

NUCLEAR FAMILIES

AND KINSHIP GROUPS IN IRAN

In the course of the last fifty years, there has been a slow, but continuous and decisive, transformation of the Iranian family.

In its traditional form, the Iranian family shows three basic characteristics: a certain inbreeding between relatives, a sense of masculine primacy, and a special attachment to the land where the father was born. The woman enjoys no social, professional or political freedom, while the male, the only breadwinner and the only one entrusted with any responsibility, is considered master after God. To belong to a kinship group, a lineage, represents for him an attachment to a respected, well-defined trunk, which guarantees the life and continuity of the family and grants him a place in society. Among the nomads, as well as in the villages, we see the family as the unit of production and of consumption. At the same time, in the cities, the family is not only the unit of consumption, but in the work of craftsmen (which is flourishing in the urban centers) we still see retained the familial aspect. This rule finds its origins not only in Moslem

Translated by Susan Scott.

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

law and in the post-Islamic history of Iran, but also in the traditions and religions of ancient Persia.

Contact with industrial civilization, the urbanization process, and the transformation of the Iranian way of life (under the influence of the school, mass communications, and the state) are changing the face of things, and we can detect two contrary tendencies: on one hand, the older generations still observe strictly the ancient social and religious customs, and on the other, we see emerging a new generation, believing in different values, and forced by the necessities of economic and social change to create for itself a new life within its own "counter-culture." Thus we begin to discern two patterns of behavior, with a conflict between the adherence to local customs and the adoption of foreign ones.

This article proposes, without addressing itself to the study of the reasons for these changes, which have already been discussed many times over, to describe the means of passage from the old-fashioned to the modern family, emphasizing the various milestones of this evolution. Our task is to demonstrate that in its evolution, the Iranian family has not followed and will not necessarily follow the Western pattern. If, statistically speaking, the majority of Iranian families are nuclear, the relations which tie them to their kin give them a completely different aspect, which we will not find defined in existing vocabularies.

For this study, we have used essentially census reports, sample surveys, rural monographs, etc.,¹ and it is evident that we must proceed cautiously in drawing conclusions and formulating generalizations. We shall limit ourselves here to speaking of the family in the urban and the rural environments. We have avoided discussing the tribal environment, above all because of the complexity of its kinship structure, but also because of the lack of valid data.

* * *

The 1966 census permitted us to obtain some relatively important information on the households and their composition.

¹ The principal surveys whose results have been used in this study are: a) P. Vieille, M. Kotobi, *Origine des ouvriers de Téhéran*, Institute of Social

Even though the terms “household” and “family” differ, in the majority of cases, at any rate, the “household” is made up of members of the same family, that is, of all those who are tied to the head of the family by blood or by marriage.² The fact that in Iran the average number of persons constituting a household is five substantiates our thesis. In the same way, we can perhaps utilize the statistics on households to obtain information on families. The following table shows the different categories of families in rural and urban environments:

<i>Family category</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Country</i>
1. Couples without children	10.73%	10.91
2. Couples with unmarried children	72.80	73.14
3. Couples with married children	1.34	0.83
4. Couples with married children and grandchildren	3.08	5.65
5. Other family forms	12.02	9.11

I. NUCLEAR FAMILIES (Categories 1 and 2 above)

The nuclear families are composed of man and wife, either without children or with unmarried children. This is the most frequent form of family in Iran. In terms of sociological and

Studies and Research, University of Teheran, August 1965, mimeogr. (French text); b) *Étude sur la fécondité et quelques caractéristiques démographiques des femmes mariées dans quatre zones rurales d'Iran*, Institute of Social Studies and Research, University of Teheran, 1968, ronéo (French text); c) The following three surveys conducted under the direction of the author of this article: *Enquête sur la famille et le mariage dans 78 villages de la côte Caspienne*, Department of Popular Traditions of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Teheran, 1970; *Enquête sur la famille et le mariage dans trois centres sociaux de la banlieue de Téhéran*, Superior School of Social Assistance, Teheran, 1970; *Enquête sur les ménages dans la ville de Tabriz*, Moghtader-Andreff Bureau of Engineering Consultants, 1968; d) Monographs of Iranian villages, studies conducted by my students at the University of Teheran, 1959-1969.

