsuperscript{90} Honar va Memari [Art and Architecture], Issue 5, 1970, p. 71.
report of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan as a trend that would be evident in future Tehran, it is a symptom of a society that aims at being modernized in the image of the west (specifically the United States) at the expense of its real basic needs.

Centrality of commercial areas at the heart of each urban district, high-rise residential buildings and a transportation network to connect them that constitute fundamental elements of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan, once more, demonstrates that urban development processes in Iran was highly inspired by its American model. Moreover, the Tehran Comprehensive Plan by providing proposals of residential neighborhoods for different income residents solidified existed socio-spatial disparities across the urban space of Tehran, which will be discussed thoroughly in the forthcoming chapter. The proposed highly income-based fragmented urban space signifies that the master plan had no concern in terms of creating a more socio-spatially equalized city. Rather, in concert with its proposed economic-based segregation of social groups in the city, by setting high criteria and standards for further urban developments colonized specific urban enclaves for particular social groups and drive the rest away to settle in the peripheries.

Drawing on what has been mentioned, it seems clear that the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 designed and planned the city for the high-income social groups, who could afford to live with the plan’s imposed lifestyle—the lifestyle that was prevalent in capitalist societies of that time encouraging consumer culture, using private automobiles and living in high-rise buildings (Figure 2.19-20). Although Gruen and Farmanfarmaian’s prepared plan was not fully implemented, the plan’s proposed transportation network of highways, income-based segregated residential neighborhoods and high-rise apartment buildings were executed that radically transformed urban space of Tehran.91

---

91 Due to various factors, the master plan prepared for Tehran was implemented partially. “Aside from technical, administrative and implementation problems and lack of a concrete national spatial policy, this master plan had a major flaw which was its fundamental assumption that the population of the city would be limited to a pre-established ceiling of 5.5 million in 1981 and 10.5 million in 1991 which did not take place.” Abdollah-Khan-Gorji, Bahram. “Urban form transformations – The experience of Tehran before and after the 1979 Islamic Revolution.” A dissertation presented to the faculty of the graduate school university of southern California in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy (Planning), 1997, p.126.
Ultimately, the Tehran Comprehensive Plan could be considered as a significant part of the processes of implementing the White Revolution’s objectives at the spatial level. In other words, the urban future envisaged by the Tehran Comprehensive Plan meshed with the socio-economic and political reforms came along with the Shah’s White Revolution.

Furthermore, regarding the residential areas the Tehran comprehensive Plan of 1968, considered high-, middle-, and low-income neighborhoods that followed the same spatial pattern of north-south direction. Accordingly, the north was planned to be occupied by the high-income groups, the center by the middle-income, and the south by the low-income strata. Beside this way of spatial organization of income groups along the north-south axis, the qualities proposed by the plan for each neighborhood were also defined based on economic status of residents, detailed discussion of which will be provided in the following chapter. The city’s master plan proposals that were in support of the spatial segregation of different social classes based on their income level manifested along the north-south urban axis of the city, in turn, enhanced the division between the north and the south. In step with this strategy of maintaining spatial segregation of social classes, the 1968 Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s established new criteria and standards for the future urban developments likewise influenced the poor south residents that will be studied thoroughly during the next chapter.
Fig. 2. 12: The Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s proposal for development of Tehran. The proposed urban districts with commercial centers at the heart of each one, linked via a massive network of highways can be seen.


Fig. 2. 13: The First Master Plan of Tehran prepared by Victor Gruen and Abdol Aziz Farmanfarmaian in 1968.

Fig. 2. 14: The Tehran Comprehensive Plan's proposal for interior space of shopping centers located at the core of each proposed urban districts.

The similarity of design approach that Gruen used here and in his designed shopping malls in the United States makes it difficult to diagnose that it is a mall located in Tehran until one sees the advertisement boards that are in Persian.


Fig. 2. 15: The Southdale Center, a shopping mall in Edina, Minnesota, 1956.

The Southdale Center is one of the America's first fully enclosed malls designed by Victor Gruen and opened in 1956.

Source: https://www.theguardian.com/ (Last retrieved on 31 October 2017, at 15:25)
Fig. 2. 16: The Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s proposed section of one of the ten urban districts.
The proposed section of urban district evoking American cities’ downtowns.

Fig. 2. 17: The Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s proposed section of one of the ten urban districts.
Fig. 2. 18: The massive transportation network of highways and transit routes proposed by the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968. This proposed transportation network was partially implemented in the urban space of Tehran. Source: *Honar va Memari* [Art and Architecture], Issue 5, 1970, p. 72.
Fig. 2. 19: The proposal for northern part of Tehran (high-income families’ neighborhood) in the Tehran Comprehensive Plan, 1968.

High-rise buildings, network of highways and commercial areas at the center proposed by the plan for high-income families’ neighborhood (located in the northern part of Tehran) imply that the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 actually imposes a prevalent lifestyle in capitalist societies of that time likewise this high-income groups are the basis upon which the plan for whole city was designed. This proposed view was partially implemented in the northern part of Tehran.


Fig. 2. 20: View of a part of northern Tehran proposed by the Tehran Comprehensive Plan, 1968.

One of the other large-scale urbanization projects that was halted due to the 1979 revolution but can be taken into consideration as a best spatial expression of the White Revolution and its objectives is Shahestan Pahlavi—the project that was planned to cover over 560 hectares of a site in the north of Tehran. Designed by Llewelyn-Davies Associates in the mid-1970s, it was supposed to be a multi-use complex consisted of government, commercial and cultural offices and housing (Figure 2.21). In the proposed plan, the allocated floor space for commercial activities was impressive (about 5,130,000 square meters), which signifies the influence of capitalist development patterns, particularly American consumerism, in Iran of this period.

The Shahestan Pahlavi project was designed to be in the north of Tehran and its location was appropriate to encourage the rich north residents to involve in shopping activities more and more. Since, at the same time the southern parts of Tehran had more necessary needs to be fulfilled that were disregarded by the state. The Llewelyn-Davies Associates prepared the plan of the project as a new urban center addressing the growing wealthy northern urban enclave of the city. The government office towers, luxury hotels and restaurants, commercial centers, parks and parking lots along with high-rise residential apartments mainly to house privileged high-income families were designated to be located in the site. It was supposed to locate commercial buildings, financial institutions, retail and hotels and government office towers along the major axis.

Moreover, separate shopping centers for each residential area in the site were proposed. Allocating central areas for commercial facilities and government office towers reflects the emphasis of the project on developing these spaces, also by evoking downtown areas of American cities reveals that the Llewelyn-Davies Associates applied a Western-style development pattern while designing. Although, Llewelyn-Davies Associates’ proposal for the project that required several billions dollar to be realized was in contradiction with the very basic demands of the low- and middle-income families in the city, it was approved and supported
enthusiastically by the Shah. The main design characteristic of the project can be considered as its attempt in incorporating elements of Persian architectural tradition in the western design and planning approaches (Figure 2.22-23-24). It is not surprising that this demand was coincided with the time that the country was incorporated into the global market economy and desired to be a part of cosmopolitan society. Designing modern shopping buildings and then attempting to make them looking like traditional Iranian bazaars through applying vaults, or constructing hotels and using arcades in order to be like caravanserails, certainly, these are superficial approaches that produce a weak pastiche. Harvey best explains these—using his words—‘large-scale interior shopping malls with postmodern accoutrements’ and the like spaces as the end products that are produced and reproduced under the capitalist patterns of development across the urban space of the capitalist countries. Accordingly, it can be claimed that the Shahestan Pahlavi was a representative of the radically changed socio-economic and political context of Iran in which it existed, rather than a project that reflected Persian architectural tradition.

The Shahestan project is a spatial manifestation of the processes that took place in a specific period of time in Iran in that “spatial forms are there seen not as inanimate objects within which the social process unfolds, but as things which contain social processes in the same manner that social processes are spatial.” Drawing on Harvey’s viewpoint, production, reproduction and transformation of space as a ‘social product’ is contingent on dominant socio-economic and political relations in the society. Planning and design of Shahestan, then, demonstrate the pattern of urban development lies behind this project promoting American consumerism.

Regarding the scale of Shahestan, it was a large-scale urbanization project. The project’s extensive scale, in fact, reflects the Shah’s concern in constructing an urban center that aimed to be the largest of its kind in the Middle East and Asia. The Shahestan project for the Pahlavi dynasty was supposed to be similar to the Persepolis of the Achaemenid dynasty. In one of the advertisements for the
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92 One of the endnotes of the article entitled “Tehran: Paradox city”, mentions that the investment fund allocated to the Shahestan project was equivalent to the funds required for urbanization processes of the whole country for ten years. Shahshahani, Soheila. “Tehran: Paradox city”, IIAS Newsletter, 31 July 2003.
Shahestan project it was written as following: this is the first large-scale project of Iran and the fifth of the whole world in terms of scale. Half a million square meters is the building area with four thousand dedicated parking lots and 3 high-rise buildings of 30 floors that will be located in the site (Figure 2.25). The scale that was considered for Shahestan was as large that could influence the city form and character. Hence, Shahestan Pahlavi was a showcase development project that could shape Tehran’s urban space in a way that the Shah envisaged the capital and so could be accounted as a representation of Tehran’s urban future.
Fig. 2. 21: Plan of the Shahestan Pahlavi project proposed by Llewelyn-Davies Associates.
Source: https://mashruteh.org/ (Last retrieved on 2 November 2017, at 18:40)
Fig. 2. 22: Shahestan Pahlavi project, view of the model.
This is the view of a part of the Shahestan’s model, shows grid pattern of streets and a planned compact structured urban space; while delving into details demonstrates there are buildings with inner courtyards, vaults, arcades and so forth.

Fig. 2. 23: Shahestan Pahlavi project, view of the model.
Fig. 2. Shahestan Pahlavi project, drawing of interior space.
There is an article about Llewelyn-Davies, published in the New York Times in 1981 that mentions the Shahestan Pahlavi as one of his projects. It is noteworthy referring to it. “Lord Llewelyn-Davies was also involved in the planning, in 1976, of Shahestan Pahlevi, a new town that was to be a new center for Teheran. That project was directed by Jaquelin T. Robertson, the New York architect who is now dean of the School of Architecture of the University of Virginia.” Then it continues as “[F]or Shahestan Pahlevi, which was never realized because of the fall from power of the Shah of Iran, Lord Llewelyn-Davies and Mr. Robertson planned a dense, structured city inspired in part by Rockefeller Center.” While defining the Rockefeller Center as an inspiration source mentioned in this passage, illustrates the point that the attempt is to create a city in the image of the west, Jaquelin T. Robertson’s own notes (the architect who mainly directed the project as noted above) will be worth referring.

Robertson in an article concerning Shahestan Pahlavi, envisions it as a project that will “give Tehran and the nation both a precinct of high amenity and a ceremonial centre with which all citizens can identify; symbolize Iran’s rapid progress toward becoming a leading industrial nation and world power; also demonstrate new
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commitment to quality development.”

Then, he continues defining Shahestan Pahlavi as a project that can receive the admiration of foreign travellers. Making Tehran as a city—using Mazumdar’s words—‘worthy of foreign dignitaries’ visits’ was an important issue for the Shah so that some scholars find it as his main objective of modernizing Tehran. Moreover, he states that “Shahestan Pahlavi offers Tehran more than the chance to become just another large capital; it affords an opportunity for greatness.”

Here, there is an implication for the Shah’s used term ‘Great Civilization’. He proclaimed that the White Revolution would lead the country to move toward becoming a ‘Great Civilization’ and Shahestan Pahlavi was supposed to be the spatial manifestation of this movement.

Finally, Robertson states that “[T]he development of Shahestan Pahlavi can transform Tehran’s image to one of the world’s major capital cities: conversely, it could all too easily become a mediocre Western-style twentieth century development like the new downtown areas of too many North American and European cities.”

The emphasis given to the western-oriented development pattern of Tehran, here again, is explicitly stated (Figure 2.26). Therefore, it seems fairly clear that the Shahestan project embodied a significant ideological meaning; represented the state’s attempt to define the country’s relation to the world (as it was the stage that Iran was incorporated into the world market economy); and ultimately, was an urban manifestation of the socio-economic and political reforms that occurred at the context of Iran in the post-land reform era.

The Shahestan project and the Tehran master plan both signify how architecture and urban planning turned into an apparatus for serving the interests of the state. Following Mohammad Reza Shah’s launched White Revolution in 1963, the capital Tehran underwent urban transformations via which the autocratic state intended to

---


99 There is, even, a book entitled as “Toward the great civilization: a dream revisited” written by Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi himself.

modernize the image of the country across the world. The White Revolution as a reform series imposed from above aimed at eliminating pre-capitalist relations, introducing capitalist economic relations and encouraging foreign capitalist investments. Meanwhile, the United States as the major leading power in the global capitalist economy had considerable influence throughout the development process in Iran. Collaboration of Iranian technocrats with foreign (mainly American) firms as the state’s imposed requisite for preparing plans and urban development projects indicates the state’s tendency to construct a modern country in the image of the west.

The urban space of Tehran envisaged by the large-scale urbanization projects namely the Tehran Comprehensive Plan and the Shahestan Pahlavi Project was in concert with the reforms came along with the White Revolution. Constructing shopping malls, networks of highways and high-rise apartment buildings as particular architecture and urban planning practices compatible with capitalist cities constituted significant part of proposed urbanization projects for the capital from the mid 1960s until the late 1970s. At the heart of the examined urbanization projects was an imposed lifestyle prevalent in capitalist societies (mainly the United States) that promoted consumer culture, using private automobiles and living in high-rise buildings. Indeed, Tehran of 1960s and 1970s was designed and planned for those who could afford to live with the imposed lifestyle, which shows that the state’s pursued modernization programs under the White Revolution were devoid of social equality objectives. As a result of promoting westernized lifestyle, western-oriented bourgeoisie was increased in the society. The rising bourgeoisie that were aspired to live in a westernized lifestyle, in turn, exacerbated the cleavage between bourgeois class and the lower social classes. That is to say division of lifestyles sharpened the class divisions in Iranian society.

The mega-scale urbanization projects proposed and implemented in Tehran following the White Revolution also embodied ideological stances to represent Iran as a developed country like North America and Western Europe. Analyzing significant urbanization projects that although implemented partially shape further spatial organization of Tehran reveals that these projects were intended to improve place-image regardless of the primary urban needs of the poor. In order to fulfill the
Shah’s proclamation that his launched White Revolution would lead the country to move toward becoming a great civilization, the projects’ proposals were to create modern image for the capital while the southern neighborhoods of Tehran lacked very basic urban amenities. The pursuit for an improved place-image led to purification of the problematical neighborhoods of southern Tehran. The unevenness of such urban development pattern in Tehran of post-White Revolution period was one major motive to state that the White Revolution could not forestall rather paved the way for the 1979 Revolution.
Fig. 2. Shahestan Pahlavi project, view of the model.
This northward view of the model shows the major axis of the project and the government office towers and commercial buildings that are located along this central spine. This area was planned to be downtown of Tehran like downtowns of North American and European cities. 
Source: https://mashruteh.org/ (Last retrieved on 2 November 2017, at 23:40)
CHAPTER 3

UNEVEN URBAN DEVELOPMENT: SPACE PRODUCTION UNDER HEGEMONIC COMMAND OF CAPITAL AND THE STATE

Switching capital into built environment is the most accomplished spatial manifestation of capital. Then, that is to say, urban development is contingent upon the accumulation of capital and fixing the very capital in the built environment. However, this process of spatial fix is mainly directed by the rate of profit to be achieved. Smith expresses this direction of capital where he writes: “The mobility of capital brings about the development of areas with a high rate of profit and the underdevelopment of those areas where a low rate of profit pertains.”

Indeed, what Smith calls as the ‘see-saw’ theory, provides a framework based on which production of uneven development patterns under capitalism can be better perceived.

He argues that the course of capitalist developments is tied up with the logic of capital—capital has a tendency to move toward an area where the rate of profit is highest. Thus, concentration of capital in particular areas leads to development of these regions; however, the growth itself eliminates this high rate of profit through increasing the ground-rent, labor costs and so on which entails another capital movement. “That is, capital attempts to see-saw from a developed to an underdeveloped area, then at a later point back to the first area which is by now underdeveloped, and so forth.”

This pattern of movement of capital is like a ‘see-saw’ movement so Smith calls it as the ‘see-saw’ movement of capital and states that it is the logic lie behind the pattern of uneven development.

102 Ibid, p. 149.
Although, Smith’s ‘see-saw’ theory expands on understanding of the uneven development patterns in capitalism as not attributing a historical account to the produced unevenness but considering it as a movement that there is a logic behind it; experiences of all urban areas do not follow his offered pattern. According to Smith’s ‘see-saw’ theory, there is a continuous movement of capital so all areas will experiences of periods of growth and decline. He states that capital will leave an area and then move back to the very deserted area; this is not valid for all urban areas.

There are, of course, examples demonstrate that some areas across the urban space can remain undeveloped and marginalized from the process of development like Tehran. The southern Tehran in the 1960s that urbanization and modernization processes were at their peaks remained undeveloped; the flows of capital were into the northern areas and never abandon this direction to move toward the southern areas. Massey in her book ‘Spatial Division of Labour’ in 1984 goes further and develops a more proactive explanation of the process of uneven development. She offers that it is not the logic of capital alone that results in growth or decline of a specific area, rather there are wider driving forces such as political agencies and activities. “In short, in her view, the economic success or failure of regions was a result of the interplay between regionally specific attributes and processes and wider systemic forces shaping flows of capital.”

Massey emphasizes to develop a kind of political-economy approach that comprises wider agencies responsible for the formation of uneven developments. In this respect, the state and other powerful agencies that play crucial role in producing and organizing uneven development across the urban space can be taken into account. The government’s policies, investments, reforms and so on are highly important forces deciding the success or decline of a particular urban area. Therefore, this political-economy approach toward the uneven pattern of capitalist development is more comprehensive and more urban areas with experiences of growth or decline can fit this pattern. Nevertheless, whether it is the logic of capital or political objectives that lie behind the uneven urban development, capital flows away from creating a

livable place for many of the citizens. Concentration of capital in the form of large-scale investments, commercial and economic activities in few urban enclaves is spatial manifestation of uneven urban development. If this uneven urban development turns to be the predominant pattern of development across the urban space, the areas with locational advantages will continue to grow at a rate faster than other areas; this is what generates socio-spatial disparities across the urban space. Such development programs do not succeed in reducing poverty level of the lower income group of the society; rather produce and reproduce much more poverty.

The uneven urban development, then, is a mode of spatial pattern of development, very often, can be seen in developing countries during the process of urbanization. This uneven urban development continues and roles as the predominant pattern of development based on which further course of development is determined. As this unevenness goes on and on the socio-spatial disparities between different areas of the urban space will be intensified. Even if the uneven development and concentration of modernization programs in some particular areas across the urban space are occurred as inevitable part of the early stages of the development, moving toward the more balanced spatial growth should be favored at the later stages of the development.

There should be interventions by the responsible authorities to re-direct the course of developments to the less developed areas before this polarized spatial development becomes solidified. As polarized development proceeds in the same pattern, the areas with locational advantages will continue to grow at a rate faster than other areas; this is what generates socio-spatial disparities across the urban space. Areas of concentrated disadvantages as areas of high poverty and their dwellers as the urban poor emerge in the society. Ever-widening disparities, socio-spatial segregation and exclusion from socio-cultural structure of the society, all prepare the grounds for further problems of enormous proportions.

Particularly, following the White Revolution of 1963, under modernization programs Tehran as the capital of the country underwent major urbanization. At the core of this urban process was the command of capital and state power, based on which urban investments were directed. Since, high levels of concentration of capital in the form
of large-scale investments, projects and economic activities in specific urban locations is spatial manifestation of development pattern rests on the logic of capital mobility, this uneven development expressed itself as the north-south polarization in the urban space of Tehran. The modern state-buildings, institutions, urban facilities and infrastructure constructed through modernization programs of Tehran were mainly concentrated in the northern part. Thus high-city residents were benefited from advantages brought about by modernization, whereas the low-city residents were excluded from it. As this mode of uneven urban development solidified as a hegemonic pattern of development, socio-spatial segregation of high-income and low-income residents turned to be one major dynamic, organizing urban space of Tehran. The residents of a specified part of the city were profited from the urban facilities and infrastructures; however, those who were remained outside of the very specified part were totally deprived of any facilities.

Hence, it can be said that shaping the high-city space to serve the needs and interests of high-income residents and excluding lower social classes from the very benefits alienated the urban poor from development process. The alienation of urban poor has the necessary potential that under specific conditions could stimulate movements that have a revolutionary dimension. Like the Iranian Revolution of 1979, when in the late 1970s the alienation of the underprivileged population that reached to a dangerous level provoked urban uprisings with revolutionary potential. For this reason, uneven urban development, its produced stark socio-spatial disparities across the urban space of the capital, and deteriorating urban life qualities of the urban poor associated with disequilibrium condition existed in the city, could be taken into account as one significant motive lay behind the 1979 Revolution.

In this perspective, throughout this chapter, uneven urban development of Tehran, in particular its most crucial geographical materialization in the domain of housing will be examined. Since, “uneven development is social inequality blazoned into the geographical landscape”105 (using Smith’s words) this can only be comprehended through integrating social processes go on in the city and the related spatial forms bring about while analyzing urbanization of a city. From this standpoint, addressing

uneven urban development in Tehran would be feasible by analyzing socio-economic and political structural changes and even in a period of time the state’s deliberate planning strategy that all contributed to uneven urban development of the city.

3.1. BREAKING THE ETHNO-RELIGIOUS SEGREGATION: THE EMERGING CLASS-DETERMINED FRAGMENTATION OF THE URBAN SPACE

Like in other pre-industrial urban societies, spatial segregation of ethnic and religious groups was common and more vividly manifested itself in the residential layout of the Persian urban societies such as Tehran. “The often diverse ethnic and religious backgrounds of social groups found spatial expression in the division of the city into quarters, though these were seldom walled off from one another,” say Clark and Costello, “Minority religious groups were segregated from Muslims, the Zoroastrians of Kerman, for example, being forced to live outside the city walls, while the large Armenian community which was forcibly transplanted from Azerbaijan to Isfahan in the sixteenth century was settled across the river to the south of the city.”

Therefore, while the rich and the poor both lived in a neighborhood, the ethno-religious factors were important cause of spatial discrimination.

Along with modernization attempts began in the capital Tehran, socio-spatial segregation of ethno-religious groups was breaking down and instead a new form of stratification based on economic classes emerged within the urban space. “Money provides access to the community, making it less exclusionary on other grounds (residential segregation by ethnicity and even race tends to weaken the further up the income scale one goes).”

With the transformation of Tehran into a modern city, the traditional communal bonds that created coherent urban entity was dismantled and replaced by a new form of strict spatial segregation along the lines of social classes. In this hierarchical arrangement, residential segregation based on class stratification along the north-south axis was reflected. The emerging pattern of north-

---

107 Ethno-religious groups, themselves, split into different social groups according to their economic classes.
south duality of Tehran was simply spatial materialization of social stratification according to income groups. Within this context, it is possible to say that spatial segregation is linked with the continuing production of social divide. “Stated somewhat differently, every mode of production produces its own space, or perhaps more accurately, its own socially organized space, which becomes particularized and concrete within a given social formation.”\textsuperscript{109} Particularly from the mid 1960s onward that capitalism was entirely supporting urbanization processes of Tehran, its class-divided urban space could be considered as direct product of capitalist mode of production of space. Doubtless, this new form of socio-spatial discrimination mostly addresses the new poor urban social class. From the state’s socio-economic and political reforms to planning strategy all produced, exacerbated and guaranteed the reproduction of the class-determined fragmentation of the urban space of Tehran.

Especially, the pervasive role of the state in manipulating the production of space via development planning that brought about class fragmentation within urban space of Tehran cannot be underestimated at all. In this regard, in the last years of Mohammad Reza Shah’s reign (1970s) Tehran was dangerously divided between the poor in the south and the rich in the north. The increasing social inequality became manifested in the widening differences of the size and type of housing in the Tehran’s different residential districts; in the unequal distribution of means of collective consumption namely, transportation, welfare, education, health and so on; in the distinct experience of urbanism of different income groups; and even in the uneven distribution of population across the city.

The nature of capitalist development, capital-intensive industrialization, dependent urbanization, and implementation of land reform policies all contributed to uneven urban development of Tehran; although the resulted unevenness may not be their objectives. As discussed in the earlier chapter, a wave of modernization programs executed during Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi reign—starting from 1963—brought about major transformations in socio-spatial organization of big cities, particularly Tehran. Mohammad Reza Shah always dreamed of Tehran as a large metropolis. In so doing, his implemented socio-economic reforms and political strategies affected

and operated at all levels of the city, turned Tehran into a metropolis. Castells best describes this process of metropolitanization. Before, referring to Castells’s explanation, it is worth mentioning that, although the process of “Metropolitanization” of each city is different from another, there are some shared stages in such processes, based on which drawing a general outline for it is feasible. Castells’s note on “Metropolitanization” implies the generality of this process for most large cities, when he writes: “Concentration of the population and activities in some major areas at an accelerated rate. Metropolitanization follows from the process of uneven development and from the concentration of capital, means of production and labour in the monopolistic stage of capitalism.”

The restructuring of agriculture leads to transform means of production and even means of consumption, what follows with influx of migrants into the urbanized areas. Then, the concentration of working-class, labour, means of both production and consumption, services, activities and capital absorb more and more population—that is to say, a metropolitan area is formed. The capital Tehran, also, underwent the same stages during its transformation into a metropolis. Encouraging private capitalist development, pushing for rapid capital-intensive industries and in support of them implementing socio-economic reforms (especially land reform policies) together produced dependent urbanization. Dependent urbanization, then, caused concentration of mass of population in the capital without integrating them into the urban system. The ever-widening socio-spatial cleavage between different social classes intensified the poor-rich polarization of the city.

If the socio-spatial discrimination that the new urban poor experienced due to the above-mentioned processes could be considered as an unexpected outcome, the state’s planning strategy was, consciously and intentionally, aimed at economic-based segregation of social groups across the urban space—a kind of “planned segregation by income for the Tehran metropolitan area has been a feature of development policy.” This planning strategy was carried out by the state and the private sector throughout the 1960s and 1970s in the form of building housing

projects based on economic status of residents in particular urban locations reserved for the relative social classes. In so doing in the 1960s, the neighborhoods such as Naziabad and Kuy-e Nohom-e Aban in south Tehran were built for working class; Tehran Pars in the eastern parts of the city was designed for middle-income groups; and Abbasabad in north Tehran was developed for high-income groups.

For instance regarding Naziabad, “it began in the early 1960s on 300 hectares in south Tehran, divided into plots of 80 square meters, for two-room flats for the working class of the neighboring industrial centers.”\(^{112}\) Also, Kuy-e Nohom-e Aban, began in the mid 1960s, was located in the south Tehran, about 6 kilometers south of the railway station. “Over 3450 low-cost three-bedroom houses were built for sale to slum dwellers who would pay for their units at low monthly rates over 15 years.”\(^{113}\) However as it is documented in the later government reports, slum dwellers could not pay for their units even in the defined long period which caused problems for further development of this project.\(^{114}\)

While, these projects were constructed in the south for the lower social strata, residential districts for high-income groups, such as Abbasabad, were built in the north. In other words, social gradient among different income groups found concrete reflections on the space. This way of spatial distribution of housing for different income groups in different geographical directions of the city alludes to the point that topographical factors cause climatic differences for Tehran. Upon this issue, Bahrambeygui writes: “Tehran is severely restricted by mountains and high hills both to the north and, to a lesser extent, to the east. On the south, it is the proximity of the dessert that imposes limitation.”\(^{115}\) Geography of Tehran is, in itself, unjust but there are another processes at work that (re)produce unjust geographies as well. Beyond the geographical advantages of the north, there existed socially constructed qualities that attracted more capital investment toward this area and produced socio-spatial inequalities. The above mentioned Abbasabad area while provided better

\(^{112}\) Ibid, p. 173.

\(^{113}\) Ibid.


\(^{115}\) Bahrambeygui, H. “Tehran: An Urban Analysis”, Tehran: Sahab Book Institute, 1977, p. 131. Accordingly, climatic diversity from north to south is the main determining factor in the preference of south Tehran for low-income and north Tehran for high-income residential areas.
climatic conditions (fresh air, water, and the like) for its residents also offered high rate of profit for investing there due to the high land price and so more newly established facilities located there; but, Naziabad both endured geographical disadvantages of the south and its own particular location, which was adjacent to the slaughterhouse of the city and railway station on its north side and the military airport of Qale Morghi on its west side and of course the investment on its land is lower. The location of Naziabad and Nohom-e-Aban as working class neighborhoods in the south was produced locational disadvantages for its residents, however on the other hand their location in the south were of importance for industries existed in the same site. Since, industries are assured of accessing to a cheap and large labour force that does not need to be transported great distances.

Examination of the proposals for high-, middle-, and low-income groups’ neighborhoods under the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 shows that executed planning strategy aimed at solidifying class-determined fragmentation of the urban space of the city; so that, high-income families in the north, middle-income families in the center and low-income families maintained in the south of Tehran. Accordingly, the proposed plan for high-income groups’ neighborhood was large open area located in the north of Tehran (Fig. 3.1). This part of the city benefits from better climate; while also its natural geographical slope provides a view of the whole city. The key point that can be highlighted regarding wealthy neighborhood proposal is the given emphasis on high mobility of dwellers by supposing an average of one private automobile for a family. It has been mentioned that high-income families’ high mobility entails adequate roads, parking lots and accessibility to urban facilities rather than pedestrian access. In accord with this issue, commercial centers were supposed to be located along the major streets and a gas station proposed to be built in the neighborhood.

It is obvious that in the proposal, private automobile took priority over pedestrian and became the basis for design and planning. Moreover, land pieces are considered large enough to enable constructing buildings in different forms toward north-south direction as well as encompassing facilities such as swimming pool, tennis court,

garden and the like.\textsuperscript{117} Then, more than allocating lots for public parks and gardens, the intent was to designate land piece of each building large enough to have its own private greenery space.

The proposed plan for middle-income families’ neighborhood was located in the middle of the city, between the northern and southern part, just like their economic class (Fig. 3.2). The point that is significant is the greater stress on the issue that these middle-income families’ socio-economic status is usually in change, then, urban facilities and equipment of their living neighborhood should be foreseen concerning this change.\textsuperscript{118} For instance, it has been noted that tendency of a middle-income family to buy a private automobile should be considered even if they do not possess it yet, and based on this sort of anticipation, major roads and accessibilities within their neighborhood should be planned.\textsuperscript{119} Single-story or two-story houses will be constructed on the periphery of the site, and four-story apartment buildings that will accommodate to major segment of middle-income families will be built in the central area of the neighborhood.\textsuperscript{120}

As it can be guessed, low-income groups’ neighborhood was an area with small housing units, proposed to be located in the southern part of the city (Fig. 3.3). Again, anticipation of possibilities of possessing a private automobile for a low-income family and designing according to this presupposition can be noticed. It has been stated that a low-income family could not afford buying a private automobile during 10 to 15 years ahead, and hence they will be quite dependent on public transportation and pedestrian accessibility.\textsuperscript{121} Therefore, instead of long-distance motor vehicle routes, more numbers of short-distance pedestrian routes can be observed in the proposal. Unlike the wealthy neighborhood that accessibility of each housing unit to the major street was a priority, some of the low-income families’ housing units have accessibility to main roads and the rest do not.

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid, p. 54.  
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid, p. 55.  
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid, p. 56.  
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid, p. 57.
Nevertheless, as explained in the comprehensive plan, parking lots for 10-15 years later (assuming that low-income families’ could buy private automobiles at that time) have been designated.\textsuperscript{122} Since, it seems impossible for a low-income family to buy a private automobile in a period less than 10 to 15 years and at the contemporary time housing shortage is a more necessary problem to be dealt with, it is suggested in the plan that in place of these parking lots, temporary housings could be built and in the future they could be demolished.\textsuperscript{123} Neither the issue of keeping particular land pieces vacant as future parking at the time that poor housing problem is at its peak, nor the suggestion of constructing temporary houses to be demolished in the future (destroying a house even a temporary one is not that much easy) could be valid affairs.

Interestingly, it has been clearly mentioned that contrary to the high- and middle-income families’ neighborhoods, need for educational facilities to be existed in the low-income groups’ living area is not high; but because education is a medium via which poverty could be eradicated, the state will provide educational equipment for the southern impoverished neighborhoods as well.\textsuperscript{124} There is no justification for lesser need of the poor families living in disadvantaged neighborhoods of southern Tehran, while simply knowing that they are more crowded families with more number of school-aged children comparing to the high- and/or middle-income families. There exist land pieces allocated for constructing mosque, public bath, soccer field, park and petty retail shops. Almost all housing units are planned as small pieces for living of one or two families organized in an orthogonal grid. There are some four-story apartment buildings that have been proposed to be constructed in the central part of the neighborhood.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{122} Ibid, p. 60.  
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid, p. 57.}
Fig. 3.1: Example of the proposed plan for high-income group's residential neighborhood.

Fig. 3. 2: Example of the proposed plan for middle-income groups’ residential neighborhood.

Fig. 3. 3: Example of the proposed plan for low-income groups’ residential neighborhood.
Hence, the new form of spatial segregation based on economic classes came along by modern urban planning strategy that the government implemented, through which residential stratification was institutionalized. A direct consequence of these planning strategies was, undoubtedly, sharpened segregation among different areas of the city. The inhabitants of each neighborhood were ascribed a collective status, drawing on which their neighborhood was segregated from the others. Class-based segregation of the city engenders many problems of which high levels of poverty concentrated in some areas across the urban space and their dwellers as the urban poor come to prominence. Planned segregation of different income groups, indeed, paved the way for the growth of urban inequality. Then, socio-spatial polarization of Tehran along the north-south axis and the severe spatial inequality existed in the city cannot simply be seen as a historic trend. Adopting the metaphors of historic or natural trend to these socio-spatial processes, merely, help authorities skip responsibilities regarding their actions in the public. The intensified contrast among different districts of the city was in part because of the nature of capitalist development, capital-intensive industrialization, dependent urbanization and implementation of land reform laws and in part because of the government’s strategy of planning spatial segregation based on economic classes.

In step with the strategy of planning spatial segregation, setting criteria and standards for the urban development plans regardless of the needs of the most vulnerable class of the society, urban poor, is another cause of their authorized marginality. Truly, as James D. Wolfensohn explained in his speech on poverty and social justice in 1996, “the worst feature of poverty is ‘voicelessness’.” The Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 did not make provision for low-income groups while setting land use and zoning regulations. Consequently, due to the Tehran Comprehensive Plan poverty would be eradicated by the 1974, which in turn heralds that whether urban poor left out of the urban development plan or responsible authorities were not aware of the concrete reality of poverty existed in the poorest strata of society.

Referring to some criteria set by the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 casts light on how the urban poor was neglected. According to Athari, the average plot size in Tehran was 100 square meters before the Tehran Comprehensive Plan was prepared.
in 1968; however, the development plan of 1968 set the minimum plot size of 300 square meters.\textsuperscript{125} Another constraint regulated by the master plan of 1968 that contributed to displacement of the urban poor from particular urban localities was about designating the ‘legal city boundary’ and the ‘urban periphery’. Within the defined legal city boundary formulated regulations and policies are applied, also, this is the area that the state has to make provisions of the basic services and infrastructures. The urban periphery, which encompasses the legal city boundary, is the area preserved for the future development so that any construction inside it is not allowed. The confined supply of land inside the defined ‘legal city boundary’ in one hand and being the only area that construction is allowed (outside of this boundary is the area called the ‘urban periphery’ where construction is prohibited) on the other hand are two significant factor in rising the land price within this boundary.

Following the implementation of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 and delineation of city’s legal boundary the property price within this area had a rapid rise. Unaffordable land price is among one of the major problems that Tehran has borne it particularly from the 1960s onward. Rising price of land, limits the property available for low-income urban residents to afford a decent housing. Thus, excluding such vulnerable class of society from their rights of having affordable housing as urban citizens, forces them to live in informal developments. In this regard, Braithwaite argues that the rise of modern bureaucracy, namely, building regulations acts as an important instrument of organizing and governing for the state.\textsuperscript{126} Regulations and regulatory agencies, also, by reducing the risk of development promise capitalist investments profitable capital accumulation.

Drawing on what has been mentioned it seems fairly clear that the government utilized modern urban planning system to drive poor away from legal city boundaries since they cannot meet the defined standards. This force relocation of poor is, exactly, what Merrifield called as ‘the practice of neo-Haussmanization’.\textsuperscript{127} According to him, like Paris of 19\textsuperscript{th} century that drove poor away from centers to the

peripheries, similar kinds of matter happened (and still happens) in other urban societies as well. “Paris is a cell-form of a bigger urban tissuing that’s constitute by a mosaic of centers and peripheries scattered all over the globe, a patchwork quilt of socio-spatial and racial apartheid that goes for Paris as for Palestine, for London as for Rio, for Johannesburg as for New York.”\textsuperscript{128} If Georges-Eugene Haussmann by constructing grand boulevards, buildings and other large-scale reconfiguration of Paris caused expulsion of the poor residents from the city; in the 21\textsuperscript{th} century, socio-economic forces such as rising property price, class monopoly rent, state interests, employing urban development plans to regulate high criteria and standards beyond capacity of the lower class to afford them, and so on through colonizing the core lead to great dispossessions and to living on urban fringes as the only survival alternative for the poor. Thus, the same practice of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Paris under Haussmann still happens, which Merrifield conceptualized it as a form of neo-Haussmanization.

Subsequently, from the implementation of the Tehran’s master plan of 1968 onwards, formation and expansion of spontaneous settlements on the city’s margin to house the neglected urban poor could be observed. For instance, the very first spontaneous settlement on the Tehran fringe is Eslamshahr that its emergence dates back to the 1960s. Merrifield Argues that urban space under neo-Haussmanization undergoes socio-spatial transformations that bring about dispossession, expulsion and marginalization of the poor. At this very stage, the urban space is no longer a realm to live rather it is transformed into a financial commodity. As long as the urban space is treated like a pure financial commodity, end of neo-Haussmanization can not be reached; core-periphery tensions will be existed; formation and proliferation of informal settlements on urban fringes could be observed; and ultimately, spatial segregation and social exclusion of urban poor will be legitimized. For him the only way to change the existing nature of urban societies—peripheralizing poor population—is to have “the urban space as use-value not exchange-value, as a lived not ripped off realm, with integrative not speculative housing.”\textsuperscript{129}

Living in informal settlements where there are not adequate public facilities and services, marginalizes their dwellers from the whole society. The failure in provision

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid, p. 29.  
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid, p. 31.
of basic facilities and the dwellers’ inability to afford the standards of the formal settlements cause them (informal settlement dwellers) to find their personal solution in order to house themselves. This led to create a new way of life in these spontaneous settlements that in turn through enhancing extant socio-spatial segregation and through excluding the urban poor from the rest of the legal city prepare the grounds for further problems of enormous proportions.

3.2. THE HOUSING PROBLEM: THE NEW URBAN POOR, THE NEW URBAN RICH, AND RELOCATING THEM TO APARTMENT BLOCKS

The metamorphosis of Tehran from a traditional city into a modern metropolis was accompanied by the crisis of some key urban public facilities namely housing. Particularly, devastating reality of housing condition in south Tehran was indicating that a severe problem of housing exists in the city. Since, housing is one of the most crucial geographical materialization of the uneven urban development in the city, as urban inequality was exacerbated the housing quality of the southern parts of Tehran was deteriorated more and more. Regarding the housing condition of the working class, Hovanesian’s description is worth quoting in full:

Although the steady industrialisation of the country made the number of workers increase day by day, nobody would think of their welfare. So many children would die every day in those chaotic, contemptible and dirty places, lacking suitable light and fresh air; these unhealthy conditions would gradually and cruelly break the spirits of these young people and would penetrate into and poison all their cells. It is a gradual death, it is a crime! ... The government had to think of a solution for this strange disease called ‘housing famine’ which had afflicted the workers and low-income families. For this reason, architects and urbanists have to accept the responsibility to tirelessly make efforts to address the housing problem and to develop a ‘lively and dynamic’ city, which required the establishment of modern neighbourhoods with all sorts of facilities.130

---

During the last years of Mohammad Reza Shah’s reign (the late 1970s), the housing problem was at its worst. As Asef Bayat argues in his book, other sociologists also state that housing problem was one of the significant active forces that motivated participation of the masses in the Revolution of 1979.\textsuperscript{131} From this it follows that, southern parts of the city such as Shemiran-e-no, Javadiyeh, and Shahr-e-Rey to name just a few, were the areas from where the first sparks of the 1979 Revolution were ignited.\textsuperscript{132} The government was aware of the problem of shortage of housing, high property price, and high rent. That is to say, “urban expansion in Tehran was based on under-regulated, private-sector driven, speculative development. Demand for housing always exceeded supply, and a surplus of labour and capital was always available; hence the flourishing construction and the rising prices of land and property in Tehran.”\textsuperscript{133}

To resolve the problem, the state unveiled a program to construct low-cost housing units through which, actually, relocating segments of the low-income people to the apartment blocks. Most of these state-run projects for the poor segment of the society were to be located in the south Tehran near industrial plants. The idea of low-cost mass housing was, indeed, materialized in the form of construction of new neighborhoods. This formulation was envisioned by Europe-trained Iranian architects. Accordingly, like European governments constructed mass housing in the form of new neighborhood as a remedy to heal war-stricken Europe, Europe-trained Iranian architects envisioned the same approach in Iran. One of the first modern mass housing projects in the southeast end of Tehran was Chaharsad-Dastgah—a project of 400 low-cost housing units for low-income state employees—started in 1946 (Fig. 3. 4-5-6). The housing units of this complex generally were a single-story or two-story houses with a basement.

To cite the main principles of Chaharsad-Dastgah housing complex, it can be said that the average area of each plot is 170 square meters. Building plans were designed


\textsuperscript{132} Here, it is noteworthy to mention that the political participation of the urban poor living in the slum areas of the southern Tehran in the Revolution invalidated the mostly accepted notion that urban poor are so concerned with their daily survival than to be politically active.

due to the accessibility to streets. There was a main square in the north side of neighborhood that functioned as both public space and green area. “Four main housing typologies (with two, three, four and five rooms) were designed,” say Arefian and Moieni, “Terraced housing combined spatial economy with ease of construction. Flat insulated roof was chosen for houses, with plain brickwork to facades and plain white finish to interiors. Kitchens, storages, independent yards with a trough, and balconies were common elements in all types…Toilets in all types were provided outdoors in yards and connected with shallow wells which work with septic tanks.”

Since the project was highly attentive to economy, there were some heavily debated shortcomings. “[A]ll windows were of the same size, regardless of whether they face north or south. The arrangement of rooms gave a lack of privacy to the members of the family. Moreover, the courtyard and its adjacent windows were all visually accessible from the neighboring homes.” Interestingly, there were several shops constructed as attached to the houses, however for financial inability of households, they turned shops into extra rooms of their houses. Likewise, these 400 low-cost housing units were granted to low-income homeless state employees without receiving any prepayment on favorable terms; but because dwellers could not do the payments even in a long time under defined conditions, problems arose that hindered the project.

The project of Narmak was one large housing complex developed in the form of neighborhood in the eastern part of Tehran for middle and upper-middle income residents (Figure 3. 7-8). The whole area of Narmak was about 600 hectares. “On this large area, 8000 plots of land between 200 and 500 square meters in area were laid out and on most of these one-storeyed villas with small gardens were eventually built. This residential district has been divided into 19 sections, each with open

---

137 Ibid, p. 113.
spaces and equipped with power supply and well water.\textsuperscript{138} Open spaces provided room for children’s playground and green zones. There were car-free zones that became safe areas for residents. Buildings were attentive to local climate so that they had the north-south orientation. Spaces for gatherings of the residents were also designed. Ultimately, in the following years Narmak rolled as a successful model for modernist mass housing projects built in Iran.

Fig. 3. 4: Chaharsad-Dastgah housing complex, Tehran.
One of the first modern mass housing projects for low-income state employees that constructed in Tehran in 1946.
Fig. 3. 5: Chaharsad-Dastgah housing complex, Tehran.

Fig. 3. 6: Chaharsad-Dastgah housing complex, Tehran.
Fig. 3. 7: The urban layout of Narmak.

Fig. 3. 8: The mass housing project of Narmak.
Source: Journal of Bank-e Sakhtemani 1, no. 6, 1956.
The idea of public housing developing in construction of new neighborhoods continued in the same manner, to name a few, Kuy-e Mehran (1963), Kuy-e Farah (1963), kuy-e Kan (1964), Kuy-e Nohom-e Aban (1965) and so forth. Most of low-cost housing projects are low-rise housings for single families (rarely walk-up apartments of four- and five-story), in contrast to the same projects in other countries that are usually high-rise apartments. In this regard, Kuy-e Kan, for example, that was four-story walk-up apartment blocks—constructed in the 1960s to accommodate 40,000 lower-middle income families in the west Tehran—could be accounted as one of the early examples of condominium housing (Figure 3. 9-10). Particularly, throughout the 1950s in Iran, public housing projects were mainly as single-family houses—the government’s housing practice that was highly under influence of American models. Development of condominium housing projects suggested by Iranian architects through promoting collective scheme of living for lower income groups was, actually, considered as an attempt to resist against American influences on everyday life of people and to compare with post-war housing practices of Europe.

In spite of the Iranian architects’ attempts to promote collective living among lower income groups as a new lifestyle resisting against the government’s will of expansion of American models of living, Kuy-e Kan (one of the first mid-rise apartments) was an unappealing choice for the lower social strata. Drawing on the letter of Iran’s housing organization about the Kuy-e Kan project, less than 20 percent of the supposed class appealed to purchase these houses, so these apartments would be remained empty. Although problems like lack of public communal spaces and remoteness from the city center were existed, but the main reason as mentioned in the housing organization’s letter that the Kuy-e Kan was appealed unpleasant for the lower income families was the fact that they were not accustomed to the apartment mode of living. Although in the following years, there were some attempts made to stimulate them to live in the Kan’s apartments, when compared this project with other single-family housings for lower income groups, it is apparent that apartment mode of living was still unfamiliar with them.

139 Source: the National Archive of Iran; Architectural archives of the Tehran University, accessed April 2017.
As the other experience of constructing mass housing in the form of mid-rise apartments for the lower income groups, the project of Kuy-e-Chaharom-e Aban in the Naziabad area can be mentioned (Figure 3. 11-12). Naziabad was located in the south of Tehran between the Qale Morghi military airport and railway station. On the land, which was used formerly for large number of brick, kilns and other related establishments involved in producing construction materials, building apartment blocks of four stories (first phase) and five stories (second phase) for low-income groups begun in 1969. Typically, plots were of 80 square meters, where domestic space was reduced just to the essential needs, such as bedroom, living room, kitchen and toilet. During the first phase of the project eight apartment blocks of four-story and later in the second phase of development, seven apartment blocks of five-story were constructed. Considering huge number of low-income groups suffering the housing problem and the provided number of housing units by this project in one hand and its inauguration time that was coincided with the celebrations of 2500th anniversary of the Persian Empire held in 1971 on the other hand imply that prestige factors may not have been unimportant in construction of this project.

The reluctance of the lower income groups to move into the apartment blocks demonstrates the objection of their social class to the enforced new lifestyle. While living in mid-rise apartment blocks (four- or five-story apartments) was an unattractive experience among low-income families, inhabiting in high-rise residential apartments became a new fashion for the Iranian elite. To such an extent that those who live in the high-rise apartments would gain a privileged status and become a part of the cosmopolitan elite. Accordingly, the highest buildings in Tehran at that time were luxury residential apartments in the northern areas of the city.

All these mentioned mass housing projects majorly were developed as several phases and actually became the model for further development of the same kind projects in the capital. However, the huge immigration, large number of lower income groups with housing problem, and the limited capacity of the executed projects in providing housing units could not tackle the housing crisis existed in the city. Apart from problems and shortcomings of these projects that discussed, it can be said that major parts of this state-run mass housing projects were allocated to government
employees. Then, for instance, before the urban poor, the low-income and/or lower-middle income government employees were housed in the state’s constructed low-cost housing. This means that the poorest of the urban poor housing problem was remained at large, and they had to find their own personal solutions to house themselves to survive, which were mainly manifested as creation of slums and shantytowns on the southern urban margins. “Even at the height of the country’s economic boom (after oil prices quadrupled in 1973-74), slum dwellers grew in southern Tehran, and the quality of life in the neighborhoods was quite miserable.”

Hence, the urban poor whether living in low-rise housing for single family, mid-rise apartment blocks of four- or five-stories, or informal settlements and slums was pushed to reside mainly in the southern parts of the city. That is to say, during the 1960s and 1970s, southern Tehran and its fringes were the most receptive area to the most poorest groups made up of rural migrants, industrial working class, slum-dwellers, squatters and the like.

Fig. 3. 9: The Kuy-e Kan project in 1964.
Source: National Archive of Iran.

Fig. 3. 10: The Kuy-e Kan project in 1964.
Source: National Archive of Iran.
Fig. 3. 11: Kuy-e Chaharom-e Aban in Naziabad, 1971

Fig. 3. 12: The urban layout of kuy-e Chaharom-e Aban
Unlike almost everywhere around the world that modular blocks are designed for the working class, high-rise modular apartment blocks were built in Tehran throughout the 1970s for the Iranian bourgeois class. For instance, Eskan towers, Park de Prince and A.S.P are all high-rise luxury residential apartments with top floors include penthouses (Figure 3. 13-14). Although housing problem was not affected the rich and privileged Iranian, desire for living in the westernized life style was a major motive for relocation of a segment of Tehran’s elite from their courtyard houses to high-rise residential apartments. That is to say, the westernized life style of many of the privileged Iranian was more consistent with the high-rise buildings in which they aspired to live.