² A survey on the fecundity of the women in four rural regions showed the distribution of the members of the households, according to their relationship with the head of the household, to be the following: heads of households 18.3%, spouses 18.5%, sons 29.8%, daughters-in-law 0.6%; children of sons 0.9%, sons-in-law 0.1%, children of daughters 0.2%, other members of the family 5.5%, household workers 0.4%.

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

economic factors, we can determine the different forms of the nuclear family in the cities. The criteria we have adopted are:

a) the occupation of the head of household—included within this criterion are the degree of specialization of the head, his salary, and his affiliation with a social security fund.

b) the method of choice of a mate, that is, whether made with liberty of choice or with the intervention of relatives.

c) the degree of attachment to the kinship group and the social and economic obligations which result.

d) the equality or inequality of rôles of the woman and the man as a function of educational level and the degree of utilization of the means of culture diffusion.

Based on these four criteria, we can distinguish at least three types of nuclear families in the cities:

a) Independent conjugal family, first type: the head of the family belongs to the upper levels of management or practices a profession—liberty in choice of wife—few social obligations—financial independence—husband and wife live on a plane of equality—Western way of life.

b) Independent conjugal family, second type: the family head works in trade or as a craftsman or skilled worker—the choice of wife is handled with the intervention of the family group—social obligations are not very numerous because of the limited dimension of the family group—financial independence—the man retains his superiority over the woman—in general, the family lives in one or two rooms—strong religious faith.

c) Immigrant conjugal family: this category includes essentially those families who have left the country or a small town to establish themselves in a big city. The head of the family works at odd jobs, or if he finds employment as a non-skilled worker, it is usually in construction—the male has absolute superiority—housing is poor and often several families live together.

II. CONJUGAL FAMILIES WITH AN ADDITION (Category 5)

These are the families composed of a principal core, plus direct descendants or members of the immediate family. The 1966 census shows that 605,000 fathers and mothers (89.1% mothers and

10.9% fathers) and 1,392,000 other relatives live within the families of their children or relatives. One can see very much of this type of family in the city because of the breaking apart of the old extended family. In general, the elderly father and mother join the families of their children. As long as there is no social security plan for elderly people, they will have no other solution. The breadwinner of the family is usually provided by the conjugal family, but this does not exclude that other relatives living with them might give some financial assistance.

The immigrant nuclear families might also be enlarged by the presence of relatives who have come from the country or the small towns and are living temporarily in their midst.

III. EXTENDED FAMILIES (Categories 3 and 4 above)

This group includes the principal nuclear family, with direct descendants, embracing as well the conjugal families of one or two sons of the family. Their number is very limited and constitutes around 6% of the total of families. The heads of these families are either old landowners or tradesmen of some importance. They can be found especially in the older sections of the cities or in the provinces. The father has the principal rôle as far as family administration and the education of the children and grandchildren are concerned. The choice of mate for the children is made with his approval as head of the family. The social obligations of this category of family are very numerous. For the most part, the son follows the same occupation as the father, and, in the families of less elevated income, contributes to the family budget. In the families where three generations live side by side, family customs are very strong and the paternal house represents an impregnable fortress.

* * *

One cannot yet observe a very marked evolution in the rural communities. The majority of the families, even though they have the form of the conjugal family as far as statistics and family environment would indicate, are in fact elements which together make up kinship groups.

If we wished to utilize here the four criteria used to charac-

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

terize the urban families, we would not obtain valid results, since the choice of mate is made almost solely by the family and the male retains his indisputable superiority in domestic affairs. The conjugal family is tied socially and economically to the group of relatives, even if, after marriage, because of the lack of possibility of living with the group, it separates itself from them and seems to constitute a small family.

The system of land ownership and the methods of its cultivation are essential factors in the classification of families. Nevertheless, the movements of migration from the country towards the city and from the city to the country (new occupations) create modifications in the family form. We can divide Iranian rural society into two general strata:

1. Individuals who own land (or who, within the ancient system of land ownership, have the right to participate in the annual drawing of lots for land).

2. Those who do not own land (day-laborers, small merchants, new occupations).

We can classify the independent conjugal families in the second category since they do not have groups of relatives within the town in which they live temporarily. Also, since they are far away from their principal kinship group, their social obligations are minimal.

The group of landowners constitutes the majority of the rural population. This includes families which are apparently conjugal, and also at times extended families or several generations living together. (This form of family is found above all in the more well-to-do circles, the rural middle class). But, in the two cases, the families are dominated by the kinship groups and for this reason it is preferable to study the rural families in their larger context.³

* * *

In general, the group dominates the nuclear and the extended family. Even though this fact no longer has the importance it once had (at least in the cities), it still remains one of the social

³ In principle, the number of extended families is more elevated in the country (5.65% in the country compared to 3.08% in the cities). Taking the

realities of today's Iran. Until now no scientific study has been made on this subject, and we shall try, in this article, to bring into focus, on the basis of surveys and a number of rural monographs, certain of the characteristics of these groups, as well as formulate some temporary hypotheses.

In a general manner, we can define the kinship group as an ensemble of lineages united by blood or by marriage, and tied together by social, economic, and sentimental relationships, under the direction of the oldest member, who functions as head. This group has certain customs and traditions which it follows strictly, and a series of obligations and social and financial responsibilities unites all the members. Marriage within the group is one of its principal characteristics. Because of the difference in characteristics, in solidity and in importance between urban and rural kinship groups, we shall discuss the latter separately.

The existence of kinship groups in the villages is a well-established fact. According to a study made on the origin of workers in Teheran, in 93% of the villages examined, the group, *täiefé*, is a recognized social reality. In 83.5% of the cases, the village is divided into several *täiefés* (most often 3). In 34% of the cases, the *täiefé* extends to other villages. In general, however, the *täiefé* do not extend to more than one village, and remain rather limited to one geographical region. In the majority of the villages for which we have monographs, the population is divided into *täiefés* and each *täiefé* lives in its own quarter. Sometimes the *täiefé* takes the name of the quarter of the town in which it lives, and sometimes it gives its own name to the quarter. The *täiefés* can be classified according to their origins, as follows:

—those which have detached themselves from a tribe and established themselves in a village.

—those which have emigrated either voluntarily or by force, for economic, religious, or political reasons.

—those which have spread out naturally, while others have diminished or disappeared altogether as a result of emigration.

From this one could postulate that in the beginning these groups are an assembly of families linked by common character-

rate of urbanisation seen in the different types of household, we find that 40% of these are citydwellers, with the exception of the three-generation families, of which only 25% live in the city versus 75% in the country.

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

istics such as geography, loyalty to a chief, religion, etc. But in the long run, because of the influence of proximity, marriage between the groups ends up creating ties kinship between them.

Each *täiefé* is placed under the direction of a chief who constitutes the most important symbol of its existence. In general, it is the chiefs of the *täiefés* who choose the chief of the village. At times the function of chief of the village is hereditary within the *täiefé*, which represents an advantage for the group members. To be owner of several lots of land, be a descendant of the Prophet or of a religious chief represent equally other advantages.

In terms of economic position, the members of the kinship group are landowners or have the right to participate in the annual lottery of land. As has been brought out earlier, those who do not possess land or who have no fixed point or reference are not part of a *täiefé* in their village of residence. Sometimes the administration of the village has connections with the group and the unit of administration is composed of its members.

The members of the group, under the direction of their chief, collaborate in all business of the *täiefé*. One can observe this spirit of cooperation and unity of mind in the agricultural work, as well as at the time of weddings, circumcisions, funerals, and feasts. The expenses of weddings, circumcisions, and burials are the responsibility of all the group members. The members of one group generally have an established cemetery plot, in which they all are buried. Certain *täiefés* have a particular sub-culture of their own, with customs, beliefs and a dialect peculiarly theirs.