In fact, by the 1970s the government was promoting modernist urban developments, particularly in Tehran global capitalism was supporting urbanization. Through this market-led urbanism several urban mega-projects constructed that were designated for the Iranian elite. Large corporations (mostly international) that were looking for large profits executed a series of large-scale projects in the city as high-rise residential buildings. Luxury high-rise apartments that built in Tehran at that time were means of accumulating wealth, accelerating developments and a modern approach to traditional Iranian houses. Since the projects were marketed as new spaces that create modern living environment in the western fashion for the privileged Iranian, interest in dwelling reform grew. Those who wanted to be a part of the global elite began to move from their traditional homes to high-rise residential complexes.

Eskan towers, was one of those high-rises that had a significant status and became a symbol for Tehran’s elite. “The Eskan project, initiated in 1972, was intended as a mixed-use luxury compound. It comprised three towers of 32 floors each, above five floors of high-end commercial facilities with underground parking (Figure. 3. 15-16). It is located at the intersection of two main streets in the north of the city, facing Pahlavi Boulevard (today Valiasr).”\textsuperscript{141} Two rows of penthouses were designed at the top of towers. The commercial center that has a separate entrance was designated for luxury brands. Also, there was an idea of constructing a pool with a see-through floor.

on the roof of the commercial part that could not be implemented. Regarding the design of the plan of residential sector the housing units’ area and facilities provided are significant. “Each floor of Eskan’s residential towers comprised four split-level large and luxurious apartments differently arranged, with large rooms, balconies, state-of-the-art facilities, and a servant’s annexe (Figure. 3. 17).”

142 Ibid, p. 240.
Fig. 3. 13: A.S.P residential towers after completion in 1969.
Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/ (Last retrieved on 15 April 2017, at 18:40)

Fig. 3. 14: A.S.P. residential towers photographed in 2016.
Source: http://memari.online/ (Last retrieved on 15 April 2017, at 19:10)
Fig. 3. 15: Eskan towers under construction, street view, 1976.
Source: https://www.pinterest.com/ (Last retrieved on 16 April 2017, at 15:30)

Fig. 3. 16: Eskan towers under construction, 1977.
Source: Israeli planning in the Shah’s Iran: a forgotten episode/ Dan Perry.
The market-led urbanism should be preceded in a way that free market economy dictate, which is to see the city as a site of accumulating wealth. The Eskan project that can be classified as market urbanism was not attentive to the concrete needs of the city. Tehran of that time was suffering from housing shortage, high cost of rent and high property price. This project and other luxurious high-rises that were built in Tehran throughout the 1970s were not intended for lower and middle class population that had to cope with the housing problem. These high-rises were material manifestation of global capitalism; architectural expression of market-led urbanism; machines for making high rate of profit and accumulating wealth; and symbols of representing Tehran as a global city.

The state-run projects as powerful mechanisms were penetrating the daily lives of citizens and due to associating modernization with westernization, pushing the society towards westernization. So long as, the rich live in the high-rise apartments and the poor in the single-family low-rise houses in the form of neighborhoods, the
correlation between density and poverty can be invalidated in Tehran of the 1970s. Then, it can be claimed that by the 1970s, the Tehran’s elite were living at much higher densities per hectare than the urban poor whether living in the low-cost housings (built by the government in 1950s and 1960s) or on the urban fringes. “Except for blocks of four story buildings, the area of southern Tehran is characterized by one or two story buildings of low quality construction.”143 Further discussion on this issue will be provided in the subchapter of this study entitled as ‘Fetishism of urbanization: different experience of urbanism by different income groups’. The other interesting issue to be argued is that some approaches such as using large windows became that much widespread that was applied in luxury residential apartments as well as working-class mass housings.

Undoubtedly, employing same approaches would not be led to same results due to the cultural and ideological differences that existed between populations who resided in a particular socio-spatial distance from each other. Drawing on different ideological and cultural values, application of the large windows in the working-class housings in south Tehran did not function appropriately as those in the higher-income residential apartments of north Tehran. While larger windows through providing broader vistas were favored by those who resided in the luxury residential complexes; the working-class residents of the low-cost housings found the very same windows as one major problem since their excessive size put one’s life on display. Bringing one’s life into the others was not accepted for the low-income residents of the south Tehran and was a challenge to their socio-cultural and religious values.

Consequently, large windows of low-cost housings did not function like those employed in luxury residential complexes, rather they brought about problems in the working-class everyday life. This is exactly what Castells explains it as he writes: “Differences in cultural style, rooted mostly in social class and family practices, will be symbolically reinforced by the social-spatial distance and be the environmental imagery.”144 The exercise of large windows in the residential complexes, as one common approach of modernizing the traditional Iranian house did not produced a unified outcome; Iranian families received it in different ways based on their social

groups. To cite another example, it can be said that in most state-run projects government asked designers to design a house for families of four people regardless of average family-size. Non-consideration of high proportion of families with more than three children that were living in south Tehran was a challenging issue. Considering that spaces of the houses were designed for nuclear families composed of four to five members, despite the fact that large extended Iranian families supposed to live there, none of the spaces were used in ways that were designed. Spaces designated as living rooms, bedrooms and so forth had to fulfill several functions instead of the one defined for them in order to provide required spaces for large Iranian families. The assignment of single-functional spaces could not fulfill the needs of the extended Iranian families, so replaced by the traditional multi-functional spaces. Indeed, the government in step with its top-down modernization programs attempted to construct a uniform national identity for the society. In so doing, state-run projects through imposing different experience of space were of best apparatuses to form people’s identities. However, in the traditional society of Iran how much people could accept and adapt themselves to the propagated ideas and enforced modern lifestyles or attempted to reinterpret the imposed ideas in their own personal ways is a matter of question.

3.3. MODERNIZING THE IMAGE OF THE CITY: PURSUIT FOR AN IMPROVED PLACE-IMAGE

The image that a city transmits to the world is important in terms of capital investments; new technologies; people as visitors; and influence. Bad imagery means losing all the aforementioned opportunities. So long as the development programs aim at improving the place-image, accompanying the execution of large-scale investments in some particular urban enclaves, the low-income residents’ standards of living will be worsened. This is what Merrifield best described it as “the desperate pursuit for an improved place-image has led to a purification of some of the more unpalatable and problematical internal spaces of cities.”145 Later, he alludes that this is not a new issue and Marx already noted about it in 1867, as he writes: “Improvements of towns, accompanying the increase of wealth, by the demolition of

badly built quarters, the erection of palaces for banks, warehouses, etc., the widening of streets for business traffic, for the carriages of luxury, and for the introduction of tramways, etc., drive away the poor into even worse and more crowded places.”146

This deteriorating condition of the poor ensuing implementation of urban development schemes results in incapability of making a city that is compatible with the collective needs of the majority of the society. At this very stage, Harvey argues that “[T]he city is turned over to the growth machines, the financiers, the developers, the speculators, and the profiteers. The result is unnecessary deprivation (unemployment, housing shortages, and so on) in the midst of plenty.”147 Then, no wonder if in the 1970s that Iran’s economic boom led to fast large-scale urbanization, none of these developments made a dent in the society’s poverty and even intensified socio-spatial inequalities across the urban space of the capital. This is how the market-led urbanism works. “Unregulated free market capitalism widens class divisions, exacerbate social inequality, and ensures that rich regions grow richer while the rest plunge deeper and deeper into the mire of poverty.”148

During the 1970s, urbanization in Tehran was fully dictated by the free market economy that considers the city as a money-making machine. Since the main objective of modernizing Tehran was to make a city that the foreigners who came to visit found it as a modern city, much of the development activities were concentrated in the northern areas of the city as the only part likely to be seen by foreign visitors. While air-conditioned towers were commonly seen in the northern Tehran, people were still living in shantytowns in the southern Tehran, for instance. In this situation the southern Tehran could not benefit from the changes came along with development projects; rather the socio-spatial gap between the north and the south of the city became more widened. Here, it can be said that the processes of urbanization operated in Tehran alienated poor strata of the society. Tehran then became more divided between the rich north and the south poor. In this city the loss of sense of collective rights to the city is not surprising. Accordingly, attempts at modernizing the ‘image’ of the city—instead of the city—intensified bipolarity of urban fabric in
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In so doing, he commissioned mostly foreign architects, designers, planners, experts and advisors to employ western designs for modernizing Tehran. Upon this issue, Mazumdar writes:

World-renowned planners, architects and designers came, attracted by opportunities of work on a massive scale. Many of the projects were ambitious and high budget. To enable Tehran to join the ranks of world cities with modern metros, French engineers planned the Tehran Metro subway system. US assistance helped plan for Tehran a new airport capable of accommodating the busiest traffic in the world. Other examples included the building of the Aryamehr Stadium, the largest in Asia, seating 100000 spectators; Pardisan—paradise on earth—an emulous natural recreation centre to have vegetation from the various climates in the world; and many large housing and new town projects.

Although, foreigners who came to visit Tehran found it as a modern city and by this means that Shah’s above-mentioned objective was achieved; development had not diminished the spatial concentration of poverty in southern Tehran. In 1964, the United States ambassador to Tehran said: “the Shah is making Iran a showcase of modernization in this part of the world.” Considering the Iranian society’s real needs and desires, the above-mentioned projects can be accounted as showcase development projects, namely, building a natural recreation center that will be like a paradise on earth or Aryamehr Stadium as the largest in the Asia (Figure. 3. 18-19-20).

149 Concerning the fate of these foreign architects, planners and experts and their projects after the 1979 Revolution, Madanipour writes: “An economic crisis and the revolution of 1979 brought to an end a period of development frenzy. All foreign consultants and many of their Iranian counterparts left the country. A decade of war and revolution, and a strong anti-monarchy and anti-western attitude undermined many of the projects developed during the 1960s and 1970s, leaving many unfinished or merely on the shelves.” Madanipour, Ali. “The limits of scientific planning: Doxiadis and the Tehran Action Plan”, Planning Perspectives, Vol. 25, No. 4, 485-504, October 2010, p. 500.


Regarding the Aryamehr Stadium, there is an article published in the newspaper *Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran* in September 1971 that informs about this project. This newspaper due to its direct affiliation with the state was actually the ruling power’s media delivering messages that had to be delivered to the society and hence examining its articles will illustrate key points lie behind projects of that time. The title of the article about Aryamehr Stadium presents this stadium as ‘an example of constructive facet of celebrations in the capital’.\(^{152}\) There were several festivities held between 12 and 16 October 1971 to celebrate the 2500\(^{th}\) anniversary of the founding of the Persian Empire by Cyrus the Great. The main aim of the celebration was to show the history of this great nation and more its improvements under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi’s reign to the invited official international guests.

The Aryamehr Stadium as the title of the article also suggests could be considered as the constructive facet of the celebrations of 2500\(^{th}\) anniversary of the Persian Empire, since its construction was supposed to be finished at the beginning of the celebrations and the closing ceremony of the festivities were to be held at the stadium. In this light, Ayamehr Stadium as the largest in the Asia was of great import for showcasing Iran’s development in an international event to the international guests. It is mentioned in the article that there are few countries in the Europe have a 100,000-capacity stadium such as England, Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and some others, so this newly constructed stadium will also put Iran beside these countries.\(^{153}\) The football and track and field facilities, light and sound equipment of the stadium all were provided according to the latest modern technology. Moreover, an artificial lake about 1350 meters in length and 350 meters in width was constructed close to the stadium that drawing on the article will be used by athletes during competitions and by ordinary people on the weekends.\(^{154}\) In addition to the entrances to the stadium, there was a royal entrance, where a bronze statue of the Shah was located.

Like Aryamehr Stadium, there were several projects of luxurious hotels (to accommodate international guests), monumental structures (of which Shahyad was the most important one that will be discussed in detail during the next chapter) and

\(^{152}\) “A 100,000-capacity stadium: an example of constructive facet of celebrations in the capital”, *Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran* newspaper in Persian, Issue 35, 2 September 1971.

\(^{153}\) Ibid, p. 8.

\(^{154}\) Ibid.
so on constructed and finished at the beginning of the celebrations. The changes brought about by these projects transformed the urban space of the capital in a way to make Tehran the locus of world’s attention as a modern city. Within this way of modernizing the image of the city and not the city itself, of course, impoverished neighborhoods will be considered as an obstacle to pseudo-developments and then disregarded.
Fig. 3. 18: Aryamehr Stadium on the *Ettela’at* newspaper published in 18 October 1971. 
Source: [https://mashruteh.org/](https://mashruteh.org/) (Last retrieved on 21 April 2017, at 13:50)

Fig. 3. 19: West entrance of the Aryamehr Stadium. 
It was the largest stadium in the Asia that had a capacity of 100,000 spectators. Also, 10,000 parking spots were designated for the stadium. 
Source: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/](https://commons.wikimedia.org/) (Last retrieved on 21 April 2017, at 14:15)

Fig. 3. 20: Iran postage stamp of 1975 showing an engraved portrait of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and Aryamehr Stadium. 
Source: [https://hipstamp.com/](https://hipstamp.com/) (Last retrieved on 21 April 2017, at 15:10)
At the time of constructing showcase development projects, shantytowns and slums were growing in south Tehran, and housing was still a major problem for the mass of urban poor. On the other hand, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi as the ruling power was continuing in proposing the vision of constructing a prosperous future on a foundation of social justice, so that he said in a speech: “The next generations will live in an environment which I hope will be equal and comparable to the highest social standards anywhere on the planet…Your income should be such that you and your family are full. That you will have smart clothes. That you will have a nice house…”

Unfortunately, Mohammad Reza Shah’s implemented model for development had to do nothing with the poor’s everyday experience of poverty and his constructed picture of the future was merely a phony utopian vision. To cite an example, he argued for having an income that could best serve the basic needs, namely, housing; but “[B]y the mid-1970s it was calculated that the top 10 percent of the population accounted for 40 percent of expenditure; in addition, the urban poor suffered from the housing shortage, with the result that some had to spend up to 70 percent of their income on rents.” Despite the reality of poverty and inequalities in the capital that the large segment of the society had to deal with them, the ruling power seemed to have been determined to create obvious symbols of development rather than genuine developments.

While in 1965, almost 86 percent of the Iranian population was considered as very poor, the state’s modernization programs instead of providing their very basic needs were mainly in the search for being visible symbols of development as well as means for more capital accumulation. For instance, under modernization programs, huge amounts of capital was spatially fixed via constructing highways and transit routes, aware of the role of network of roads and transportation in opening up new markets. However, there was a small proportion of the whole society who could afford private automobiles, and hence the majority of the population had to ride on their donkeys on the very highways.

Berman best expresses this situation when he proposes concept of ‘the tragedy of development’ in his book “All that is solid melts into air” in 1988. This notion of development is depending on a project in which changes brings about by developments are not in step with provision of the concrete needs of the majority of the population; rather proceed in the way to making more profits. “If the very basic and long-term objectives of economic development include a reduction in poverty, unemployment, inequality and oppression, and the creation of the conditions for the realization of human personality and freedom and democracy, as advocated years ago by Dudley Seers, then the historical experience of Iran during the past few decades is a failure.”

There are many examples around the world, particularly in Latin America, that the promises of development did not ameliorate living standards, but deteriorated populations’ living conditions. Regarding this myth of development in Tehran, FitsGerald notes:

Iran is basically worse off than a country like Syria that has neither oil nor political stability. The reason for all this is simply that the Shah has never made a serious attempt at development … The wealth of the country has gone into private cars rather than buses, into consumer goods rather than public health, and into the salaries of soldiers and policemen rather than those of teachers.

Development that cannot generate real progress to fulfill people’s real needs; to improve living standards; and to diminish misery, Berman calls as pseudo-developments. He also alludes to the Shah of Iran as an example of a pseudo-developer that people overthrew his monarchy, where he writes: “From time to time, a people manages to overthrow its pseudo-developers—like that world-class pseudo-Faustian, the Shah of Iran.” Berman’s critical perspective on this kind of pseudo-developments follows his desire to the directions in which developments should move forward, as he says: “ […] to imagine and to create new modes of modernity,

---

157 Toshtzar, Manoochehr. “The growth and development of the urban system in Iran, the period: 1900-1976”, A dissertation in city and regional planning presented to the graduate faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy, 1985, p. 273.


in which man will not exist for the sake of development, but development for the sake of man." Discussion on the Shah’s implemented urban development schemes could best represented his modernization strategies of the capital, endowing Tehran a modern image; whereas, the modern image that Tehran was transmitting to the world had another darker side that surfaced in the 1979 Revolution.

3.4. FETISHISM OF URBANIZATION: DIFFERENT EXPERIENCES OF URBANISM BY DIFFERENT INCOME GROUPS*

Since market-led urbanism is a mode of urbanization shaped by free market economy, its relevant experience of urbanism is what dictated by free market ideologies as well. This process of urbanization produces a rather different experience of urbanism for different income groups though living in a same city. The experience of urbanism of those who inevitably step out of the formal markets, living in informal settlements that lack access to the very basic infrastructures such as electricity, water, sewage system and so on could not be the same as the high-income families. This is the uneven urban development that dramatizes the urban poor’s experience of urbanism. The shortage in the provision of adequate housing, basic infrastructure and services is the issue that the poor in the south Tehran had to cope with it in everyday life not the rich in the north Tehran. The fetishism ascribed to this mode of urbanization, indeed, reveals that development programs do not always improve urban life quality, instead sometimes could produce much more poverty.

On the other hand, as earlier mentioned like the new urban poor, there was a relocation of the new urban rich—those who wanted to live in a westernized life style—to high-rise apartments. The aspiration to live in the western fashion and segregational tendencies of the new urban rich from the new urban poor were motive forces behind their move from courtyard houses to high-rise apartments, particularly in the 1970s. This move was just fashionable, and fashionable city dwellers that could afford high costs of high-rises could reside there. Regarding the production of

---


this kind of differentiated tastes and preferences and the spatial representation of the very differentiation through construction of particular built environment within which upper-income groups live, it could well refer to Bourdieu and what he calls as ‘symbolic capital’. Bourdieu argues that in addition to the prevalent forms of accumulation of capital, another form of accumulation of symbolic capital, also, exists. He describes this symbolic capital accumulation as “the collection of luxury goods attesting the taste and distinction of their owner.” Then, he discusses the effect that the conversion of economic capital into symbolic capital produces, where he writes: “Symbolic capital, a transformed and thereby disguised form of physical ‘economic’ capital, produces its proper effect inasmuch, and only inasmuch, as it conceals the fact that it originates in ‘material’ forms of capital which are also, in the last analysis, the source of its effects.”

The fetishizing value of symbolic capital that Bourdieu states is clearly understood. The fetishism embedded in this form of capital, in fact, serves the owners’ differentiated taste and segregational tendencies. Bourdieu’s discussion could be extended to explicate the production of particular built environment for upper-income groups in order to fulfill their differentiated tastes. The high-rise apartment blocks of 1970s were the form of the house that in one hand could satisfy the upper-class communities’ socio-spatial distinction preferences and on the other hand, could provide them the opportunity to live in a westernized life style as a part of cosmopolitan elite.

Reaching back to the upper-class communities’ relocation pattern, it can be claimed that the rich residents of high-rises in the 1970s were living at much higher density per hectare than the poor that still resided in the low-cost housing projects—in the form of neighborhoods of whether one- and/or two-story single-family houses or mid-rise apartment blocks—built by the government. Therefore, in Tehran in 1970s there had been a fetishizing of high-rises. Following this feverish fetishizing of high-rises, more and more apartment residential complexes for the rich city dwellers in north Tehran were constructed. Hence in this context, it is possible to say that the

162 Ibid, p.197.
The process of urbanization of Tehran was inevitably wedded to the fetishism of urbanism—the urban experience of modernization plans. The form of urbanization of Tehran was accompanied with the fetishism from the outset, because in its totality, it was a capitalist urban process that operated at all levels of the city. This capitalist urban process gains concrete expressions as unfolds through everyday space and subsequently its spatial outcome is the urban space that is replete with the fetishism. However, the fetishism embedded in the urbanization of Tehran varies according to different income city dwellers ranging from fetishizing of high-rises to living urban.

Despite the years of growth and prosperity in the 1970s in Iran, non-consideration of the government for the poor and their basic needs produced a rather different experience of urbanism for them. The unevenness of developments and urban inequalities associated with the boom were at their worst in the late 1970s. The mass of poor could not enjoy the benefits of the city and the urban process that unfolded over its urban space. The poorest groups where need is greatest were neglected, then, the proceedings of the state did nothing to their living condition; even, as earlier discussed, their situation had worsened after the implementation of urban development schemes. Fetishism of development can be an explanation for how growth and prosperity might produce much more poverty. From this it follows that urbanization of a city is a process that simultaneously can produce both prosperity and poverty. In this regard, Merrifield states:

[...] It’s possible to conceive planetary urbanization not as simply bricks and mortar, as high-rise buildings and autoroutes, but as a process that produces skyscrapers as well as unpaved streets, highways as well as back roads, by-waters and marginal zones that feel the wrath of the world market—both its absence and its presence. This process involves dispossession of land, of sequestering the commons and eminent domain.  

As Merrifield explained above, this is exactly how market-led urbanism produces, re-produces and transforms the urban space of cities; how cities capture monetary investments and turn to be vital nodes for market exchange; and how developments
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are not for the sake of man, but for the sake of market. Molotch best expresses this issue when he says that the city is a ‘growth machine’, but not for all social groups.\footnote{Molotch, Harvey. “The city as a growth machine: toward a political economy of place,” \textit{American Journal of Sociology} 82, (1976): 309-32.} The neglected urban poor reside in urbanized areas that lack adequate public facilities and services or in informal settlements on the urban fringes have a different way of life. Only at the point that concrete realities of urban life, experience by this underprivileged group cause them to ask questions regarding development for what and for whom, possibilities of constructing an alternative to replace the existing setting will be arisen.

The feverish fetishizing of high-rises in Tehran in the 1970s in a major part was because of the nature of capitalist urban developments that aim at gaining more profit and in part was, actually, because of highly Westoxificated Iranian society as a kind of intoxication produced by the society itself. Throughout the study discussion on the nature of capitalist developments and how this market-led urbanism proceeds by dictations of the free market have been examined. Thus, it suffices to say on the capitalist urban processes unfolds over the urban space of Tehran and better to expands on an illness produced by the Iranian society itself which was involved in constructing fetishism of high-rises.

During the 1960s and in particular the 1970s, modernizing society based on the dominant Western values and especially the United States was at the top of agenda of the government. From the Reza Shah period onwards, modernization was associated with Westernization. Upon Reza Shah’s major strategy that directed transformation of the traditional society of Iran into a modern nation-state, Abrahamian writes: “His long-range goal was to rebuilt Iran in the image of the West—or, at any rate, in his own image of the West.”\footnote{Abrahamian, Ervand. "IRAN Between Two Revolutions", Princeton University press, New Jersey, 1982, p. 140.} Since Mohammad Reza Shah followed in his father’s footsteps modernizing Tehran, he also associated modernization with Westernization. Indeed, Iran was never colonized by the West directly, rather Iranian colonization by Western capitalist powers, particularly the United States was implicitly through the acquaintance of the upper classes. The articles published in Architecture Journals of that time that attempted to promote American housing
practices to design interior spaces of upper-class Iranians’ houses likewise the image of families and their living spaces that projected in advertisements of different commodities illustrate imposing Western culture from above (Fig. 3. 21-22). The upper-class Iranian families absorbed this alien culture as an inevitable step to become a part of modern global elites.

In this regard, the term Westoxification—coined by Iranian intellectuals—is derived from the Persian Term ‘Gharbzadegi’ refers to complete fascination with Western culture while eroding traditional Persian culture. It was from Heidegger’s criticism of modern technology that he provided in his book “The Question Concerning Technology” in 1977, the notion of Westoxification was built up. As he writes: “The threat to man does not come in the first instance from the potentially lethal machines and apparatus of technology. The actual threat has already affected man in his essence. The rule of Enframing threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth.” Building on Heidegger’s mentioned core interpretation, the notion of Westoxification was devised and this conception could best epitomize the basic illness of modern Iranian society. The term in its root attempts to herald a kind of alienation that happened in the society that no longer just consumes Western imported products but Western culture and values as well. Upon the term Westoxification and its implications, Deylami explains:

It embroils its subjects into identifying with it so that the entralling effects are no longer products of the West but the products of our selves and of our own desires. The strangeness of the Other becomes the strangeness of members of the body politic. It encodes subjects into believing that what the West has to offer is what we should desire. And in the end, it is the strangers among us that fuel Westoxification. It is the recognition of this characteristic of Westoxification—the recognition of the ability to entice people into an alien way of life that becomes their own—that fosters a sometimes nativistic orientation towards the rest of the world. 
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As Deylami mentioned, there was a hegemony of an alien culture that dominated mainly the upper classes, tempting them to live in an alienated way. Since the fascination and absorption of this alien culture was mainly by the upper class, the more this infatuation developed, the more they became alienated from the rest of the society. In this light, it can be said that ‘Westoxification’ was, in turn, contributed to intensify the socio-cultural gap between the urban poor and the rich.
Fig. 3. 21: Example of one of the many articles published in newspapers that provided proposals of the arrangement of interior spaces of Iranian houses according to American housing practices.

Source: Journal of Banke Sakhtemani 2, no. 1, 1958.
Fig. 3. 22: Advertisement of wooden shutters of the brand named Mischler, published in *Art and Architecture Journal of 1970*. Beyond the advertisement of wooden shutters, there is an image projected to the society, which is more compatible with the West than the Iranian society of that time.

One of the most visible impacts of enticing the upper classes (since they should have the required financial capacity to pay for this fashionable way of life) into an alienated way of life is the very relocation of the new urban rich from courtyard houses to high-rise apartments. Here it is worth turning to the Eskan apartments as an example. Besides living in high-rise apartments that was a kind of western imported mode of life for traditional Iranian society, and the Eskan apartments’ designing practice that was totally in western fashion, being designed by western architects and planners (not Iranian) was another added-value to the project. Hence, the point that was highlighted in bold in the Eskan project’s advertisements was its ‘foreign planning’.

The urban rich’s fascination by the Western culture was to an extent that motivated the move from their traditional homes with gardens to high-rise residential complexes. This fetishism of high-rises among Iranian elite in the 1970s was an issue to claim that at this period of time the urban rich were living in higher densities per hectare than the poor who could not afford the cost of living in westernized mode. Fetishizing of high-rises in Tehran in the 1970s was the exploitive desire of the capitalist urban development that consider city as a site of accumulation of wealth; however, popularizing it by the Iranian upper-class was the blind imitation of the west as the most visible feature of a Westoxificated society.

Conditions of socio-economic domination lead to different urban experiences and to different spatial practices and life-styles. Doubtless, the spatial practices of the mass of the low-income group that regard the urban area as a setting to cope with deprivations of all sorts and to survive in, are distinct from the upper-income group that consider the same urban space as a site of capital accumulation. These spatial practices differentiate from each other through the agency of class. Distinctive urban experiences that bring about distinctive social, cultural and ideological tendencies as well arise from different conditions of class polarities. In spite of the different experience of urbanism by different income groups, studying the urbanization process of Tehran indicates that the fetishism can be involved in both low- and upper-income groups’ urban experiences—the fetishism that the mode of urbanization shaped by free market economy produced it.
Examination of the state’s implemented urban planning strategies, development projects and policies under modernization process of the capital demonstrates the key role of these programs in solidifying spatial segregation and neighborhood privileges across the urban space of Tehran. The proposals of the Tehran Comprehensive Plan of 1968 for income-based segregation of residential districts of the city, in effect, legitimized existed differences between different neighborhoods through high-, middle-, and low-income classes and distinct needs associated with them. While, proposals for constructing private tennis court, pool, and garden within each housing unit of a wealthy neighborhood were mentioned in the comprehensive plan, building a public bath for an impoverished neighborhood was on the agenda. Clearly has been noted in the information part of the plan that for wealthy families due to their high income, private automobiles, refrigerators, televisions, personal gardens and skiing are of great importance; on the other hand, again explicitly mentioned that education facilities are not a great need of the poor living in impoverished neighborhoods. This is exactly depriving the poor of equality of life chances because of living in a disadvantaged neighborhood.

The result of this planned segregation of groups due to their income level was nothing but widening socio-spatial inequality in the society. Along with this growing gap among different social classes, a new lifestyle emerged, which was confined to high-income groups who could afford living in that way. Therefore, wealthy families within their wealthy enclaves constructed in the northern part of the city living a sort of westernized mode of urban life, using western imported commodities and were fascinated with western values. That is to say, construction of wealthy neighborhoods in the north brought about a new lifestyle that was experienced within their boundaries. The more the Iranian upper classes aspired to live in a produced new and alienated lifestyle, the more they became alienated from their society. Promoting this new way of living laden with western values was a part of modernization process of the city, so development programs were also in accord with producing socio-spatial setting appropriate for experiencing it. Moreover, this new mode of living experienced by the Iranian upper classes was helping the state in constructing the ‘image’ of modern Iran.
Development programs of the state were successful in sharpening the socio-spatial gap between different income groups and in maintenance of produced contradictions. Shaping the affluent enclaves in the northern parts of the city in order to serve the interests of its wealthy dwellers—the interests that as an outcome of Westoxification became more alienated from its origin society—and impoverished neighborhoods in the southern parts where worsening quality urban lifestyle were experienced, signify hegemonic pattern of uneven development.

In 1979 that Tehran turned to be a major scene of the revolution, socio-spatial polarization existed within its urban space was reached to a dangerous level. The impoverished southern neighborhoods and surrounding slums that were considered as obstacles for improving place-image of the capital and hence disregarded, were of first sites out of which urban uprisings stemmed in the late 1970s. The alliance between marginalized poor slum-dwellers and discontented middle classes demanding more equal qualities of urban life in the streets of the capital led to the triumph of the 1979 Revolution. Unlike the myth of development processes, ever-growing socio-spatial inequality and its produced deteriorating qualities of urban life were concrete realities of daily life experienced by the urban poor throughout the 1960s and the 1970s. Indeed, demand for changing the existing disequilibrium condition and for ‘equality’ rose out from the urban poor’s experience of socio-spatial ‘inequality’.
CHAPTER 4


One of the most significant motives behind the 1979 Revolution was the ever-widening socio-spatial gap among different social classes. Contrary to the major argument that the 1979 Revolution occurred due to the large-scale and fast modernization processes that were incompatible with the traditional Iranian society; it is not vain to claim that the 1979 Revolution took place due to uneven development. The myth of the White Revolution and the state’s promised goals contrasted with the real outcomes and the society’s daily life experiences. Of course, the living standards of upper classes were improved since they could benefit from the advantages brought about by reforms, but the formation and proliferation of informal settlements on urban fringes alone signifies the deteriorating living conditions of lower class.

This increased inequality and the state’s inability to improve the living standards of lower social strata triggered demonstrations. Indeed, southern parts of Tehran such as Shemiran-e-no, Javadiyeh, and Shahr-e-Rey to name just a few, were the areas from where the first sparks of the 1979 Revolution were ignited. The political participation of the urban poor living in the slum areas of the southern Tehran in the revolution invalidated the mostly accepted notion that urban poor are so concerned with their daily survival than to be politically active. The state’s implemented development program that away from creating a livable city for all citizens creates a city for those (upper classes) who enjoy living concentrated advantages, capital and power, actually, produces (not ends) poverty. That is to say, the urban poor’s alienation in terms of what the process of development is about manifested itself at the spatial level as an urban revolt. The urban space that embodied ever-growing ‘unevenness’
became the arena for expressing alienated citizens’ discontent with the very uneven pattern of development.

Then, the urban crisis that engulfed the city produced an urban revolt and consequently the site, where urban revolt first took place was the capital city, Tehran. “It was primarily Tehran, not Iran, that toppled the monarchy: the city became a historical scene for massive million-person demonstrations against the Shah.” Manifestation of the urban discontent along the street that acted as an edge segregating rich north and poor south implies that neither large-scale and fast modernization nor its incompatibility with the traditional society of Iran resulted in the 1979 Revolution, but it was its produced and reproduced uneven urban development that led to the revolution.

Hence within this context, how unjust urban space of Tehran that was fashioned by capitalism, in turn, fashioned an urban revolt against the very produced unevenness will be examined. In this regard, the urban-based Iranian Revolution of 1979 can best states that “[I]f our urban world has been imagined and made, then it can be reimagined and remade.” The urban space of Tehran as precondition and outcome of capitalist structuring, on the eve of the 1979 Revolution turned to be the site of urban uprising. Accordingly, the myth of the White Revolution, the state’s showcase development projects that neglected the fabric of society and had nothing to do with social well-being and ultimately the development process that alienated lower social classes played vital role in the Iranian Revolution of 1979.

4.1. DEMANDING FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE IN SPATIAL DIMENSIONS

As Lefebvre insists on using ‘residents’ instead of ‘citizens’ in his call for right to the city, residing in the city enables the right to resources that urban life provides. However, locational discriminations that are produced as outcomes of space production under capitalism bring about advantages and disadvantages of living in a

171 The notion of ‘right to the city’ was first proposed by Henri Lefebvre in his book “Le Droit à la ville” in 1968.
particular location in the city. As a result of these spatial discriminations, injustice will be embedded in spatial organization of cities. In connection with this Soja writes: “Locational discrimination, created through the biases imposed on certain populations because of their geographical location, is fundamental in the production of spatial injustice and the creation of lasting spatial structures of privilege and advantage.”  

He states that examples of redlining of urban investments, exclusionary zoning, institutionalized residential segregation and so on could be accounted as the ways of politically organizing space, which in turn produce spatial injustice.

Considering Tehran, the state’s top-down modernization under which reforms, development planning and policies and urban investments in multi-billion dollar projects implemented, all oriented toward promoting the interests of dominant classes. Soja asserts that this process of producing uneven development is an indicator of the working of capitalism in cities. Indeed, as the capitalist system extended to the urban space, by commodification of space, desirable locations in terms of exchange value introduced and developed along the north-south axis of the city. The outcome was the state and private development agencies’ tendency in concentration of modern urban facilities and amenities toward the north and somehow central areas. The state’s biased distribution pattern of urban facilities and land uses enhanced the north-south polarization, and turned the city’s this vertical structure, in effect, as defined access to resources. “The north has higher and larger buildings, higher land prices, lower densities, smaller households and higher rates of literacy and employment. Whilst it is mostly residential, it accommodates higher concentrations of modern facilities and amenities.”

As earlier mentioned, location of modern educational institutions, libraries, healthcare centers, banks, recreational facilities, parks and green space and the like were more stretched from the center northward. The south, then, located at the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of above-mentioned qualities. “On the contrary

172 Soja, Edward W. “The city and spatial justice” [« La ville et la justice spatiale »], traduction : Sophie Didier, Frédéric Dufaux], justice spatiale | spatial justice | n° 01 septembre | september 2009.
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(to the north), the south is poorer, with smaller buildings, lower land prices, higher densities, larger households, lower rates of literacy and employment, and a concentration of workplaces and traditional institutions.” 176 It has been also mentioned that traditional institutions that concentrated in the south were mainly mosques, old teahouses and public baths.

The state’s employed biased distribution pattern of modern urban facilities, urban land uses, land values and varying characteristics of housing can be considered as the indicators of the locational discriminations between the southern and the northern end of the city, and of colonizing the north (as a desirable location) by the dominant class and leaving the south to the underprivileged class. In this light, it can be expressed that commodified and class-determined fragmented urban space of Tehran were sort of preconditions for uneven development. Thus, that is to say socio-spatial injustice is embedded in the spatial organization of capitalist cities and can be solidified in the forms of structures of advantages that benefit the dominant class, and disadvantages that marginalize the poor. As this spatial structure of advantage and disadvantage reproduces within the city, it will be lasted until planning an intervention to stop it. Claiming the right to the city by those peripheralized that experience disadvantages stimulates movements toward socio-spatial justice.

In the late 1970s, Tehran was a city where spatial hierarchy of wealth and poverty were clearly expressed along the north-south urban axis (Figure 4.1-2-3). The unjust development processes operated in Tehran generated solid forms of spatial segregation best manifested in the residential layout of the city. Attached to this rigid class-based segregated city were problems of rise in property price, housing shortage, sprawling slums and shantytowns, urban poverty, shortcomings in just distribution of collective means of consumption and the ever-growing gap between high and low social classes. “Between 1967 and 1977, the percentage of urban families living in only one room increased from 36 to 43. On the eve of the revolution, as much as 42 percent of Tehran had inadequate housing.” 177 Therefore, housing as an important factor in measuring the quality of life was one of the major
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issues that outraged lower social strata living on southern margins of the city. The myth of the White Revolution could not deliver its promises of development in a way to benefit all social strata, rather turned the city into the enclave of the rich and greatly deteriorated socio-physical condition of the poor.

Examining the Iranian newspapers of the last years before the 1979 Revolution best signify the existing urban crisis in Tehran and the state’s attempt in promising to address the low-income families’ housing problem via for instance informing about new payment criteria for cheap mortgage for housing on the first page in bold and large font in the middle or mentioning to the queen’s 3-hour visit to the southern neighborhoods of Tehran and hearing the voice of dwellers (Figure 4.4-5-6). Interestingly, while the news regarding new payment criteria for cheap mortgage for housing appeared on the first page of the Ettela’at newspaper in April 1978, in the left corner of the same page there is news about influx of Iranians to buy tenements in California, which led to the 10% rise in property price and caused protest of the people of California and concern of the United States government. The contrast between the news appeared on the first page of a newspaper does imply the widening gap between the rich and the poor in the Iranian society.
Fig. 4. 1: Aerial view of Takht-e Jamshid Street in the north of Tehran in the 1960s.
Source: http://www.fardanews.com/ (Last retrieved on 10 November 2017, at 19: 08)

Fig. 4. 2: A shantytown in the south of Tehran in the late 1970s.
Source: http://pro.magnumphotos.com/ (Last retrieved on 10 November 2017, at 19: 20)

Fig. 4. 3: Difficult living conditions in shantytowns in the south of Tehran months before the 1979 Revolution.
Fig. 4. Front-page of the Rastaakhiz newspaper published on 6 May 1976.

The highlighted part through appearing at the top of front-page and using large font size clearly indicates that it is the most important headline of the newspaper. It is a quote from Amir-Abbas Hoveyda who was prime minister of Iran from 1965 to 1977. “The housing problem will be solved with a quick move,” Hoveyda quoted in 1976.

Source: http://www.melli.org/ (Last retrieved on 10 November 2017, at 22:15)
Fig. 4. 5: Front-page of Ettela’at newspaper published on 10 April 1978. The highlighted headline at the top of front-page is informed about the new payment criteria for cheap mortgage for housing and the other highlighted headline appeared at the left corner of the front-page is the news regarding influx of Iranians to buy tenements in California. The contrast between these two news appeared on the same page implies the ever-growing gap between high and low social classes in the Iranian society. 

Fig. 4. 6: Front-page of Ettela’at newspaper published on 11 May 1978. The queen’s 3-hour visit to the southern neighborhoods of Tehran and hearing the voice of dwellers is the highlighted headline at the top of front-page. This visit was supposed to appease outraged dwellers of southern neighborhoods of Tehran at their difficult living conditions. 
Source: http://www.parstimes.com/ (Last retrieved on 10 November 2017, at 23:40)
The housing problem of the urban poor was yet to come into prominence even in the early years after the triumph of the revolution. Headlines such as ‘don’t buy houses, the prices will go down’ addressing again the lower-income families, can be seen in bold in the newspapers published following the 1979 Revolution (Figure 4.7).

Urban housing, proved to be a serious crisis among the poor south. “Only days after the insurrection, a group of tent-settlers at the southern margin of the capital warned that if the new regime did not provide them with decent housing, ‘we will occupy vacant apartments’.” 178 Days later, families from the southern neighborhoods occupied housing units and apartment blocks in Tehran. “In the days and weeks that followed thousands of homeless families, poor tenants, and students joined the protagonists in Tehran and other urban centers, occupying empty apartment blocks, luxury homes, villas, and deserted hotels.” 179 While students mostly had political motives to occupy properties and so left; the poor families resisted and stayed on in occupied residential buildings. Reflected in the poor south families’ immediate
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squatter activities in the early chaotic years of the 1979 Revolution, housing problem was one major motive behind their widespread mobilization against the state in 1979. The urban crisis of the late 1970s with its most clear manifestations in the housing domain, then, took place in the southern fringes of the city. The southern Tehran became one major site for displaying urban discontent (Figure 4.8-9).

Studying Abrahamian’s account of the Islamic Revolution led to find indications for this issue in-between his detailed description of protests. As he says: “The worst clashes occurred in southern Tehran, where the working-class residents set up barricades and threw Molotov cocktails at army trucks…In the southern slums, helicopter gunships were used to dislodge the rebels.”180 On the threshold of the revolution, urban protests and street violence with active participation of slum dwellers were at their apex. In this regard, Abrahamian writes: “Slum dwellers provided much of the youth that defiantly challenged the military authorities, many of the martyrs that died in the major massacres, and the bulk of the vast crowds that tenaciously marched in the streets.”181

Examining Ayatollah Khomeini’s writings and preaching that as the leader of the 1979 Revolution invited masses to display their opposition to the state, shows that he explicitly divided the society into two groups of people—the oppressors and oppressed. As Khomeini says:

Through the political agents they have placed in power over the people, the imperialists have also imposed on us an unjust economic order, and thereby divided our people into two groups: oppressors and oppressed. Hundreds of millions of Muslims are hungry and deprived of all form of health care and education, while minorities comprised of the wealthy and powerful live a life of indulgence, licentiousness, and corruption. The hungry and deprived have constantly struggled to free themselves from the oppression of their plundering overlords, and their struggle continues to this day.182

In Khomeini’s above-mentioned passage integration of Islamic themes with the existing situation can be noticed. Identifying dispossessed masses as ‘the oppressed’ and calling for justice addressed slum dwellers of the southern Tehran that were actively involved in struggling against unjust structure. To be a helper and to free the oppressed from the unjust condition created by the oppressor should be the task of whole society, was one significant theme in Khomeini’s preaching on the eve of the revolution. He also mentions to the housing crisis of the south Tehran during one of his speech where he declares:

Those whose hearts are truly beating for the needy and oppressed people of our country are the women of Qum, of south Tehran, and the poor quarters of other cities, those same people you regard as being “the lower classes”? They understand what human rights are all about and they act in accordance with their convictions; they donate their gold jewelry so houses can be built for the poor.183

Considering the above-noted the oppressed poor south and their housing problem, this theme was constituted an inseparable part of Khomeini’s speeches and writings before the revolution (Figure 4.10). His used potent terms such as the oppressed and the oppressors and integrating them with Islamic themes found reflections in revolutionary street slogans: “Islam belongs to the oppressed, not to the oppressors; Islam represents the slum-dwellers, not the palace-dwellers; The poor die for the revolution, the rich plot against the revolution; The oppressed of the world, unite; Oppressed of the world, create a Party of the Oppressed; Islam will eliminate class differences; In Islam there will be no landless peasant.”184 As the opposition leader, Khomeini, adopted a pro-oppressed discourse over the course of the revolution, which was successful in hearing the voice of the marginalized mass and influencing them to accompany him more enthusiastically.185

185 After the triumph of the revolution, the former Pahlavi Foundation was renamed the Foundation of the Oppressed (Bonyad-e Mostazafan) and as a welfare institution aimed to provide aid to the poor in order to promote their living standards via monthly pensions and low-interest loans.
While such a closed political system of Iran hardened organizing masses against the ruling power, the slum dwellers of southern Tehran in contrast to mostly accepted notion that does not consider political participation and consciousness for the urban poor, have played a key role in fostering a collective movement against the state. The major motive behind their involvement in the revolution could be considered as their shared experiences of socio-spatial exclusion. Due to their daily life practices of marginalization, they have to find their own personal solutions to survive (as the example of slum dwellers in Tehran building their own informal settlements illegally on illegal sites), which in turn reinforce their solidarity and sense of community. It can be said that their demand for justice, rooted in their shared everyday experiences of socio-spatial marginalization, acted as a mobilizing force behind their involvement in the revolution.

Indeed, urban uprising embedded in Lefebvre’s notion of the right to the city heralds a kind of radical openness of urban future. Deprived masses’ assertion of the right to the city in the 1979 challenged the processes of domination and alienation; the hegemonic pattern of uneven capitalist development; and claimed the more just development across the urban space. As Lefebvre argues that although the urban space can be both the site and medium assisting the survival of capitalism, the very urban space has the potential to form revolutionary struggle against the existing socio-spatial organization, the urban space of Tehran in the late 1970s took on the same role.186
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Fig. 4. 8: A rooftop in South Tehran and revolutionaries armed with weapons and Molotov cocktails that wait there for army forces to enter their area, February 1979. Source: http://www.wideasleepinamerica.com/ (Last retrieved on 12 November 2017, at 16:30)

Fig. 4. 9: Armed revolutionaries ride in a truck in the southern neighborhoods of Tehran, February 1979. The picture of Ayatollah Khomeini was hung on the wall that can be seen in the background of the picture shows dwellers of southern Tehran were followers of Khomeini as their leader. Source: http://www.wideasleepinamerica.com/ (Last retrieved on 12 November 2017, at 16:40)
Fig. 4. 10: Cover image of the Ferdowsi weekly magazine published on 23 October 1978. In concert with Ayatollah Khomeini’s adopted pro-oppressed discourse over the course of the revolution, the background image shows inadequate housing conditions of the poor and in the foreground there is a typing machine that was captioned “Break a pen, a hand if you turn away from serving the deprived”.

The mass demonstrations during the Iranian Revolution of 1979 mainly took place in the Shahreza Street and ended at the Shahyad Square beside the Shahyad monument as the epitome of this urban axis. The significance of the Shahreza Street as the major route for mass demonstration of the revolution lies firstly on its spatial characteristics within the urban space of Tehran and secondly on the presence of the Shahyad Monument along this urban axis. The rigid dichotomy between the north and the south ruptured the urban space of Tehran into two binary poles. The edge segregating the north and the south was the horizontal Shahreza Street (Figure 4.11). “This boundary was not real—there were no physical obstacles in between north and south but the conceptual axis was very real. It did matter if one’s villa was in the north or one’s squatter in the south.”

Although, the Shahreza Street was a conceptual axis; this horizontal boundary was “divided the rich and the poor, the beautiful and the ugly, the new and the old, the aristocrat/elite and the blue collar worker/merchant.” Apart from the mentioned oppositions, the cultural and ideological differences also existed between populations who resided in the north and south Tehran. It is interesting that the very Shahreza Street as an edge segregating the poor south and the rich north turned to be the main route of the protests that resulted in the 1979 Revolution. Mass demonstrations took place along this road so that after the triumph of the 1979 Revolution its name changed into the Enghelab (translated as: revolution) Street. That is to say the opposition of the north and the south was broken along a horizontal urban axis formerly segregating them. If this boundary was ‘conceptually’ divided the rich and the poor, the new and the old, the aristocrat and the ordinary people; but it ‘really’ turned into a site of displaying collective urban discontent.

Examining the significances of the Shahreza Street demonstrates that its role as the main site for mass demonstration led to the 1979 Revolution was not arbitrary. While the spatial characteristics of Shahreza Street within the urban space of Tehran were of utmost importance in accommodating large crowds of protestors, the presence of
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Shahyad Monument at its western end augmented another dimension to its significance. In this perspective it can be claimed that the Shahreza Street spatially (in the concrete form) and conceptually (in the abstract form) was the best site for demonstrations against the state to be occurred.
Fig. 4. 11: Map of Tehran in 1970.

The above map shows the location of Shahreza Street (highlighted in red) within the urban context of Tehran. As it can be noticed the Shahreza Street is a horizontal urban axis that segregated the north and the south of Tehran. The Shahyad Square (circled in red) with the Shahyad Monument placed at its heart is at the western end of the Shahreza Street. In the course of 1979 Revolution, mass demonstrations majorly took place along the Shahreza Street and ended at the Shahyad Square.

To begin with the significance of the Shahreza Street in terms of its spatial dimension, its location within the larger urban context of Tehran should be studied. The Shahreza Street was one of the major avenues of Tehran that its construction dates back to the 1930s (Figure 4.12). Under Reza Shah Pahlavi’s modernization programs, the orthogonal grid system of streets was superimposed on Tehran’s urban fabric. “Four major new streets replaced the old walls around the perimeter of the city: Khiaban Shahreza to the north; Khiaban Simetri to the west; Khiaban Shoush to the south; and Khiaban Shahbaz to the east (Figure 4.13-14).”\(^{189}\) By the city’s northward development, the Shahreza Street that was once an avenue constructed on the northern fringes of the city remained at its center. As the north of the city grew in a far faster rate than the south, this horizontal axis due to its central position acted as a boundary separating the north from the south.

![Shahreza Street, Tehran in the late 1940s.](http://www.jamnews.ir/) (Last retrieved on 16 November 2017, at 15:30)
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\(^{189}\) Marefat, Mina. “Building to Power: Architecture of Tehran 1921-1941”. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of Architecture, Art, and Environmental studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, April 1988, p. 82.
Fig. 4. 13: Map of Tehran, prepared in October 1974.
Source: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ (Last retrieved on 16 November 2017, at 17:10)

Fig. 4. 14: Map of Tehran, a closer examination of the city’s old core, 1974.
The highlighted area is the old core of Tehran. As a part of modernization programs of Reza Shah Pahlavi in the 1930s, major streets of Shahreza (on the northern edge), Simetri (on the western edge), Shoush (on the southern edge) and Shahbaz (on the eastern edge) replaced the old walls around Tehran. Following the city’s northward development, Shahreza Street replacing the old wall on the northern limits of the city was remained at its center.
Source: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ (Last retrieved on 16 November 2017, at 17:15)
However, this centrality of the Shahreza Avenue within the larger context of the city, in turn, enhances its accessibility as well. Crowd of demonstrators from south, north, east and west of Tehran could access to the Shahreza Avenue more easily than any other place. For instance, it was difficult for a mass of demonstrators from southern Tehran to march toward a specific place situated in the northern Tehran. The long distance between the south and the north of the city would certainly influence the demonstration and decrease its intensity. Moreover, if a mass demonstration takes place in an avenue located in the northern, southern, eastern or western part of Tehran, it could be confined to that particular area and so it could be suppressed more quickly; but the same demonstration if occurs in the Shahreza Avenue it could expanded into the whole city because of its centrality.

The central position of the Shahreza Street also turned it into one of the main arteries of the city. Accordingly, while examining traffic volumes on main avenues of Tehran in 1969 shows that it is ranked as the second crowded avenue, where all the other major avenues (listed in the chart) have intersections with it (Figure 4.15-16). Since all major avenues have intersections at any point with the Shahreza Street, then, transportation will be facilitated. This means that large crowds of demonstrators could move from one place to another more comfortably along this street than any other streets in the city. Also at the intersections of these major avenues with the Shahreza Street, key urban nodes have been formed. These urban nodes were served as gathering points for masses in the demonstrations of 1979.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avenue</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Traffic Volume</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>( &quot; Takht-e Tevose)</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>( &quot; Kennedy Avenue)</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simetri</td>
<td>( &quot; Shah Avenue)</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Reza</td>
<td>(in front of Palace Hotel)</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdowski</td>
<td>(nearby Shah Reza Avenue)</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhte Jamshid</td>
<td>(between Vils and Ferdowsi)</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. 15: Traffic volume on selected main avenues of Tehran, 1969.
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Fig. 4. Main avenues of Tehran and their intersections with the Shahreza Street, 1970s.

The Shahyad square and the 24 Esfand square as two *maydans* (public squares) located along the Shahreza Street were acted as important nodes of mass gatherings of the 1979 Revolution. The Tehran University (one of the very first institutions of higher education that was constructed along the Shahreza Street), the College Bridge (at the intersection of the Hafez Avenue and the Shahreza Avenue) and a half-finished building (at the corner of the Shadmehr Avenue and the Shahreza Avenue) all situated with a distance from each other along the Shahreza axis were urban nodes that frequently used by demonstrators on the eve of the revolution.

These major five urban nodes along the Shahreza Street provided the needed space for gathering of masses in 1979 (Figure 4.17). Interestingly, during the construction of the Shahreza Avenue, there were five *maydans* proposed for this axis, but Reza Shah as a monarch that was involved in superimposing streets on the urban fabric of Tehran did not agree. Regarding this issue, Marefat writes: “In the initial proposal, there seem to have been five *maydans* planned for Shahreza Avenue between Simetri and Shahbaz. Reza Shah complained that this would mean too many *maydans*, too close together. Two maydans (one at Pahlavi Avenue and one at Saadi Avenue) were eliminated.”

It could, therefore, be said that beside the two *maydans* of Shahyad and 24 Esfand, the above-mentioned spaces due to the urban practice of the demonstrators were served as public gathering points.

The large open area with important urban nodes as focal points of gathering provided by the Shahreza Avenue was the space that protestors needed. If planning a class-determined fragmented urban structure for Tehran was accomplished by superimposing wide avenues in particular the Shahreza Avenue, but these streets brought about new movement patterns as well. If superimposing orthogonal grid system of streets on the dense traditional fabric of the city and constructing *maydans* at their points of convergence form more visible spaces that facilitate social control across the urban space; such openness by providing needed wide space for mass demonstrations could turn to be the Achilles’ heel of the state. On the other hand superimposing a wide street on the compact fabric of the city allows demonstrators
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190 Marefat, Mina. "Building to Power: Architecture of Tehran 1921-1941". Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of Architecture, Art, and Environmental studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, April 1988, footnote, p. 90.
to run away from suppressive forces to the surrounding dense and narrow alleys. The dense fabric of houses, alleys and lanes surrounded the Shahreza Street from both sides (the north and the south) sheltered demonstrators from the state’s military forces. In the following pages the location of each key urban nodes of gathering used in the course of 1979 Revolution along the Shahreza Street will be defined on the map and the photographs taken in the same period that could best illustrate the way large crowds of protestors appropriated the very spaces will be provided.
Fig. 4. 17: Shahreza Street and major urban nodes used as focal points of gatherings during the 1979 Revolution. From right to left: the College Bridge, the Tehran University, the 24 Esfand Square, the half-finished building and the Shahyad Square were served as public gathering nodes along the Shahreza Streets in the course of the revolution.

Source: http://alumn.us/ (Last retrieved on 19 November 2017, at 20:35)
Fig. 4. 18: College Bridge locates at the intersection of the Hafez Avenue and the Shahreza Avenue.
Source: http://alumn.us/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 13:10)

Fig. 4. 19: College Bridge during the mass protests in Tehran in 1978.
Source: https://origins.osu.edu/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 13:30)
Fig. 4. 20: College Bridge in September 1978.
Source: http://www.mahaleman.ir/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 14:45)

Fig. 4. 21: Demonstrators march on the College Bridge in February 1979.
Source: http://all-that-is-interesting.com/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 15:50)
Fig. 4. 22: Tehran University and the 24 Esfand Square both locate along the Shahreza Street.
Source: http://alumn.us/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 16:15)

Fig. 4. 23: Tehran University main entrance, 1978.
Source: http://iusnews.ir/ (Last retrieved on 20 November 2017, at 18:00)
Fig. 4. 24: Tehran University main entrance, 1979.

Fig. 4. 25: Tehran University main entrance, 1979.
Fig. 4. 26: Tehran University, 1979.
Government forces confront Tehran University students.

Fig. 4. 27: 24 Esfand Square and the statue of Reza Shah standing in its center.
On the right side of the photograph, Tehran University can be seen, which shows that there is a close distance between 24 Esfand Square and Tehran University.
Source: http://www.afkarnews.ir/ (Last retrieved on 21 November 2017, at 20:45)
Fig. 4. 28: Demonstrators gathered in protest at 24 Esfand Square in December 1978. Source: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 November 2017, at 21:20)

Fig. 4. 29: Protests in 24 Esfand Square, 1979. Source: http://www.rajanews.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 November 2017, at 22:15)
Fig. 4. 30: Large crowds of protestors gathered around the Reza Shah’s statue at the 24 Esfand Square.
Source: https://www.flickr.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 November 2017 at 23:30)

Fig. 4. 31: Revolutionaries climbed the pedestal of a toppled Reza shah statue decorating it with pictures of Ayatollah Khomeini after the triumph of the 1979 Revolution.
Crowds of demonstrators frequently used this unfinished building as a place of gathering along the Shahreza Avenue, so that after the triumph of the 1979 Revolution and the building’s completion, the owner named it Azadi (translated as Freedom).


Dozens of demonstrators climbed the half-finished building, chanted slogans against the Shah and in praise of Khomeini in February 1979.

Fig. 4. 34: Protestors climbed the half-finished building during a massive anti-Shah demonstration in December 1978.

Fig. 4. 35: Thousands of protestors took to the Shahreza Street; part of them gathered at the half-finished building and chanted “Long Live Khomeini” and “Death to the Shah.”
Source: http://www.tabnak.ir/ (Last retrieved on 23 November 2017, at 16:00)
Fig. 4. 36: Iranians gathered in the streets and crowded into a building under construction on the Shahreza Street during a demonstration against the state in 1979.
Source: http://www.gettyimages.com/ (Last retrieved on 23 November 2017, at 17:20)

Fig. 4. 37: The famous half-finished building that was one of the focal points of gatherings during the 1979 Revolution after completion was named Azadi (translated as Freedom) building.
Source: http://www.fardanews.com (Last retrieved on 23 November 2017, at 18:45)
Fig. 4. 38: Shahyad Square locates at the western end of Shahreza Street.

Fig. 4. 39: Approximately one million people gathered around the Shahyad Monument at Shahyad Square to show their support for their exiled leader Khomeini in December 1978.
A supporter of Ayatollah Khomeini hoisted his poster during this massive anti-Shah demonstration.
Source: https://apimagesblog.com/ (Last retrieved on 23 November 2017, at 22:15)
Fig. 4. 40: Hundreds of thousands gathered around the Shahyad Monument at Shahyad Square in January 1979 demanding the return of Khomeini from exile.

Fig. 4. 41: Almost four million Iranians gathered around the Shahyad Monument on 1 February 1979—the day of Khomeini’s arrival in Tehran after 14 years in political exile.

Fig. 4. 42: Crowds of demonstrators gathered in protest at Shahyad Square, where the Shahyad Monument stands, February 1979.
In addition to the Shahreza Street that was a crowded avenue itself and other major avenues that have intersections with it and caused more congestion, the Tehran University that situated along this urban axis made it as one of the busiest streets of the city. A large number of students that were studied at the Tehran University was great enough to form a crowd and join the protestors in the street. They were mostly politically conscious students that were like reserved armies waiting inside their campus and at the time of any unrest they poured into the Shahreza Street and participated in the demonstration. The potential source of crowd that practically await a spark to join the protests and create mass demonstrations has a profound effect on increasing intensity and extensity of a revolutionary movement. This is what the Shahreza Street via its own crowdedness and presence of the Tehran University possessed. The Tehran University with its large number of students and its role in promoting political consciousness of the society contributed extensively to the 1979 Revolution.

The bookstores and publications of the Shahreza Street as well as the Tehran University played active role in the revolution. Following the establishment of the Tehran University, on the opposite side of the university, dozens of bookstores and publications were opened. “On the south side (of the Shahreza Street), near the University, the shops catered to academic tastes for books and paper goods.”191 On the days prior to the revolution, these bookstores and publications apart from providing academic goods were engaged in publishing revolutionary materials. The statements and materials that were published regarding the revolution turned this area a common locus for political activists and intellectuals’ gathering. Then, the Tehran University and the bookstores and publications on its opposite side that were all situated in the Shahreza Street could be accounted as important factors involved in making this street as one major site of demonstrations.

Among other avenues across the urban space of Tehran, it was the Shahreza Avenue that majorly accommodated mass demonstrations from the very first days of unrest until the triumph of the revolution (Figure 4. 43-44). Hence in this context it can be

said that the street is not just a passageway to moving through. “In the street and through the space it offered, a group (the city itself) took shape, appeared, appropriated places, realized an appropriated space-time.”192 Uprisings, revolts and revolutions usually occur in the streets as the terrains where discontent of the masses could be expressed.

Fig. 4. 43: Fires were set on Shahreza Street during anti-Shah protests, November 1978. Source: http://www.wideasleepinamerica.com/ (Last retrieved on 24 November 2017, at 12:25)

Fig. 4. 44: Iranian revolutionaries at the Shahreza Avenue in front of Tehran University main campus, February 1979. Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/ (Last retrieved on 24 November 2017, at 14:05)
Therefore, the urban space that once used as an instrument in the hands of the state in order to implement its strategies (of which income-based segregation of urban space of Tehran was significant) from the above, employed by the large crowds of demonstrators as the mean to express their opposition to the state as well. Lefebvre best explains this issue where he states: “The urban phenomenon and urban space are not only a projection of social relationships but also a terrain on which various strategies clash. They are in no sense goals or objective, but means and instruments of action.”

By appropriation of the Shahreza axis during the mass demonstrations of the revolution, the urban space that was produced by the dominant mode of production and was beset with exclusionary strategies of the state replaced by the spatial inclusivity. The Shahreza Street that was formerly an edge segregating the rich north and the poor south, during the revolution days turned to be a site that was unifying all people regardless of their class, race and gender.

Beyond the spatial qualities of the Shahreza Street that turned it into the locus of displaying discontent of the masses on the eve of the revolution, the urban location and context of the Shahyad Square and the presence of the Shahyad Monument at the western end of this street were involved in making it as more conducive to accommodate mass demonstrations. Discussions on the special significances of the Shahyad Square with the Shahyad Monument located at its center will be provided in the following subchapter.

4.3. SHAHYAD SQUARE, EPITOME OF AN EDGE DIVIDING AFFLUENT NORTH AND POOR SOUTH: A PLACE OF SEPARATING AND/OR GATHERING?

The rallies started in the Shahreza Street moved toward its western end, where the Shahyad Square was located and ended under the arch of the Shahyad Monument. The mass demonstration of the day of the triumph of the revolution followed the same pattern movement too. The motive that Shahyad Square was served as an end point to the movement of large crowd of masses expressing their discontent against the Shah was more beyond the ordinary function of squares. It is really overlooking

193 Ibid, p.87.
the significance of the Shahyad Square and specifically the Shahyad Monument located at its center if considering the wide and open space that it offered to the demonstrators was the only reason why they move toward it and ended their rally there. The certain characteristics of the Shahyad Square with the Shahyad Monument as its focus point have been involved in their role as accommodating major anti-state demonstrations. The Shahyad tower (translated as King’s memorial tower) is a monument located at Shahyad Square in Tehran, commissioned by Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and designed by architect Hossein Amanat (Figure 4. 45-46-47-48).
Fig. 4. 45: Shahyad Monument under construction. 

Fig. 4. 46: Shahyad Monument under construction. 
The monument built of on-site concrete with solid marble as formwork and cladding. Source: http://www.amanatarchitect.com/ (Last retrieved on 30 November 2017, at 13:45)

This is an interesting photograph taken during the construction period of Shahyad Monument in the early 1970s that best displays the status quo of that time. The Shahyad Monument was built to represent modern Iran during Mohammad Reza Shah’s reign; however as it can be observed in the above photograph, still part of society had to ride on camels on the constructed highways.

That is to say the Shah’s implemented modernization programs were in concert with his imagined modern Iran via which he could modernize the image of the country, while neglecting the fabric of the society and their necessary social well-being development programs. Source: http://www.iranreview.org/ (Last retrieved on 30 November 2017, at 15:20)
As earlier mentioned Shahreza Avenue was a horizontal urban axis segregating rich north and poor south, and Shahyad Monument (at its western end) was as the epitome of this axis gave an end point to it. Then, Shahreza Avenue that stretched horizontally and ended at the Shahyad Monument divided the city (both physically and conceptually) into two poles. Built in 1971, the Shahyad Monument could be accounted as a spatial materialization of Mohammad Reza Shah’s objectives proclaimed under his White Revolution. The Shah’s launched revolution aimed at constructing a modern country while preserving the tradition of monarchy as its base. Accordingly, Shahyad was supposed to reify to his goal, which was constructing a modern nation-state while commemorating the 2500th year of the foundation of the Imperial State of Iran. That is to say, this monument served to be a manifestation of success of Mohammad Reza Shah’s launched White Revolution in heading the country toward becoming a modern great civilization.

In the aftermath of implementation of the White Revolution, the Shah imagined Iran as a nation at the gate of the path toward a great civilization. In this sense, the Shahyad Monument was the materialization of his conceptualized gate. Regardless of the extent that the Iranian society was alien to the Shah’s imagined nation, Shahyad was supposed to proclaim his ideology at the spatial level. That is to say, “[I]n their (monuments) very essence, and sometimes at the very heart of a space in which the characteristics of a society are most recognizable and commonplace, monuments embody a sense of transcendence, a sense of being elsewhere.”194 Thus, the Shahyad Monument as a manifestation of the Shah’s conceptualized modern Iran was a gate to Tehran, located at the western end of the Shahreza Street. In terms of architectural form, Shahyad was a gate that one could pass through it also its position within the larger urban context of Tehran demonstrates that it functioned as a symbolic gate for the capital. Since Shahyad is situated close to the only International airport of Tehran of that time, it was as an entrance gate for those who travelled to the city especially foreign visitors.

The placement of the Shahyad Monument close to the Mehrabad International Airport (the largest and the most important airport of Iran) was not based on a

---
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random choice. In this regard, Bahrambeygui writes: “At present (1970s) there are 18 airports of different categories in operation in Iran of which the International Airport of Mehrabad in Tehran is the most important one, through which Tehran is connected to major centers of the world. In 1968, 296416 passenger arrivals, 305626 departures, and 26217 transit passengers were recorded at the airport.”195 Then, major part of foreign tourists who traveled to Iran arrived via International airport of Tehran (Mehrabad). For foreign tourists that visited Iran, Shahyad was an entrance gate welcoming them, while for Iranians it was a gate that connected the country to the outside world (Figure 4. 49-50-51-52).

The above Iran Air advertisement that was headlined “Tehran. Crossroads of the world” with the image of Shahyad implies to this monument’s role that functioned as a gateway of the country to the outside world.

Source: http://www.vintageadbrowser.com/ (Last retrieved on 30 November 2017, at 20:00)
This advertisement was published in foreign newspapers in 1970s, encouraging foreign tourists to visit Iran. Drawing on the heading of the advertisement it is said that those who travel Iran via visiting modern Iran and ancient Persia will travel like 2500 years in 15 days. The image of Shahyad used in this advertisement best fits the context since this monument was both a representation of modern Iran and a reminder of the 2500 years history of Persian Empire.

Source: http://tehran.media/ (Last retrieved on 30 November 2017, at 21:20)

Welcoming strangers for 2500 years again is mentioned here, while the image of Shahyad in the middle (built in 1971) and Persepolis at the right corner (founded in 6th century BC) both used as two important landmarks of the country.

Source: https://iranian.com/ (Last retrieved on 30 November 2017, at 23:30)
Fig. 4. 52: Shahyad in the Iran National Airlines Corporation (HOMA) advertisement, 1970s.

The heading of the above advertisement is that ‘the Iran National Airlines Corporation (HOMA) is the ambassador of Iran’s impressive progress’. Employing the image of Shahyad Monument below the mentioned heading points to the created image for Shahyad, which was managed to be the symbol of Iran’s rapid progress and developments following the White Revolution. Indeed, the way that Shahyad’s image was used in Iran airlines’ advertisements reveals that this monument as a representation of modern Iran was projected not only at the national rather international level as well.

The presentation of the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument at both national and international level shows that it was supposed to represent modern capital under Mohammad Reza Shah’s rule. Particularly, as earlier mentioned, it was important for the Shah to modernize the country in a way to be worth of foreign travellers’ visit and hence the urban location of Shahyad was chosen in line with this objective. Due to the proximity of Shahyad to the Mehrabad International Airport, foreign travellers as arrived in the country could see it, which helped the ruling power in improving the place-image of the capital. No matter the reality of the city was an increased urban inequality and impoverishment, creating an attractive urban image could mask the existing difficulties. This calls to mind, Harvey where he expresses if people could live on images alone, they would have been rich indeed.196

The state’s attempts at improving image of the capital will benefit most the small segment of bourgeoisie: but, attached to it there could be raised questions concerning who benefits, why benefits be captured by a small powerful segment and not be distributed through for instance housing, education and the like. These questions could generate protests on the side of those underprivileged segments of the population, could become widespread and could contest the meaning imposed from above to the monument. This is what Lefebvre states as conflicts between fantasies of the ruling power and critical understanding of the lived experience that could trigger critical and/or concrete revolt against established structure.197 In this context, the Shahyad Square with the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument at its center was an urban setting laden with conflicts between representations of the state power and fabric of the society that accommodated million-person demonstrations during the 1979 Revolution.

On the other hand, since Shahyad was presented to the international audiences via different means, this monument was almost known to the world. Thus, its offered high level of visibility was of great import for spreading the news of mass protests in the square to the world and waiting for its echoes. For foreign travellers, official

guests and others who saw the northern part of the city as a part likely to be visited and the Shahyad Monument on their way toward the airport (not the southern impoverished neighborhoods and surrounding shanty towns), millions of protestors gathered around the monument was inconceivable.\textsuperscript{198} The Shahyad Monument’s provided visibility to the space that is organized around it, is significant regarding the invisibility of the urban poor to the government. If the poor residents of the impoverished southern neighborhoods remained at south of the city, their demonstration could be suppressed quickly before no one informs about, as what happened several times in the early days of the unrest. Therefore, it is possible to say that, the appropriate choice of the site of gathering for demonstrations plays a crucial role in unfolding uprisings, like Shahyad did.

In addition to foreign travellers that landed at the Mehrabad Airport, Shahayd was the first sight of the capital for domestic visitors who arrived in the city from the west. Also, it was located close to a bus terminal, so those who travelled by bus would see Shahyad at their arrival. The Shahyad Square’s urban location as close to the airport, bus terminal and freeway connects the west to the capital can be observed in the map of Tehran (Figure 4. 53). Actually, major roads mainly were leading toward the Shahyad Square and it functioned as directing traffic. All these factors turned this square as one main traffic junctions in the city. Then, needed crowd for forming and intensifying protests could best be provided because of the Shahyad Square’s urban location. Indeed, the placement of Shahyad Square at the western end of the Shahreza Avenue generated axially in the surrounding urban fabric, which shaped activities around it (Figure 4. 54-55).

Beside car traffic, pedestrian traffic was formed in the square as well. It was a sort of gathering hub for labourers working in the industries as well as unemployed and underemployed labor forces waiting to find job opportunities. Since, as a part of capital-intensive industrialization process stimulated following the White Revolution, along with heavy industries constructed in the southern part of the city, several industries were erected in the west. These industries were constructed along

\textsuperscript{198} Documented in foreign ambassadors to Iran, the large crowds assembled around the Shahyad Monument in the Shahyad Square was hard to believe for presidents and official guests that were received by the Shah at the same place at peace just months before.
the Karaj road that passed the Shahyad Square in order to arrive in Tehran (Figure 4.56). As BahramBeygui writes: “Several industrial activities have been established on both sides of this road (Karaj road) along a distance of approximately 25 kilometers. From Maidan-e-Shahyad, to the junction with the Old Karaj road there is an increasing concentration on basic products.”

Here it should be mentioned that the site of these newly erected industries along the main western entry to the capital was also involved for the choice of the urban location of the Shahyad Monument, which was supposed to represent the Shah’s success in making Iran a modern, developed and industrialized country following his launched White Revolution. Then, those who arrived in Tehran from the western entry first could see several industries erected along the both sides of the Karaj road and then they would be welcomed to the city by the Shahyad Monument. The same was everyday happening for the labourers that went to the factories in the morning and returned to the city in the evening.

Although there were factories constructed along the western axis of the city, labourers of these factories were not settled close to their working places. “The land price in this zone compared with the Central part of the city is much lower, these factories therefore are capable of expanding over a wide area without incurring tremendous costs.” The map of Tehran in the mid 1970s shows that factories such as Arj metal products, Minoo, Irannational car assembly plant, Daru Pakhsh and so forth are located along the Karaj road (Figure 4. 57). “One major handicap of this zone is great distance from the labour force of Tehran. This problem has been tackled by providing bus services bringing labourers from their houses in southern and central parts of the city to the factories. This zone appears therefore as an industrial zone with little working-class housing.” Shahyad Square, then, acted as a gathering hub for labourers though they were settled in the southern neighborhoods, during their everyday life they passed through it, stopped and sat, and socialized there.
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Furthermore, for its central position it was close to the middle-income residential areas as well. It was likewise close to the Tehran University. That is to say, for labourers working at the industries, unemployed ones waiting at the square, middle-income families residing in the nearby, and for students of the Tehran University, Shahyad was a place for gathering during their daily life. Accordingly, that is to say the Shahyad Square beside its largeness, openness and visibility, due to its particular urban location was a hub for gathering of low- and middle-income groups, and hence functioned as a hub of intensity, intensified anti-state demonstrations marched toward it from the Shahreza Avenue. The certain urban characteristics of this site and its social reorganization by different agents were conducive to mass demonstrations rather than other sites in the city. From within the planned and imposed function of Shahyad, aroused alternative urban practice, so it became an important site shaping protests during the revolution.

![Shahyad Square and surrounding](image-url)

**Fig. 4. 53: Shahyad Square and surrounding.**
The above map of Tehran, shows position of the Shahyad Square. It is close to the International airport of Tehran (Mehrabad) from the western-south, to the bus terminal from the western-north. Moreover major roads and freeway that connect the west of the country all pass through this square.

Fig. 4. 54: Shahyad Square and its generated urban axis within the larger urban context of the city.
Source: http://econews.com/ (Last retrieved on 3 December 2017, at 15:00)

Fig. 4. 55: Shahyad Square from the Karaj road, main western entry into Tehran.
Source: https://welcometoiran.com/ (Last retrieved on 3 December 2017, at 18:25)
Fig. 4. 56: Map of Tehran, Shahyad Square and Karaj road at its western side.
Source: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ (Last retrieved on 3 December 2017, at 19:30)

Fig. 4. 57: Shahyad Square and industries established on both sides of the Karaj road.
The above map shows there are industries expanded over the western axis of the city. Indeed, existing congestion of heavy industries in the south, capability of expanding over a larger area, lower land prices in the west compared to the central parts of Tehran all caused that several industries constructed along the Karaj road. As mentioned, there existed little working-class housing concentrated around this western industrial area; they were mainly resided in the southern neighborhoods and industries’ provided services brought them to their working place. Due to the urban location of the Shahyad Square in relation to these industries, this square functioned as a gathering hub for labourers.
Source: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ (Last retrieved on 3 December 2017, at 19:45)
As well as the significant spatial qualities of the Shahyad Square, the presence of the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument at the center of this square was of great import for becoming the main urban site in assimilating and intensifying anti-state demonstrations at the time of the 1979 Revolution. The urban function of Shahyad as one major site sheltering mass demonstrations on the eve of the revolution could best prove that particular urban spaces that are constructed as showcasing the state power are more susceptible to become sites of struggling against the ruling power. The way that Mohammad Reza Shah imagined Iran was the model, based on which the urban space of the capital was transformed and the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument was one clear example of it. In this light, Shahyad Aryamehr was the manifestation of the state power in transforming the urban space in a way that manifested the ruling ideology, likewise, was the site contesting the very dominant ideology.

As Lefebvre argues “[T]he monument is essentially repressive. It is the seat of an institution (the church, the state, the university). Any space that is organized around the monument is colonized and oppressed.”\textsuperscript{202} For Lefebvre, monuments could mobilize symbols for social awareness and contemplation when they are beginning to lose their meaning, and hence it can be also a site of collective social life.\textsuperscript{203} Building on Lefebvre, the Shahyad Monument’s representations via different means, shows that it was supposed to serve as a manifestation of the state’s success in making the country already a developed one, it was a seat of the state and its surrounding space was highly protected with always an eye to control it. However, the conflicts between the state’s projection of images and representations on a public and concrete realities experienced by major segments of the society during their daily life, mobilized dissatisfied masses, gathered them around the monument in the Shahyad Square, and turned this site as a seat of the nation. This is what Lefebvre calls it as the capacity of monuments in transcending the imposed function and meaning, and actually what gave them their real power.\textsuperscript{204}

The way that Shahyad Aryamehr Monument is presented by different state media, particularly the newspaper \textit{Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran}—as the main state propaganda
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tool—assist in understanding how this monument was served as a materialization of the ruling power’s conceptualized modern Iran and also in introducing a broader understanding of the importance of this monument for the state that appropriated by large crowds during the 1979 Revolution. Since the inauguration of the Shahyad Aryamehr in 1971, this monument as a manifestation of the state power was employed to produce a new national image for the capital and for the country in general. Examining articles concerning Shahyad, published in the newspaper Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran in 1971 best illustrates the image that the Shah attempted to create for Tehran and whole country via this monument, because it was a newspaper affiliated with the state, and indeed acted as the state media to deliver the ruling power’s messages to the society.205

To begin with examining article, first its title should be addressed, which is “Shahyad Aryamehr: the birth certificate for the capital Tehran.” The explanation for this title is existed in the first lines of the article. Then, it is mentioned that the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument is, in fact, a birth certificate for the capital Tehran and the manifestation of the modern and revolutionary Iran while also is a reminder of the glorious history of ancient Iran (Persian Empire).206 The ‘modern’ and ‘revolutionary’ Iran here is referring to Iran that Mohammad Reza Shah desired to create after launching his White Revolution. The country, which by reforms came along with the White Revolution, would be a modern country; while the tradition of monarchy will be preserved as its main structure. Hence within this context, as considering revolutionizing a monarch is implausible, democracy, also, will not be existed in the country.

The integration of modern and tradition that constituted the Shah’s imagined new Iran was addressed by employed architectural approach in designing Shahyad. The interior spaces have been formed by the traditional Persian geometry, while the main structure of the monument is reinforced concrete. Shahyad was one of the pioneers in the country in terms of using reinforced concrete that acted as barrier in such a large-scale project. The reinforced concrete structure is remained intact in the internal

205 This newspaper was published in one hundred issues and mainly devoted to celebration of the 2500th year of the foundation of the Imperial State of Iran.
spaces but the external surfaces have been covered with white marble. One dominant factor in ancient Iranian architecture that has been employed in the design of Shahyad shaped the basis of the monument. “Four Squares of 21 x 21 meters have been made the basis of the entire structure. The main arch is situated in the central square. The center of the upper square is the apex of the ogive. The dominant forms of the main plan and the structural ring beams in the buttress legs consist of 3 meter unit modules (Figure 4.58).”  

The calculations of the arches and their curves and the coordinates of the various points of the external surface to be covered by cut white marble have been accomplished by computers. The use of computers to do calculations regarding the complex woven surfaces of the monument was unprecedented for that time (1971).

The Shahyad Monument built to represent both modern and tradition so that Amanat (architect of Shahyad) in an interview told: “the main vault is a Sassanian arch representing the classical era, while the broken arch above it is a popular medieval form of arch representing the post-classical era. The network of ribs, which connects the arches together, would represent the connection between classical and post-classical Iran (Figure 4.59).” The monument is surrounded by a grand plaza (50,000 square meters), which included fountains and gardens (Figure 4.60). The patterns used in landscaping of the plaza evoke patterns of traditional Persian garden and the like approaches that have been employed to fulfill the objective of making this monument to be an integration of modern and tradition. Thus, Shahyad was designed in a way that was modern yet Persian, which supposed to be in concert with the ruling power’s envisaged modern Iran.

The Shahyad Monument was served to function as landmarks of major cities around the world. In this connection, Rouein states that genuine nationalism and patriotism are the fundamental part of the everyday life and history of different nations, so to support and represent nationalism, nations choose one of the most historical and honorable monuments of their city/country as their symbol and indeed a birth
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certificate and a city/country reference. Then he cites various examples from around the world. From 1889 onwards that the construction of the Eiffel Tower was finished, this tower is functioned as the symbol of the city of Paris and France. The huge Golden Gate Bridge that was built as a multi-billion dollar project is served as the birth certificate and symbol of California and the United States. The Kremlin Palace in Moscow, the famous London Bridge and Clock Tower, Taq-e Nosrat, Place de l'Étoile and the Arc de Triomphe stands at the center of Paris, the great Statue of Liberty in New York and other symbolic monuments around the world ascribe a significant identity to all these cities. It is mentioned in the article that all these monuments indicate that nationalism is spreading around the world; these monuments are constructed to function as representative of the nationalism of respective nation; and the same function as a need for the modern country of Iran will be accomplished by the Shahyad Monument.

The way that Iran national airline’s advertisement in 1970s used the image of the Shahyad Monument beside the London Bridge and Clock Tower for London, and skyscrapers for New York best illustrates the above-mentioned point (Figure 4. 62). Moreover, at the time that Iran was incorporating into the global world, and the state was intent on transmitting a constructed image of modern country, this monument’s use precisely fitted the context in bringing the city together with other major capital cities and to convey the new image of what the city is about after implementing modernization programs. Regarding the production of image for a city and/or country, Harvey states that it is the image of prosperity and of success that will be spread not the image of impoverishment, and hence this by diverting concern and resources from the serious problems that exist within a particular territory will not lead to amelioration of conditions but to conceal them.
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Fig. 4. 58: Main lines, points and proportions of Shahyad.
The building fits into four squares, and the legs are on their diagonals. It is interesting that everything fit into this geometry.

Fig. 4. 59: Shahyad, south-north section.
The main arch represents the classical era while the second broken arch above represents post-classical era.
The patterns used in landscaping of the 50,000 square meters grand plaza surrounded the Shahyad Monument evoke patterns of traditional Persian garden.

Source: http://www.amanatarchitect.com/ (Last retrieved on 7 December 2017, at 16:50)

Fig. 4. 60: Architect Hossein Amanat in front of his designed Shahyad Monument.

Source: http://www.bbc.com/ (Last retrieved on 7 December 2017, at 17:40)
The above left is Iran Air, New York, the right is Iran Air, London and the below is Iran Air, Tehran advertisement. The extensive use of Shahyad’s image in Iran Air advertisements, in turn, contributed to make this monument an image of the capital and the country as a whole. Like skyscrapers for New York, London Bridge and Clock Tower for London, Shahyad was served for Tehran as the city/country reference.

Source: https://www.pinterest.fr/ (Last retrieved on 7 December 2017, at 21:15)
In the other part of the article, interestingly while Rouein refers to some examples of landmarks of identification within the country such as Ali Qapu Palace, the Shah Mosque and the Allahverdi Khan Bridge in Isfahan, he notes that in the early future tall towers of massive steel factories will be the new reference of Isfahan. The steel factories of Isfahan (Zob Ahan-e Isfahan) as a part of industrialization program of the country opened in the late 1960s in the Isfahan province. The tall towers of Isfahan steel factories that would be new reference point for the city of Isfahan in place of its traditional landmarks, namely, the Ali Qapu Palace, the Allahverdi Khan Bridge, and so on implicitly demonstrates the context of Iranian society of that time—the country that was underwent rapid industrialization and attempted to transmit the world a new image of itself different from its former traditional image. It was an image of developed (rather than developing) and industrialized country that the state aimed to construct.

Like the tall towers of steel factories in Isfahan, Shahyad Aryamehr, would ascribe the capital afresh character. Built in the site of 80,000 square meters—means one of the worlds largest squares—Shahyad would deliver a message to the world that Tehran is the capital of the country, which is rapidly heading toward development and better future. In this light Shahyad is not only a reference point of Tehran but it overtakes other landmarks of the country. This monument that is the blend of Persian architectural tradition and the most recent techniques and technologies of the age of industry reminds (and will remind) the time during which the nation was prepared their great civilization. Through the article, direct and indirect references to the Shah’s launched White Revolution can be noticed. The time that the above-mentioned paragraph talks about it, is the post-White Revolution period, since the phrase ‘great civilization’, movement toward it and at the gate of the great civilization were themes that used by Mohammad Reza Shah frequently within this time period. He considered the White Revolution as a process that leads the country to become the great civilization.
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Another reference to the link between the White Revolution and the Shahyad Monument existed in the article is a paragraph concerning its construction budget. It is noted that industry owners and businessmen in order to appreciate the Shah’s implemented White Revolution, covered all the project’s cost. It is not unexpected that Industry owners and businessmen supported the Shah and his programs since they were the groups that benefited from the reforms came along with the White Revolution. However, Rouein expands this appreciation to whole the society and explains that the Shahyad Monument is a sign that the Iranian nation is content with the Shah and his launched White Revolution. The aforementioned enormous crises that produced following the implementation of the White Revolution and deteriorated living standards of lower classes in the society in one hand, and the failure of the White Revolution to prevent occurrence of a revolution from below (as 1979 Revolution occurred) on the other hand indicate that satisfaction of the poor regarding this issue is a matter of question.

In the later issue of the Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran newspaper, the role of industry owners and businessmen that covered all the cost of the Shahyad project has been highlighted again. The article begins with referring to the Eiffel Tower and its construction process. At the time that the French architect planned and designed the Eiffel Tower to serve as the manifestation of power and glory of France, there was considerable opposition. The opponents of the project considered it as a vain practice and claimed that compiling too many iron on each other and erecting an iron tower would cost much money so it is not cost-effective. However, after a quiet short time, the Eiffel Tower turned to be a symbol of new machine age for the whole world, and a source of identification for Paris. After giving an account of Eiffel Tower and its construction process, the article notes that at present time the Eiffel Tower is the symbol of Paris and even the symbol of greatness of France in the machine age and a major source of absorbing capital. Then, it is explicitly mentioned in the article that the account of Paris and its Eiffel Tower was used as an example to reveal the importance and value of what industry owners have done by providing construction cost of Shahyad. As earlier mentioned, decomposition of agrarian
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structure, capturing capital into industries of the urbanized centers and rapid capital-intensive industrialization constituted fundamental part of the Shah’s modernization program; so if both articles stress the role of industry owners in this particular project (Shahyad Aryamehr Monument), it is because of the importance of industrialization for the Shah. Throughout the article, the role of industry owners in constructing Shahyad has been mentioned repeatedly. It is stated that the Shahyad Monument is a memorial and document that industry owners of Iran—as one of the essential classes of the society in the post-White Revolution period—presented to the society in order to express their strong bond with the Shah and Pahlavi dynasty.  

Drawing on the article, industry owners by funding the Shahyad project, in fact, express their gratitude to the Shah for his great leadership of the country.

Moreover, examining the plan of Shahyad shows that museum, audiovisual theatre, ceremony halls and library were included in the project that served majorly to display developments and progress that the country achieved following the White Revolution (Figure 4. 63). It is mentioned in the Rouein’s article that the visitors of the museum will understand that Iran has passed the path of progress very quickly like in one night, while the same path have been passed by other countries very slowly and during one hundred years.  

Also from the above paragraph it can be derived that at that time Iran was incorporating into the global world and attempted to find its own place within the world’s system, and again the state’s stress was to persuade visitors of the museum to notice that Iran is not an under-developed country anymore rather it is an already developed country.

Examples of landmarks of past dynasties in different cities of Iran have been provided in the article, such as Goharshad mosque built during the Timurid dynasty in Mashhad, Grandeur palaces, squares, mosques and schools constructed by Safavid dynasty in Isfahan, Shah Abbasi Caravanserai and so forth. Building on these examples, the article declares that if these monuments never have been built, the name of the respective dynasties could not be perpetuated forever and no one could understand the power and glory of their age.
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Ultimately, the article concludes that the Shahyad Monument is like (and even beyond) one of these (above-mentioned examples) buildings that will convey the message of our era to the future generations for a long time. The main message that will be conveyed via the Shahyad Monument to the next generations is explicitly stated in the article as well. It is noted that one of the most important messages to be delivered to the future is that during the auspicious era of the Shah’s rule, Iran could end feudalism; could free cities from the hegemonic pastoral and rural economy; and could build foundation of the society based on the industrial economy.\textsuperscript{219} The message above that defines major shifts happened in the society under Mohammad Reza Shah’s rule, actually pointing the White Revolution and the changes that it brought about. From this it follows that the Shahyad Monument was supposed to be a spatial manifestation of the Shah’s White Revolution.

The article ends with a paragraph that is worth mentioning. In the last paragraph, even how future generations will think about the Shahyad Monument is noted in

\textsuperscript{219} Jashn-e Shahanshahi Iran newspaper in Persian, Issue 16, 11 August 1971, p. 5.
advance. The article states that those who will visit Shahyad will say how magnificent was the era from which this monument has remained, and how great was the Shah that its nation constructed a monument like this in order to appreciate and praise his leadership. With respect to representations of the Shahyad Monument in the state media, it can be said that, Shayad was intended to be a reminder of the history of Persian Empire; a manifestation of the existing context (Iran in the aftermath of the White Revolution); and a message to the future generations. The widespread use of Shahyad’s image from banknotes, advertisements, to stamps and so forth all show the state’s attempt in creating a specific image of this monument, which accords perfectly with its pursued objectives (Figure 4. 64-65-66). Nevertheless, masses experience of the revolution demonstrates that their image of this monument was not the same as its image and representations projected by the state.

The way the Shahyad Monument was projected to the society via different means, was indeed the state’s endeavor on furnishing this monument with imposed meanings compatible with ruling ideologies. Based on which, it can be derived that the Shahyad Monument was served to be a manifestation of state’s power and success in developing the country. However, this very site of showcasing the state power, during the revolution, turned to be the main site of struggling against the dominant power. For Lefebvre, what makes monuments media of appropriation of urban space, is their capacity for introducing another dimension to everyday life that moves beyond their immediate presence. He argues that monuments by referring to the historical past and to the future can stimulate collective acts at the present; by providing the site of appropriation of space strengthen the potentials for urban actions; and by gathering meanings, collective memories, and history can proclaim duty, power, knowledge, joy, hope.

---
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Fig. 4. 64: Iran 200 Rials Banknote of the second Pahlavi.
On the obverse side of the above banknote, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi in army uniform and on the reverse side the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument’s image can be seen. The widespread representation of Shahyad’s image in different state media led this monument gain a significant place in collective urban memory and imagination of all Iranians.
Source: https://www.banknotes.com/ (Last retrieved on 15 December 2017, at 11:45)

Fig. 4. 65: Iran stamps: 'Iran Air' first flight to New York, May 1975.
The projection of Shahyad’s image in the above advertisement demonstrates that this monument was tuned to be the representation of entire country, which was longed for connecting to the world.
Source: http://www.iranstamp.com/ (Last retrieved on 15 December 2017, at 14:30)
As can be seen in the advertisement, the images of Shahyad (left) and Persepolis (right) have been used and below them it is noted that "enjoy the delights of modern Iran, see 2500 years of history in stone and make valuable new business contacts." This is an advertisement addressing foreign tourists through which the significance of Shahyad Monument as the representation of modern Iran has been emphasized.

Source: http://airlinepress.ir/ (Last retrieved on 15 December 2017, at 19:00)
The spatial characteristics of the Shahyad Square that has been discussed in detail along with the state’s imposed meaning to the Shahyad Monument were involved in the urban role that this urban setting was played during the 1979 Revolution. Indeed, the urban axis of the Shahreza Avenue with the Shahyad Square as its epitome majorly fashioned and accommodated million-person anti-state demonstrations during the days of unrest in 1979. The state’s widespread projection of the Shahyad’s image and representations on the society clearly demonstrates the important role of this monument for the government as an emblem of the country’s modernization and developments under Mohammad Reza Shah’s rule in the 1970s. That is to say, the Shah’s domination became inherent in the Shahyad Monument. Then, if large crowds of demonstrators from the Shahreza Avenue marched toward the Shahyad Square and appropriated it, beside spatial qualities of both these urban settings, the monument that employed as the seat of the state power was of great import.

The Shahyad Monument as the seat of the state organized its surrounding space (the Shahyad Square) as the colonized space for the state power. In this context, when during the 1979 Revolution this space accommodated discontented masses, then, the passage from domination to appropriation was occurred. Therefore, the Shahyad Square was an important site to be appropriated by the state and/or people; so that while state forces highly protected it, crowds of demonstrators attempted to move along the Shahreza Street toward the Shahyad Square. Photographs taken between 1978 and 1979 (years of turmoil) illustrate how people and state forces both appropriated the Shahyad Square (Figure 4. 67-68-69-70). It was under the grand arch of the Shahyad Monument, dispossessed masses expressed that they want to regain the city from the current condition, which produced a city of wealthy enclave—a city to invest in not to live in. Hence, for the mass demonstrations to the abolition of the Pahlavi monarchy, Mohammad Reza Shah’s departure, Ayatollah Khomeini’s (leader of the revolution) arrival and the like, large crowds assembled around the Shahyad Monument in the Shahyad Square (Figure 4. 71).

In the course of time and in particular after the 1979 Revolution, the Shahyad Monument was connected more with its society. The urban practice of demonstrators during the revolution that appropriated the Shahyad Square and gathered around the
Shahayd Monument demanding change, in fact, gave another meaning to it. The monument, which was the manifestation of the state’s power turned to be the manifestation of the nation power. Shahyad was among few buildings survived the destruction in the post-revolutionary era. If it was not torn down, there could be different involved factors, which are beyond the scope of this study to be discussed in detail; but the most important one could be considered as its transformed meaning because of its played urban role during the revolution. It can be said that after the triumph of the revolution, the Shahyad Monument lost its meaning and representation imposed from above. In the early days of the 1979 Revolution, the Shahyad Aryamehr Monument was not a reminder of the Pahlavi monarchy, instead what this monument mostly reminded was an event occurred in the modern history of Iran by the nation power, the 1979 Revolution. It was no longer a monument of the state power; rather it was a monument that reminded the nation power.

In contrast with all imposed to Shahyad to represent under Mohammad Reza Shah’s rule, it found its real meaning and power when it accommodated mass protests and played a key role in unfolding the uprisings. The shift happened in the meaning ascribed to the Shahyad Monument was not imposed from outside; it was happened due to its urban function during the revolutionary period. This monument’s inherent shift and its established new bond with the society led to its survival following the power transition happened in the country. Thus, there was no need for the new state to neither destroy it, nor imposed new meanings to it, since this monument brought its own meaning and representation while passing through the revolution. In the post-revolutionary period, this monument was neglected and the anti-Shah slogans written on its body remained intact for several years, but it was not torn down. The only shift was its name that appropriately changed from Shahyad (translated as: King’s memorial) to Azadi (translated as: freedom). At present, it becomes the monument of freedom and apparently did not have any association with the Pahlavi monarchy, of course, until one asks freedom from whom, from what.

\[222\] At present, within the urban space of Tehran, the Enghelab Street (translated as the Revolution Street) ends in the Azadi Square (translated as the Freedom Square), although all revolutions could not result in freedom.
Fig. 4. 67: Shahyad Monument and military forces surrounded it on 17 November 1978. Iranian soldiers guard the route of a military parade near Shahyad Monument during 57th anniversary of the Armed Forces.
Source: https://apimagesblog.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 December 2017, at 14:40)

Fig. 4. 68: A Cobra helicopter flying at low altitude by the Shahyad Monument, 1970s.
This is an interesting photograph, taken by another pilot in the air.
Source: http://www.fouman.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 December 2017, at 16:10)
Fig. 4. 69: After Mohammad Reza Shah’s departure, over a million protestors of the state assembled around the Shahyad Monument in the Shahyad Square on 19 January 1979.
Source: http://www.bbc.com/ (Last retrieved on 21 December 2017, at 19:05)

Fig. 4. 70: Men were climbing Shahyad, while others were writing anti-Shah slogans on the body of this monument as they appropriated the square.
Source: Hossein Amanat’s (the architect of the Shahyad Monument) interview with BBC World Service, March 2011.
During the years of turmoil, 1978 and 1979, the Shahreza Street toward the Shahyad Square was major site of urban uprisings. Manifestation of the urban discontent along the Shahreza Street that acted as an edge segregating rich north and poor south within the urban space of Tehran and under the grand arch of the Shahyad Monument that was extensively used by the state as the spatial manifestation of the White Revolution and developments and progress that came along with it, shows that spaces that have been fashioned as outcomes of dominant power structure, in turn, can be refashioned as main sites of urban revolts against the very domination and oppression.

At the Shahyad Square and around the Shahyad Monument, delivery of social justice, redistributing wealth, transferring power from the rich to the poor, decreasing soaring cost of living, bringing a solution to the housing shortage and the sprawling slums, stopping growing gap between the rich and the poor, and equally distributing collective means of consumption, namely, water plumbing system, adequate
sanitation, electricity, roads, hospitals and schools were major raised promises of the 1979 Revolution to the crowds of dispossessed masses. These promises were made under the grand arch of Shahyad, the monument that was served as an emblem of Iran’s rapid progress and developments following the White Revolution; however, since the lower social classes could not benefit the advantages of the development process occurred in the country, the poor’s alienation in terms of what the process of development is about manifested itself at the spatial level as an urban uprising. The White Revolution could be genuinely revolutionary in character, if it manifested its effects on improving everyday life of all segments of the society instead of subjecting daily life of the most vulnerable class to more socio-spatial constraints, to stark inequalities and to an intensely class-based society.

Therefore, following the White Revolution, the state’s showcase development projects implemented across the urban space of Tehran that neglected the lower social classes as the fabric of the society and their primary needs, perpetuated hegemonic pattern of uneven capitalist development and, actually, the very produced and reproduced unevenness, in effect, played a significant role in triggering the anti-state demonstrations that led to the 1979 Revolution. That is to say, the urban space of Tehran that embodied growing ‘unevenness’ along the north-south axis turned to be the arena for displaying deprived masses’ discontent with the very uneven pattern of development. The unrest exploded in the 1979 Revolution that first took place in Tehran as the city, which was dangerously divided between the rich and the poor best proved Lefebvre’s argument that while the urban space can be the site and means helping the survival of capitalism, the very urban space has the potential to form revolutionary struggle against the dominant structure.223

The developments and reforms that brought about by the White Revolution of 1963 were devised for the purpose of being visible symbols of improvement and making profit for specific interest groups. Consequently, uneven pattern of capitalist development was produced and solidified in the urban space of Tehran as long as the state was intent on creating not real but pseudo developments. This unevenness was not the promise of development that the 1963 White Revolution heralded and hence

the state’s launched White Revolution not only could forestall, rather stimulated the 1979 Revolution. The state’s constructed modern image of the country while benefiting small powerful segment of the society, on the other hand, this very image could lead to unification of underprivileged population and stimulate urban uprisings with revolutionary potential. The urban discontentment with the quality of urban life and alienation of the urban poor from the development process that manifested as an urban uprising, indeed, triggered the 1979 Revolution. Thus, impoverished southern neighborhoods of the capital and surrounding slums were of first sites out of which first sparks of the 1979 Revolution ignited.

During the revolution, discontented masses collectively mobilized against the power structure through dominating the urban space of Tehran. What this affirms, of course, is that as urban space is produced by dominant relations and functions as best means for capital accumulation, the very urban space can turn into a site for struggle against the structure of capital and class power. Among various urban locations, certain ones due to their special characteristics become more conducive to urban uprisings. In this regard, Shahreza Avenue and Shahyad Square as key urban sites that mainly accommodated uprisings of the large masses were analyzed. In-depth and critical analysis of the significances of these two sites showed that why they were employed as major arena for mass demonstrations during the unrest before the 1979 Revolution.

Both Shahreza Avenue and Shahyad Square were of important sites for the state, then, presence of state forces protecting them on the one hand and mass of demonstrators attempting to appropriate them on the other became common practices of days of unrest in 1979. Particularly, examining archival documents and state media of the respective time period revealed the Shahyad Monument (located at the center of the Shahyad Square) was employed to represent the state’s envisaged modern Iran and, in fact, to represent the success of the ruling power in making the country a modern, developed and industrialized one. Thus, the Shahyad Monument was supposed to serve as the manifestation of Iran’s development brought about by Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi’s launched White Revolution. The state’s projection of this monument’s image and representation upon the public at large, signifies its
tendency in making Shahyad as a new modern image for the whole country.

Excepting foreign tourists that arrived in Tehran via the Mehrabad Airport seeing the Shahyad Monument as the first sight of the city, for labourers who commuted from their impoverished southern neighborhoods to the factories and those who were unemployed waiting at the square, for middle-income families resided in the nearby areas, and for politically active students of the Tehran University, the Shahyad Monument that they everyday saw, was not a manifestation of the modern Iran; but manifestation of the imposed state power. The Shahyad Square, for the above mentioned segment of the society was a site of gathering, of unifying, of struggling and of proclaiming their power and hope of change. The appropriation of the Shahyad Square by large crowds of demonstrators on the eve of the 1979 Revolution turned this important site served for the state’s interest into one of the main sites of displaying urban discontent against the state. From this it follows as Lefebvre argues that representations will be produced and spread by the state via the media of particular urban spaces; but the same representations could be attacked and destroyed by the urban practice of urban dwellers in the same urban sites.224

Ultimately, it can be stated that urban process, urban experience and quality of urban life under capitalism through constructing structures of disadvantages and deprivations, together with structures of advantages and exploitation bring about likewise its own overthrowing condition. Then, that is to say, the radical openness of urban future is a possibility contingent upon urban uprisings from below, since dominant practices from above, of course, will be in a way to sustain the existing whole system and its associated structures of capital, advantage and power. It was first in the urban space of Tehran (mainly Shahreza Avenue and Shahyad Square) that large mass of the population, discontent with urban experience of modernization processes fought out in the 1979 Revolution. It was also from the poor southern neighborhoods and surrounding slums and shantytowns of the city that the revolutionary movement first arose to topple the monarchy.

The late 1970s was a revolutionary period in a condition of stark socio-spatial disparities between the rich north and poor south of the city. Following the White Revolution of 1963, Tehran transformed into a city where rural uprooted migrants and low-income city dwellers as victims of modernization processes and development programs under command of capital were struggling to survive on the urban margins. This underprivileged population was diverse in terms of ethnicity, race, gender and so on, however their attempt to find personal solution in order to survive amid concrete realities of worsening urban life helped them to construct needed solidarity. Actually, their living place and everyday practices of marginalization associated with it were of great import for forming a strong bond between them. This is the class consciousness and daily life experiences that took priority over ethnicity, race and the like in bonding underprivileged population together regarding the urban poor living in Tehran of the 1960s and 1970s. When this necessary source to form a collective self-organization coupled with consciousness of the collective ‘rights to the city’ as residents, converted into an urban movement with revolutionary potential in turmoil years of 1978 and 1979.

Accordingly, the Iranian Revolution of 1979 could be taken into account as an existed example in the modern history that collective mobilization of discontented masses against the hegemonic form of capital and state power was emerged out of the very dominant setting and challenged its domination. The uneven urban development of Tehran that widened socio-spatial gap between the urban rich and the urban poor was an urban crisis engulfed the city. This serious crisis could not be ameliorated and reached to a dangerous level in the late 1970s. The capital city, Tehran, which endured stark socio-spatial disparities, was the very first city that turned into a scene for mass demonstrations demanding a change to the existing situation. It was not out of wealthy urban enclaves of northern Tehran, but it was impoverished southern neighborhoods that this demand for change rose out from them. Hence, it can be said that more than consciousness of socialism and its ideals, this is deteriorating quality of urban life produce by the urban process under capitalism and experience by the urban poor, that provokes movements to imagine and to create alternative urban spaces, in which man will experience more humane, democratic and egalitarian urban life.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. OVERALL ASSESSMENTS

This study aimed to critically analyze impacts of modernization on low-income groups, focusing on its role as generating and exacerbating socio-spatial gap. The discussions contextualized in Tehran, as the capital that underwent major socio-spatial transformations ensuing modernization scheme was put into effect and as the city that was dangerously divided between the rich and the poor along north-south urban axis. The highly bipolar urban fabric of Tehran (north-south dualism) presented an ideal opportunity for analyzing uneven urban development stretched along this north-south axis of segregation. The study proceeded in a manner to explore the way spatial forms and social processes continuously interacted with each other since spatial shapes social just as much as social shapes spatial. In this light, throughout the study, discussions have been developed to examine the way that urban space of Tehran has been transformed due to the social processes that occur in the city—that is to say, examining the spatial forms that the city takes on owing to the social structure in which it exists.

The impacts of modernization on the low-income residents of Tehran as bolstering socio-spatial segregation were examined within a specific time period that starts with the White Revolution, in 1963, until the Iranian Revolution in 1979. The role of reform package presented by the White Revolution as a step toward modernization of the country in producing urban crisis and paving the way for the 1979 Revolution is to be underlined. Accordingly, the White Revolution and its reform package, particularly land reform policies, as an important factor in transforming socio-spatial organization of the city following capitalist development patterns and emergence of a
poor urban social class is defined as the starting point of the study. The end point of the defined time period is 1979 as the year that despite the state’s launched White Revolution from above to forestall any further unrest, the revolution from below by discontented masses occurred. Within this context of socio-spatial dialectic, a special concern of this study was to reveal the impact of dominant social relations on producing, reproducing and reconfiguring the urban space served for the interests of dominant power regardless of the lower social classes and their essential needs on the one hand and the potential of the produced spatial structures of advantages, power and capital to stimulate an urban-based movement challenging the very process of domination on the other.

During the introduction chapter, the aim was to provide insight on the main concern of the study, essential theoretical framework drawing on which discussions will be built, and the structure that the study will proceed following it. Although major theoretical arguments as the backbone of the study have been discussed in the introduction chapter, the socio-spatial analysis of Tehran has been accompanied by discussions on the defined basis of the theoretical framework. That is to say, the study moved forward with locating findings of Tehran within the theoretical discussions throughout all chapters that led to have a robust base supporting discussed issues and to help contextualizing theoretical issues in the concrete everyday life.

Following the introduction part, there comes the chapter regarding the White Revolution of 1963 with specific concern on the role of this state launched revolution and its reforms in transforming socio-spatial organization of the capital. It has been attempted to explicate spatial reconfiguring that Tehran underwent ensuing the White Revolution was in perfect concert with the shifts happened in the socio-political and economic structure of the society. Rather than other dimensions of the White Revolution, which are beyond the scope of this study, the concentration was on this revolution as a step toward modernizing the country that accelerated urbanization and brought about a novel phase of urban development particularly confined to the capital city, Tehran.
The implementation of land reform policies as the centerpiece of the state’s reform package toward modernization and its role in transforming socio-spatial organization of Tehran provided an image of the city in the post-land reform period. Examining the large-scale urbanization projects that were proposed and to some extent realized in Tehran during this period revealed the modern capital that Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi (as the ruling power) was envisaged and the development pattern that he followed in order to reach his future modern city. Discussions on proposals of mega-scale urbanization projects of Tehran existed in archival documents of this time period signified the state’s tendency to pursue capitalist urban development patterns.

As a requisite imposed from the state, Iranian architects had to collaborate with international corporations (especially American firms) in all urban development projects executed from the mid 1960s until the late 1970s; this in turn, could demonstrate how the state was intent on modernizing the country in the image of the west (particularly the United States as the leading power of the world capitalist economy likewise as the foreign country that had highest share of investment in Iran), then, has been studied with references to some of these very projects. Through analyzing these urbanization projects, architecture and urban planning practices compatible with capitalist cities existed at the heart of the development projects planned, designed and implemented for the capital during this time period, were revealed. Architecture journals published within this period and reports written by the international firms directed the projects were used to examine proposals, designs and plans properly, which helped to draw an overall image of the modern capital that the state envisaged. Generally, the stress of this part of the study was about to demonstrate Mohammad Reza Shah’s tendency to modernize the country in the image of the West and in particular the United States and its impacts on urban space of the capital.

It is important to analyze urban transformations of Tehran in the post-White Revolution era since large-scale urbanization projects that were implemented (whether fully or partially) during this period shaped further spatial organization of the city and produced an urban crisis by forming a sharply bipolar division of rich north and poor south across the urban space of Tehran. The uneven urban
development as an inherent tendency of capitalist urban development and its produced systematic unevenness across the urban space of Tehran in the aftermath of the White Revolution has been underlined with its role in paving the way for the 1979 Revolution.

Within the chapter following the White Revolution, main focus was on the analysis of uneven urban development of Tehran, in examining the way that the state under modernization programs utilized urban planning, programs and policies to intensify class-determined fragmentation of the urban space. The uneven urban development of Tehran, the housing problem of the urban poor and the state’s solution for it as well as fetishism of towers and high-rise apartments among the urban rich, have been analyzed to shed light on widening socio-spatial gap among different social classes in the society. The state’s main objective to construct a modern image for the capital, instead of real improvements, has been discussed with references to some state-run showcase development projects as helping to explain why standards of living of lower social classes not bettered but worsened after implementation of development plans.

Different experiences of urbanism by different income groups are provided to better understand that within a mode of urbanization shaped by market economy, the experience of urbanism will be dictated by the market ideologies as well. In this context, the urban experience of modernization programs that were not the same for the urban rich and the urban poor is discussed under westoxification—complete fascination of the Iranian upper class with western culture. The state’s attempt in promoting a lifestyle accords with western culture and values as a part of modernization programs of the country and absorption of this alien culture by the Iranian upper classes (as they could afford living in that way) since, in turn, contributed to sharpen the gap between the urban rich and the poor has been studied.

Overall, the main theme of discussions in this chapter aimed to demonstrate the rapidly growing socio-spatial disparities between the high- and low-income groups in the Iranian society following the modernization programs came along with the White Revolution of 1963. This ever-widening socio-spatial dichotomy between the urban
poor and the urban rich led to the emergence of crowds of discontented masses who became one important source of urban uprising stimulated the 1979 Revolution.

The 1979 Revolution with the main theme of, ever-growing socio-spatial gap among different social classes as one major motive behind it has been discussed. The myth of the reforms and development programs at the core of the White Revolution that produced and solidified hegemonic pattern of uneven capitalist development across the urban space of the capital, excepting a very small segment of the society, wealthy elite, alienated the lower social classes from the development process. The urban discontent and alienation of the deprived and exploited masses expressed as an urban revolt triggered the first sparks of the 1979 Revolution. Then, the urban space of Tehran that embodied rapidly growing unevenness turned to be the first and most important site struggling against the very processes of domination and alienation.

Discussions on the role of urban poor as actively participated in the 1979 Revolution, their demands of which decent housing was came into prominence, and promises of the revolution to fulfill, together invalidated the mostly accepted notion that the urban poor are engaged with their daily survival that cannot be politically active. The loss of any sense of collective rights to the city and instead growing individualized rights of private property and capital accumulation via urban development were ensured that only the rich areas of the northern Tehran will grow richer and the rest of the city will plunge deeper into the poverty. In this context, stretch of inequality across the city could be changed unless by those who experience everyday exclusion. Appropriation of the city by large crowds of demonstrators during the 1979 Revolution transformed urban space into a public sphere of active democratic participation within which the right to equal life chances for all social classes with different economic status, to basic material supports, to inclusion, and to difference were loudly demanded.

Hence, it can be stated that uneven urban organization of Tehran that was fashioned by capitalist urban development fashioned an urban revolt against the very produced unevenness. The Shahreza Avenue and Shahyad Square as the main arenas of displaying collective urban discontent of the masses were analyzed at this part of the
study. Examination of the significances of the Shahreza axis toward the Shahyad Square with the Shahyad Monument at its center, revealed how and why they accommodated mass demonstrations during the days of unrest in 1979. Visual materials that have been used throughout this chapter assisted with representing the way these key urban sites were appropriated, manipulated, and regained by large crowds of dispossessed masses. Particularly, discussing the Shahyad Monument through archival documents and state media of that time provided an opportunity to reveal this monument’s significance directly for the ruling power. The study emphasized on the state’s projection of the Shahyad’s image and representations upon the society by different means, namely newspapers, advertisements, stamps, and the like, which demonstrated the ruling power’s attempt in employing it to produce a new national image not only for the capital but for the whole country. It can be said that the Shahyad Monument was aimed to serve as the manifestation of Iran’s development and progress brought about by Mohammad Reza shah Pahlavi’s launched White Revolution.

The outbreak of the 1979 Revolution and appropriation of Shahyad as one of the main arenas for expressing urban discontent of large crowds of masses suggests that there was a conflict between the state’s representations of this monument and understanding of the society of it; the White Revolution was not successful and the development that came along with it was not tangible for all social classes. It was under the grand arch of the Shahyad Monument that objectives, which were failed to deliver by the White Revolution, became promises of the 1979 Revolution. The representations of Shahyad in archival documents were examined to further disclose the importance of this monument for the state as a spatial manifestation of progress the country achieved under Mohammad Reza Shah’s rule to the world as well as to the future generations, and as a new birth certificate for the modern Iran. However, this monument as a seat of the state power that was supposed to serve the state, became an arena mobilizing protestors against the state and, actually, through its played urban role during the revolutionary period it connected more with the nation and constituted a significant part of the history of this country.
Discussing Shahyad’s representation for the state, the way it was projected to the public and its different urban function that sheltered mass anti-state demonstrations in the revolution led to comprehend that residents can carve out their own space of the urban space that is constructed in accord with dominant ideology. Throughout this study, in analyzing growing disparities between the haves and the have-nots and marginality of the underprivileged group within the rapidly urbanized space of Tehran, the role of modernization processes and development programs directed by the logic of the capital and the state in sustaining socio-spatial structures of class power is stressed. As exclusion of the lower social classes from the society finds spatial manifestation, resisting against this exclusionary process and replacing it with inclusionary one also occur through the space. Therefore, it can be derived that urban space should not be considered as the setting within which different processes just unfold, rather it is context, cause and outcome for social processes; if the urban space has been imagined in its existing structure that is set to perpetuate exclusionary processes, it can be reimagined as more inclusive.

5.2. EQUILIBRATING PROCESSES AND DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

The socio-spatial dialectic that spatial shapes social as much as social shapes spatial is not ignorable in the context of this study. Social exclusion and likewise inclusion, both find manifestations at the spatial levels. Indeed, Wilson argues that social isolation should be taken into account as a characteristic feature of the urban environment of the poor urban dwellers. 225 "The multidimensional phenomenon of social exclusion finds spatial manifestation, in its acute forms, in deprived inner or peripheral urban areas." 226 In the urban space of Tehran, the spatialization of social exclusion was stretched along the north-south axis. As it has been claimed throughout the study, the growing dichotomy between the city’s two poles, north and south, was the hallmark of modernization programs and its stimulated market-led urbanism. There even existed an urban axis of segregation between the north and the south of Tehran, the Shahreza Street, which was full of certain qualities that have been examined in detail. The stark socio-spatial gap between the rich north and the

poor south that was manifested across the urban space of Tehran, actually, signified that most forms of social exclusionary processes are, in turn, socio-spatial processes. Hence, considering socio-spatial dialectic allows for grounding social justice in spatial dimensions and subsequently for creating a more inclusive city to be able to integrate urban poor into the society.

Through critical analysis of impacts of modernization programs on the low-income residents of Tehran, focusing on its role as intensifying socio-spatial gap in this study, it has been stated that social justice/injustice should be considered at the spatial level, in other words, as socio-spatial justice/injustice. Then, drawing on this socio-spatial justice/injustice, questions such as urban development for what, for whom and urban relocations where and why could be raised. There should be a move beyond visible injustice outcomes across the urban space to the processes produce it as well as not thinking about just outcomes but just processes. It is a bigger challenge, since if there is not any understanding of how the active processes work, so how one can contest it.

As injustice mostly manifests through space it could be resolvable merely in a practical way through the very space. In step with this notion, Merrifield gives a central role to urban dwellers in order to make a more just urban space. He clearly asserts that urban dwellers should wrestle for negative dialectics of their city if they want to achieve a more democratically positive urban space.²²⁷ Spaces as the Shahreza Avenue and Shahyad Square that have been studied with reference to their role as main arenas mobilizing mass demonstrations against the state during the 1979 Revolution are connected to the society and kept alive via practical struggle of urban dwellers. “This is how ordinary people might socialize urban space,” says Merrifield, “might transform it into an arena where use values predominate.”²²⁸ According to Merrifield, reconstruction of all existing dominant relations in order to return to use-value can bring about its own utopias. “The production of socialist space, means the end of private property and the state’s political domination of space, which implies the passage from domination to appropriation and the primacy of use over

In this perspective, abolishing private property means there will not be any exploiting, thus, private housing will be superseded by social housing and predomination of use-value through diminishing locational discriminations will lead to growth of both ends of socio-spatial structure. This radical reorganization entails a radical consciousness and a collective way of urban (since it is supposed to be a solution to an urban crisis) expression of the quest for socio-spatial justice.

The idea of social housing if being materialized in the form of constructing mixed-income housing will be more efficient. Instead of building low-income housing that because it is for the poor, most of the time is constructed in a poor quality, constructing mixed-income housing will be a better solution. Throughout the study, some examples of low-cost mass housing constructed in the form of neighborhood for the low-income residents in Tehran have been examined that provided information on the poor quality, locational disadvantage, and other problems led to the reluctance of the low-income groups to live there. These low-income mass housings were overwhelmingly concentrated in the remote locations to the southward of Tehran as the poorest part of the city. Consequently, constructing low-income public housing in the impoverished neighborhoods turned them into centers of concentrated poverty. Then, it could be argued that state-run public housing projects were de facto an authorized institution that segregated families based on their social class, resulting in concentration of low-income groups in south of the city.

As discussed by building on Wilson’s arguments, in the neighborhoods concentrated with impoverished families, the lack of buffer impact renders problems even more serious and increases isolation of these neighborhoods. Neighborhoods of concentrated poverty are more vulnerable to the changes come along with urban development programs, for instance, poor neighborhoods often could be razed in order to build a shopping mall regardless of those living there. Therefore, impoverished neighborhoods with less diversified families as being more weak, more isolated and more vulnerable, reinforce the marginal position of their residents. The
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conceptions of equity and diversity might seem at the first sight as contradictory to each other but in fact they are in a continuous interaction. The neighborhood’s diversity of middle- and low-income families absorb crises and diminish locational advantages, rising property price and class-monopoly rent that act as socio-spatial barriers and, so could bring about more even development. Housing developments that provide units for low-income families in neighborhoods that do not welcome poor living there through breaking the blocking that has been done by the state’s planning strategy can make a more inclusive city.\textsuperscript{231}

Moreover, since socio-spatial segregation reinforces cultural and ideological differences, breaking the socio-spatial segregation down will prevent employing ideology to naturalize inequality in distribution of public facilities and infrastructures. To cite an example, the distribution pattern of mosques in Tehran of the mid 1960s is interesting. While there is a very dense concentration of mosques in the southern areas of Tehran, the number of mosques decreases highly as moving toward the north and instead concentration of modern institutions such as kindergartens, universities and advanced colleges can be noticed. Considering the high proportion of families with more children that were living in the southern neighborhoods of the city indicates that number of school-age children is far higher than the very number in the northern areas, which necessitates higher concentration of educational institutions in the south and not the north.

Shortcomings in the equally distribution of collective means of consumption can be observed in other basic services, namely, health centers, open spaces for recreation, sanitation, garbage-collection, sewage disposal and the like, endure by impoverished families living in poor neighborhoods. The refusal of the government to provide the most basic infrastructure to the high-poverty neighborhoods indicates the lack of the poor urban dwellers’ ‘right to the city’. This unequal allocation and access to public facilities is spatial injustice experience by families reside in impoverished neighborhoods. To be able to ask questions of achieving socio-spatial justice, first just mechanisms should be devised. It is not possible to expect just outcomes to be attained via unjust means. Regarding just structures, it is worth referring to Rawls’s

\textsuperscript{231} However, it should be mentioned that attempting to improve diversity in neighborhoods should not be accompanied by force relocation of poor people.
argument where he says: “The basic structure is just throughout when the advantages of the more fortunate promote the well-being of the least fortunate. The basic structure is perfectly just when the prospects of the least fortunate are as great as they can be.” 232 If ruling power takes its responsibility for the provision of basic public services justly by preventing concentration of advantages in few urban localities and of the equal access to essential public facilities, it is possible to arrive at having fair share of societal resources for all social classes as a normative criterion.

As it has been discussed throughout the study, capital flows toward the areas with high rate of profit and not areas with concentrated needs. Consequently, formation of disadvantaged neighborhoods with unfulfilled needs can be seen across the urban space. To divert capital flow to the areas that are not profitable is to influence decision-making process. Considering as an example, the housing problem of the urban poor in the southern neighborhoods of Tehran that was deteriorated under urbanization projects of the city. The withdrawal of capital from the southern areas of highly concentrated housing crises and its transfer to the more profitable private high-rise residential buildings, such as Eskan and A.S.P towers in the north of the city were the result of capital flow. Therefore, capital will not flow into the areas that are not profitable to deal with needs and problems unless the government takes responsibility for reversing the capital flow. This intervention can be effectively done only by the government (undoubtedly a socialist government is assumed), because asking private developers and institutions to divert the capital flow away from the profitable areas will not be accomplished but through promising much more rate of profit. “What this suggests is that ‘capitalist means invariably serve their own capitalist, ends’, and that these capitalist ends are not consistent with the objectives of social justice.”233

In a market-led urbanism, concentration of surplus capital should be absorbed in a way that does not threaten the growing imbalance between areas; to have some urban areas to exploit and some to be exploited on which the urbanism is itself founded. Harvey provides a great analysis of this condition as he writes: “Hence the surplus
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product is consumed in socially undesirable ways (conspicuous consumption, conspicuous construction in urban areas, militarism, waste): the market system cannot dispose of the socially won surplus product in socially just ways.” In this regard, to accompany development with social justice (to have a somewhat more egalitarian pattern of the urban growth instead of organizing and maintaining unevenness between different urban areas) is a great challenge in capitalist societies. This implies that “[U]neven development is social inequality blazoned into the geographical landscape, and it is simultaneously the exploitation of that geographical unevenness for certain socially determined ends.” The patterns of domination and exploitation continuously build up through the working of market-led urbanism, maintaining socio-spatial inequalities to prevent any organization aims at fulfilling need and common good are, of course, antagonistic to the principal of socio-spatial justice.

The concentration of low-income families within southern sections of Tehran was discussed as the outcome of functioning of institutions (majorly directed by the state) that aim at formation and maintenance of disequilibrium condition in the city. It is not acceptable that the urban poor should (of necessity) live within sections of the city that they could afford living there. This is exactly what encourages concentric zoning based on economic classes in the city and the result is inevitable formation (and proliferation) of the sort of ghettoization. Preventing this exclusive regulatory of spatial organization and achieving equilibrium in the city, could occur through the state institution by socialized control of urban space and in particular the housing market. However, examining urban planning strategies employed by the state demonstrated that as long as income-based segregation of social groups in the urban space has been a feature of urban development policy, finding a policy capable of rectifying the existing disequilibrium condition would be impossible.

It is obvious that there are limits on what can be done in preventing the growing urban inequality and exclusionary geography, but even examining a deepening inequality in any context at least could lead to ask if the state’s employed policy is
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just and what are its impacts. “Urban segregation is not a frozen status quo,” writes Davis, “but rather a ceaseless social war in which the state intervenes regularly in the name of ‘progress,’ ‘beautification,’ and even ‘social justice for the poor’ to redraw spatial boundaries to the advantage of landowners, foreign investors, elite homeowners, and middle-class commuters.”  

The problem usually is imposing urban planning and designing from above, but if listening to the users and putting their experiences as a base, then proposing, designing and planning being done, urban equality and justice could be taken into consideration. This means minimizing the interventions of the government in organizing urban space as well as regulating property and housing market.

To resolve urban poor housing problem, first approach should be elimination of any sort of ghettoization of residential structures. In this regard, Harvey’s suggestion could be applicable. He offers that, for example, if instead of marginalizing poor urban dwellers into informal settlements on the urban fringes or within particular areas of the city, housing them in old housing exist across the urban space as rent free, this could address the poor housing problem while also integrate them more into the society.

Under such a system, the housing in an urban area should be considered as a social good, which again arrives at the point of abolition of the notion of private property and the primacy of use value over exchange value. Harvey implies this issue where he says: “We have an enormous quantity of social capital locked up in the housing stock, but in a private market system for land and housing, the value of the housing is not always measured in terms of its use as shelter and residence, but in terms of the amount received in market exchange, which may be affected by external factors such as speculation.”

Within a socially controlled housing market system, all old housing in an urban area could become as rent free, and the money that would be paid for the rent could be spent for the maintenance costs. By adopting this approach the gradual decadence of the old core of cities that usually occurs because of inability of the low-income residents to pay for maintenance and service charges (like the gradual deterioration  

---

238 Ibid.
of traditional quarters of Tehran that has been discussed) could also be prevented. It is a situation accomplishes within an assumed socially controlled housing market, otherwise abolition of private property and rent would be impossible under capitalist institutions. Interestingly, Davis finds squatting, for example, as a collective form of resistance of the very poorest groups against property ownership.\(^{239}\) In step with Davis’s definition, informal settlements of the urban poor in low-value and marginal locations majorly in the southern Tehran as a part of both their struggle and personal solution to their homeless condition has been discussed. Moreover, as examined in the study, along with triumph of the Iranian Revolution of 1979, squatter activities were increased. The early chaotic years of the 1979 Revolution provided opportunities for property invasion, squatting and occupying housing units and apartment blocks by tent-settlers of the southern fringes of Tehran. Part of the poor south families were evicted from occupied empty buildings and property, while others resisted and stayed on in the very housing units and land like their properties.

Overall, constructing informal settlements on illegal lands, as an informal activity turned to be a prevalent mode of living for the urban poor in the capital helping them to survive and to assert their ‘right to the city’. Although, they occupied marginal locations on the urban edge and lands that had low value, their action could be taken into account as a sort of struggle against the state’s defined formal structure by encroaching on the laws such as possession of land without paying for it, without title, and of course rent-free. This is exactly what Davis calls it as “a huge unplanned subsidy to the very poor.”\(^{240}\)

However generally growing demand for informal settlements in a certain area leads to creation of a new land market within which the very marginal lands along with construction cost are being sold through those who are exploiters of even the most vulnerable and poorest of the poor population. In this context, squatting becomes a strategy to gain more profit and if it continues in the same way, occupation of unused public land on urban fringes by the urban poor would not be for free. Then, the poorest of this poor population could not even have informal settlements on marginal locations that were previously personal solutions to their homelessness. That is to


\(^{240}\) Ibid.
say, by reaching capitalism and its relative dominant market relations into the even slums and marginal urban locations, the poor squatters will lose formerly have free access to public lands on urban edges of the city as well. Additionally, “[W]ithout formal land titles or home ownership, slum dwellers are forced into quasi-feudal dependencies upon local officials and party bigshots. Disloyalty can mean eviction or even the razing of an entire district.”

There again domination and exploitation could come along with quasi-feudal dependencies of the very poor.

Considering informal settlements of the low-income households as a solution and not the problem could also sometimes allow eschewing to find appropriate approach in order to ameliorate their deteriorating living conditions and so constrains the help to accepting their illegal settlements and merely upgrading their spontaneous dwelling. The cost of upgrading self-built illegal settlements would, certainly, be lower than providing decent housing, likewise, this approach by keeping them on their marginal location helps to maintain the formerly existed spatial segregation. The problems of informal settlements that needed to be overcome are not only confined to physical conditions such as poor quality of housing and lack of adequate public facilities, rather have severe social dimensions as earlier mentioned. These are neighborhoods of concentrated poverty and social isolation. According to Wilson, social isolation of a neighborhood causes deprivation of its residents of both economic and social resources and of cultural learning as well as diminishing presence of appropriate conventional role models that can buffer the negative impacts of neighborhood’s problems, which together hinder betterment of their living environment.

Drawing on his discussions, continuous accumulation of poverty in one specific urban locality increases isolation of that impoverished neighborhood, which in turn, reinforces marginal position of its underprivileged residents.

Upgrading informal settlements and their surrounding site could improve their worsening physical conditions, but does nothing regarding their dwellers’ marginalization, criminalization and exclusion from the society. To deal with both
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physical and social dimensions of the urban poor housing problem, it would be appropriate to make them available more alternatives of units in mixed-income housings of the various parts of city. Moreover, this approach of upgrading informal settlements through enhancing land value could cause increments to rents that will have significant impact on deteriorating living conditions of the most poorest of the urban poor who are tenants. Subsequently, giving some dwellers interest (even low) and the others not, weakens solidarity within their community and hardens forming a collective body struggling for a common goal—the right of possessing decent housing. From this it follows, by considering self-built shantytowns and slums of the urban poor as a solution, the way should not be prepared for reducing the helping strategies to just upgrading the existed structures, which in effect endorses spatial segregation and social differentiation.

Insofar as state is oriented to employ democratic control, so the dominant relations governing housing market could be restructured and urban poor housing problem could be resolved appropriately. If the state committed itself to social housing and addressing socio-spatial marginality of the poor urban dwellers via embracing policies adjusted to promote a more egalitarian spatial organization of capital investments, then it will be revealed that continuing accumulation of poverty in specific urban locations and slum growth are not inevitable future of these urban spaces.

The soaring land value, property speculation and inflation are of dominant forces driving the major segment of the poor more to the margins. Indeed, there are various agencies in the housing market that are involved in determining use and exchange value, among which government institutions’ interference is the most. Harvey’s defined forms of government’s intervention in the housing market are exactly compatible with what has been discussed in the study regarding the state’s operation in the market. “Production of use values through public action (the provision of public housing for example) is a direct form of intervention,” writes Harvey, “Government also imposes and administers a variety of institutional constraints on the operation of the housing market (zoning and land-use planning controls being the
most conspicuous).”  

There, likewise, exist indirect contributions of the government to the use value of housing, considering its main role in fashioning the urban environment. The great contributions of the government in this market indicate that property and housing are complex commodities that majorly depend on the ruling power’s (and specific interest groups with political influence and economic power) operation in the housing market. Hence, in this context, limited choices of the poor make them being more affected by implemented policies and strategies than the rich who possess more choices to escape or resist. That is to say, “[…] the rich can command space whereas the poor are trapped in it.” Then, the poorest groups that have the greatest demand for housing could not afford a decent housing within the formal housing market system.

As long as the capitalist mode of space production continues to work, it is difficult to consider the urban poor housing problem independent of the capitalist market system. Thus, the very first task should be to subject the basis of the society and the mechanisms working within its structure to a deep critical analysis. “It is not merely capital that must be restructured but the political basis of society, in order to produce a genuinely social geography.” In other words, to promote the process of democratization the extant political economy ought to be reconsidered. Since the problem actually lies behind privileging small interest groups with economic power and political influence who can even buy political process and judicial policies to secure their own capitalist common. This critical examination also should not be conceptualized in abstraction; rather, it should be formulated with regard to the existing situation and ongoing actions. Consequently, it is revealing that the capitalist market mechanism contributes to the existing disequilibrium condition in the city and to eliminate its produced outcome is to eliminate the mechanism itself.

The condition of equilibrium is an impossibility under the dominant capitalist relations due to the forces exist at the core of capital that strive to disrupt the foundation of equilibrium (To gain more insight into this issue, Smith’s discussions
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have been used in the study). As discussed throughout the study, this is the working of capitalism that continuously reproduces disequilibrium condition via different means whether urban planning policies or urbanization projects and the like, and this is the lowest social classes that are doomed to experience this situation; unless acknowledging that this exclusive regulatory spatial forms are man-produced so could be restructured. The transformation of ‘an urbanism founded upon the exploitation of the many by the few’—using Harvey’s words—to the more humanizing urbanism entails a revolutionary practice.

The processes that by promoting inequality tend to perpetuate spatial hierarchy of poverty and wealth across the urban space, in turn, could force people (dissatisfied people) to struggle against this domination process and its produced inequality in order to create an alternative urban experience which is less alienated. It can be said that more than understanding of socialism, it is the concrete realities of capitalism experience by peripheralized groups that stimulate socially-driven movements. The processes that led to exploitation and alienation of the urban poor from the development programs of Tehran insofar as it compelled dissatisfied masses to form urban revolt against the state has been analyzed through the study. Regarding urban revolt stemming out of urban discontent, Merrifield argues that this is “[…] the enormous creative power of conflict, of human dissatisfaction, of history progressing through its darker side, of the power of lepers struggling at the city gate.” The process of marginalization of the poor urban dwellers following modernization scheme was put into effect in the capital and considering these masses (majorly rural migrants) deprived from the advantages of the city as playing active role in the 1979 Revolution have been focused during the study.

As examined, the first sparks of the Revolution in 1979 were ignited in the poor neighborhoods of southern Tehran, slums and shantytowns surrounding it. The gulf between the poor and the rich in Tehran was most starkly illustrated through its neighborhoods. It has been examined that the state’s employed planning strategies, urbanization projects, development policies and the like mechanisms solidified spatial exclusivity particularly in the residential areas. The result was formation of
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high-, middle-, and low-income neighborhoods where economic status provided a basis for population segregation. The polarized patterns of capital investment, urban land use, and population congestion signified dominance of the north of the city over its southern end.

Drawing on what has been studied, it is obvious that the government did nothing to bridge the gap between the north and the south, on the contrary, made the northern areas of the city as a showcase of multi-billion dollar mega-projects merely served to be visible symbols of pseudo-development. The northern areas of the city was a part likely to be visited by foreign visitors and concentration of large-scale projects there, would represent the country as developed and progressed under the rule of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi; while accumulated poverty was concealed (and not ameliorated) in the south. According to the examinations that have been done throughout the study, the state determined international firms, specifically American corporations, in charge of planning, designing and directing large-scale urbanization projects and Iranian firms’ role mainly were remained as consultant. The outcome was majorly capitalist urban development patterns of unevenness and segregation.

The body of Tehran was more than ever polarized between the north and the south in the late 1970s. Capital investment was directed toward the already well-endowed northern areas, whereas provision of the very basic facilities to the poor southern parts was neglected. The neighborhoods of highly concentrated poverty in the south of the city were considered as an obstacle to progress of the society (as envisioned by the ruling power) and their poor residents were excluded from the urban culture. Thus, the impoverished southern neighborhoods were the locus of urban crisis engulfed the capital and, indeed, the very first demands for the change stemmed out of them formed an urban social movement that had a revolutionary potential. Since the realities of capitalism mostly adopt spatial dimensions, then attempts to bring an end to its domination and exploitation pattern and process should be also formed on urban space, rise up from neighborhoods, streets and the like. “Capitalism has always been a fundamentally geographical project,” writes Smith, “It may not be too soon to suggest, and I hope not too late, that the revolt against capitalism should itself be
‘planning something geographical’.”

The expression of collective dissatisfaction of those who resided on the urban fringes of the city and were marginally integrated to the society in the outbreak of the revolution has been stressed on the discussions going around the urban basis of the 1979 Revolution. Although the poor urban dwellers living in slums and shantytowns around Tehran were ethnically diverse population, they were successful in constituting a collective class struggle, because they were mainly uprooted, shocked with violence of everyday exclusion of the urban life, and deprived of the advantages of the city rural migrants. “Class could be that cement, that unity in difference, if only the cracks can overlap.”

Then, the urban poor have the needed capacity for collective self-organization. It was not a factory, where their struggle formed and expressed but the very slum that they were living in it was their major urban arena of struggle. “Communities and neighborhoods are key sites,” says Harvey, “within which explorations occur, both in terms of the learning and construction of new imaginaries of social life as well as their tangible realizations through material and social practices.”

The poor urban dwellers’ shared everyday experiences of marginalization bond them together to express their dissatisfaction collectively; to direct it toward a common power that produced (and reproduced) that condition of inequality; to critically recognize this systematic unevenness could be changed; and to employ it to change the existing situation. As Merrifield best describes: “That’s how a social movement takes shape—how could it otherwise? By bonding, by wedding critical thought to practical struggle and action, everyday people—people like you and me—can construct real cities from below, not inherit phony utopias from above.”

Davis notes of Breman’s defined one of the most dangerous crisis of world capitalism that “[A] point of no return is reached when a reserve army waiting to be incorporated into the labour process becomes stigmatized as a permanently redundant mass, an excessive burden that cannot be included now or in the future, in
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economy and society.”

In this context, the city instead of becoming a center for growth has become a ground for over-accumulation of surplus labor force. In the lack of any program for incorporating this surplus labor force, the number of the urban poor experiencing structural deprivations will be increased. As explored via socio-spatial and historical analysis of Tehran, these surplus labor forces reside in slums and impoverished neighborhoods are like volcanoes await to erupt. It should not be surprising that their everyday violence of exclusion made them to reclaim the unfulfilled and suppressed promises of development. According to Davis, proliferation of slums and informal settlements and growing socio-spatial segregation of the rich in their own wealthy communities bring about fractured humanity. For him, this is the question of ‘human solidarity’ as he says: “Indeed, the future of human solidarity depends upon the militant refusal of the new urban poor to accept their terminal marginality within global capitalism.”

The issue of marginalization of the urban poor should be eradicated not only to alleviate the problems come along with it overwhelmingly targeting the impoverished groups, but also in order to create a better society for all social classes. Discussions and arguments that have been presented throughout the study could be used to assist in providing theoretical basis for programs that aim at ameliorating problems produce by continuous accumulation of poverty in neighborhoods of the poor. As examined, socio-spatial segregation of the urban poor is often produced by institutionalized practices and policies. Hence, to eradicate marginalization of the urban poor is to enable them to have socio-spatial mobility, which is contingent upon elimination of the state policies, zoning strategies, development projects and land use patterns designed for restricting poor families’ residence in impoverished segregated neighborhoods.

However, city dwellers those who are aware of their right to the city are real sources for urban change than the state apparatuses. “In some instances and places,” writes Harvey, “loss of confidence in the state apparatus and political parties has resulted in the coalescence of political thinking around ideals of local and people-based action
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as the main means to humanize, ameliorate, transform or in some instances even to revolutionize the qualities of urban life.” Therefore, major concrete socio-spatial changes can be arisen from these people-based urban movements than any state-run reform programs. Like the 1979 Revolution as an urban-based uprising that has been discussed in the last chapter of this study, Harvey argues for the transformative role of communal actions of city dwellers that stimulate urban movements. The form that urban discontent of the masses could take, the urban setting that mainly accommodates manifestation of that uprising and active agents lie behind it are not actually that predictable, as examined with reference to the 1979 Revolution. The large crowds of poor residents of the impoverished southern neighborhoods of Tehran that were disillusioned with government actions to bring a more humanized urbanism, indisputably, played an active role in triggering the revolution in 1979.

The 1979 Revolution was an occasion that the right to the city, to the urban space, and to the experience of more humane consequences of urban life took an expression though collective forms of action dominating urban space (as a setting out of which urban crisis has been arisen). In the context of the cities that undergo large-scale rapid urban transformations under modernization, development or the like programs, the right to the city is, indeed, a right to democratize the urban space as well as to democratize power to produce space. It is a collective right to produce and transform the city against dominant attempts to privatize and monopolize the city and, of course, needs a collective power. It is an inclusive right that could form a unity against exclusive individualized rights, namely the right of private property. Embedded in the right to the city is the concept that appeals to collective democratic ideology, then, it can be interpreted not only as the right to the existing resources and structure of the city; but, as the right to reclaim the city and to rebuild it in a way that produces more viable democracy in urban setting. This is the consciousness of this notion of the right to the city that has the potential to stimulate movements toward socio-spatial justice.

Throughout this study, the role of modernization and capitalist urban development that came along with it in production of the uneven forms of urbanization to
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perpetuate capital accumulation for special interest groups has been highlighted. The reciprocal correlation between capitalism and urbanization has been stressed particularly through discussions contextualized in Tehran. Building on Harvey’s arguments, capitalism is grounded in gaining surplus value that entails producing surplus product and this (producing surplus product) is what stimulates urbanization; on the other hand, urbanization by absorbing surplus product, actually, acts as a solution to capital surplus problem and prevents devaluation crisis. According to this reciprocal correlation, in a capitalist society, growth of capitalism and urbanization go hand in hand. This form of urbanization (as examined in Tehran) has to be decoupled from real development as responding to the inherent tendency of capitalism.

The result of working of capitalist urbanization processes is the continuing accumulation of capital, wealth and advantages as well as poverty and disadvantages in particular urban locations defined through specific interest groups’ decision-making. This way of urbanization turns cities into cities of fragments, of segregated communities based on their economic status, and of highly privatized spaces, which brings with it its own way of urban life—a new lifestyle that is developed upon consumerism in order to help absorb more surpluses. That is to say, within this system, urban space and quality of urban experiences both become like a commodity for who could pay enough for it. Since lower social classes could not afford living in this emerged new way of urban life, this in turn, secularizes the poor, like the urban experience of residents of impoverished southern neighborhoods of Tehran that has been studied. Then, concentration of peripheralized populations alongside this way of urbanization and consumption-oriented society to serve the needs and desires of the wealthy elite could be observed. At this point, asking questions such as development for what and for whom by alienated masses, rise out of disadvantaged urban spaces (neighborhoods, streets, and so forth) has the potential to mobilize an urban uprising. Again this is at this point that upon the existing capitalist uneven urban development, constructing alternative urban spaces that provide more humanized urban life experiences would be a possibility.
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Inasmuch as urbanization under capitalism operates as both producing and absorbing surpluses, the notion of right to the city will be achieved unless via democratization of realization of the surpluses in the urban process. Democratic use of surpluses by urbanization shapes the urban fabric in a way to serve needs and interests of all city dwellers irrespective of their class. However, the problem is always existed in the aforementioned correlation between capitalism and urbanization that dictates the way production and absorption of surpluses should be realized in the urban space. Drawing to this correlation that capitalist urbanization is being stimulated by capitalism meanwhile it sustains reproduction of capitalism, then, seeking alternative urban forms with more humanized impacts for urban life embeds in struggles to find a radical alternative for capitalism. Thus, it can be said that as indeed Lefebvre asserts the revolution should be urban.258

The uneven urban development of Tehran and its produced different income-based qualities of urban living that had a significant role in the 1979 Revolution are visible in critical analysis of modernization processes of the capital in the context of this study. The 1979 Revolution was occurred for it could reach out to the discontented, alienated and frustrated masses—those, whose shared everyday experiences of marginalization caused them to recognize development processes of their city did not contribute to their well-being. The alliance between urban poor as the marginalized group and discontented middle class in rallying against the state succeeded in toppling the monarchy. The fall of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi by the Iranian Revolution on 11 February 1979 was the first step in struggle for the collective right to the city. The 1979 Revolution that has its roots in combating against the exploitation, frustration and alienation of the urban poor from development processes, should open the way for construction of more egalitarian patterns of urban form with more humane urban life experiences for all social classes—because this is one unavoidable obligation for democratization of urban space and urban governance.

Ultimately, this study strived to understand the urban process of Tehran under modernization programs between the White Revolution of 1963 and the Iranian Revolution of 1979, focusing on its effects on growing socio-spatial disparities and the worsening living conditions of the urban poor. This critical analysis of the urban setting of Tehran during the period 1963-1979 as an important stage in constructing history of the modern capital and even whole country could also inspire readers to challenge the present status quo and to invent the future in a different way. Examining disequilibrium condition produced and perpetuated in Tehran particularly during the last years of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi’s reign revealed what constituted the core of state agenda setting. Indeed, the state’s development programs were laden with shared values of specific interest groups at the expense of the underprivileged groups’ basic needs.

Hence in this context, the study highlights the need to shape alternative more egalitarian mode of urban development to the dominant mode of urban development directed by the power of capital and the state. It demonstrates that urban development with inclusive plan that aims at incorporating different income groups, providing public goods for public purposes and improving the qualities of urban commons was lacked in Tehran in its path toward becoming a modern capital. It likewise emphasizes the constructive role of self-organized communities for reproduction of urban life with more socio-spatially just experiences. Since, collective social responsibilities are needed to construct viable democracy in urban space, without which alienation of the urban poor from development process and polarization of the city will be continued. It is hard to imagine constructing an inclusionary, fair and free urban space from above, until oppressed people together struggle for building it from below. For this reason, “[L]andscapes can be deceptive. Sometimes a landscape seems to be less a setting for the life of its inhabitants than a curtain behind which their struggles, achievements, and accidents take place.”

5.3. FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Throughout this study, marginalization of the urban poor within urban space was considered as an outcome of institutionalized practices and policies, questioning the role of state-directed institutions in formation and solidification of socio-spatial disparities. Accordingly, the study aimed to open up discussions specifically on how development projects and policies under modernization programs could worsen living conditions of low-income classes and sharpen socio-spatial segregation. For such a discussion, Tehran presented an ideal opportunity, because as the capital city that modernization programs following the 1963 White Revolution were first implemented there, was transformed into a severely class-determined fragmented city. Furthermore, the urban uprisings led to the 1979 Revolution that first took place in the streets of Tehran provide wider research opportunities to understand how urban discontent of masses could stimulate movements with revolutionary dimension.

Through the critical analysis of impacts of modernization programs of Tehran—following the 1963 White Revolution until the 1979 Revolution—on its low-income residents as one working mechanism produces and reproduces socio-spatial inequality, it has been demonstrated that hegemonic power of capital and the state lay at the core of urbanization processes of the city perpetuated uneven pattern of developments; planning strategies, policies and reforms were acted as means in the hands of the state for the maintenance of the existing socio-spatial segregation particularly in the form of neighborhood privileges; and alienation of the underprivileged population from the promise of development that could stimulate movements to challenge the structure of power, which produced very alienation process.

Within the frames of this research, there are several major issues that set ground for further studies. To begin with, reinforcing ideological differences between population that reside in a defined socio-spatial distance from each other and then employing reinforced ideological differences in order to naturalize extant urban inequalities is the issue that addressed in this study and can open up new discussions
in a more extensive framework. Building on socio-spatial polarization of Tehran along north-south urban axis that has been studied, it can be claimed that reinforced ideological differences between the rich north and poor south were used to legitimatize neighborhood privileges. As traditional beliefs and religious conservatism were predominant among residents of impoverished southern neighborhoods, the wealthy elite of northern Tehran had more liberal view and religious openness.

This ideological division of the rich north and poor south was used as a basis for distribution of collective means of consumption, like dense concentration of mosques in the southern parts and modern institutions, advanced colleges, kindergartens, universities and so forth in the northern parts of the city, for example. Similar instances could be found if examining other public services as well. Therefore, in Tehran of the 1960s and 1970s, employing the ideology of modernity against tradition (and even religion) helped to justify high concentration of modern institutions and facilities in the northern parts and not the southern. Then, ideological differences by masking palpable inequality and injustice deceptively help to legitimate uneven pattern of urban development. The north-south polarization of Tehran in relation to ideological differences solidified in these two poles of the city with their most concrete spatial manifestations can be studied in more detail.

The formation and proliferation of informal settlements on urban fringes of the capital, following the reforms came along with the White Revolution have been examined in the study. These informal settlements’ marginal location on the one hand and highly concentrated disadvantages and poverty within their boundaries on the other, spatially and socially segregated their residents. As production of urban poverty in the context of deepening inequality continued in Tehran, re-segregation of the slum-dwellers into another ghetto communities in the slum areas occurred. That is to say, re-segregation of the poorest and most vulnerable population of the poor slum-dwellers into smaller ghettos emerged out of major ones. To what extent, origin ghettos were involved in formation of new ghettoes that stemmed out of them, what were the impacts of developments of origin ghettos on smaller ones, how formation of new ghettos influenced living conditions of dwellers of major slums and the like
can be the main questions of further studies.

The construction of network of highways and transit routes was a part of modernization programs of the state, which in analyzing the planning proposals and large-scale urbanization projects of the city has been mentioned during the study. The proposed and implemented network of highways in Tehran was in line with the country’s incorporation into the global capitalist economy for facilitating transportation and opening up new markets likewise supported the use of private automobiles promoted by the state. Moreover, it can be said that network of highways implemented in the urban space of Tehran under modernization programs, in turn, exacerbated neighborhoods’ segregation.

As an example, it has been observed in examining the Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s proposals for income-based segregated neighborhoods that major highways and transit routes were planned to surround the wealthy neighborhood. The aim was to facilitate mobility of higher income families as a class that could afford using private automobiles. However, on the other hand the major highways surrounding the neighborhood, actually, functioned as a sort of spatial barrier and intensified fragmentation of the urban space of the city. Since, the Tehran Comprehensive Plan’s proposed transportation network was implemented, it is also responsible for making present-time Tehran as a city of massive highways that some areas are accessible only by automobile and there are no sidewalks at all. In this regard, role of expansion pattern of highways built across the urban space of Tehran in rising neighborhood segregation, displacement of underprivileged communities, and transforming the city into a discontinuous urban space can be the major argument of further studies.

Finally, building on this study’s discussions upon association of modernization with westernization in modernizing the country, and the notion of westoxification as a kind of intoxication of western culture (specifically the United States), produced by the Iranian society itself, the relation between the new established state following the 1979 Revolution and westernization can be the main concern of further studies. Overthrowing of the monarchy under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and
establishment of Islamic republic government, after the triumph of the 1979 Revolution provide a proper research opportunity to discuss relation between Islam and modernization, in particular westernization as well as religion and modernity contextualized in Tehran. The particular position of the new state toward the west especially the United States and the capital that was modernized in the image of the west under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi present an ideal opportunity to comprehend shifting identities of modern Tehran and the impacts of these changes on the living standards of the urban poor (as they were the major victims of that form of modernization). The new state’s interventions in organizing the urban space of Tehran to be compatible with Islamic laws whether through direct actions of demolishing of some existing spaces or indirect form of imposing new limits on urban practices of the citizens, decrease the urban contradictions and different urban experiences associated with them and hence create a more inclusive city or produce new dynamics of socio-spatial exclusion can be extensively studied as future research focus.
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