Nevertheless, the expansion of the cities and their industrial development have diminished greatly the importance of such groups and have turned their forms upside down. In the cities they are called large families or "unions of families." In certain cities, one can remark the presence of great *täiefés*. In Amol, a city in the north of Iran, for example (and the same in many other cities), the citizens are divided into fourteen such groups, and the *täiefés* are further divided into subdivisions. These groups live side by side in separate neighborhoods. The majority of the members of each group has a particular occupation. From the economic, social, and also political points of view, (for example, at the time of municipal and general elections), there exists

a very strong concurrence between the groups. Even the youth are conscious of their belonging to a group.

In a survey made in Tabriz, 45% of the heads of household interviewed declared that they had relatives living on the same street. It was also astonishing to find that to the question: "Would you be inclined to change neighborhoods (for a better one)," 65% answered in the negative. This attachment to the neighborhood, tied to the presence of relatives within it, underlines the fact that groups of kin tend to congregate into certain particular neighborhoods. Furthermore, 30% of the workers living in Teheran responded that five or more households of relatives lived in their same neighborhood. According to P.Vieille:⁴ "One could say that the related households are in the first phases of the process of urban assimilation, whether (especially) spread out or gathered all together in one quarter. The next step tends to be to adopt a middle solution consisting of a strong established core in one quarter retaining familial relations with other quarters. The constitution of *taïefés* in the midst of groups located in cities does not appear so much as a memory of the country, but rather it is a tendency of the urban population itself."

The mode of marriage is perhaps even now the most adequate means of studying the reasons that are at the origin of the creation and development of a *taïefé*. Presently, in Iran, marriage ties together two families, two lineages, and not always two individuals. This is why marriage within the group of relatives is still seen frequently in Iranian society. This fact originates firstly in the custom of preferred marriage between first cousins, and secondly in the existence of geographically isolated spots which result in the residences of the future mates being very close together and the groups of kin living in general in the same neighborhood. As far as the persons living in the neighborhood but not part of the group are concerned, sooner or later they too will marry into it.

In Iranian law and customs, inbreeding between cousins and in particular with the daughter of a paternal uncle is recommended and ratified by Islam and by Iranian civil law. At times even, these unions are decided within the family from the earliest

⁴ *Origine des ouvriers de Téhéran*, p. 42.

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

childhood of the two concerned. This fact, moreover, is not limited to Iran, but can be found as well in other Islamic countries such as Turkey and in the Arab countries (Arabia, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and Northern Africa).⁵

Joseph Chelhod has written in this regard: "The most evident and fundamental characteristic of the Arab system of kinship (on which have been justly focused the studies referred to above), is the preferred marriage with the *bint amm*, that is, with the daughter of a paternal uncle. Custom recognizes in effect the right of the brother of the father to the daughter of the latter. This is why there is usually requested from him only a symbolical dowry, which is in fact imposed by Islam."⁶ One sees very little of this type of union in other cultures. Marriage between the children of a sister and brother is rather more frequent, and it carries a feeling of exogamy. The taker, despite the genuine kinship which ties him to the giver, is convinced that he has taken a woman from outside his blood group.

According to a study made by Shakir Salim in a small town in Iraq, marriage with the daughter of a paternal uncle constitutes 38.4% of the marriages. This proportion is 21% for the Arab countries, according to Cuisinier, and 15% for Tunisia, according to Chelhod.⁷ In Iran, several statistical studies have been made on this subject, and we reproduce below two tables summarizing the results:

Percentage of Consanguineous Marriages in Iran

rural districts Survey in 4	in North Villages	Teheran	Teheran suburbs
32.8%	31.5%	25.1%	29.2%

⁵ R. Murphy and L. Kasdan, *The Structure of Parallel Cousin Marriage*, American Anthropologist, Vol. 61, 1959.

F. Barth, *Father's Brother's Daughter Marriage in Kurdistan*, "Southwestern Journal of Anthropology," Vol. X, 1954.

P. Bessaignet, *Le système des mariages chez les Chah-Savan*, Teheran, 1960.

J. Chelhod, *Le mariage avec la cousine parallèle dans le système arabe*, "L'Homme," Vol. X, n. 3-4.

J. Cuisinier, *Endogamie et exogamie dans le mariage arabe*, "L'Homme," Vol. II, n. 2, 1962.

⁶ Chelhod, *op. cit.*, p. 114-115.

⁷ Chelhod, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

*Distribution of the Different Types of Consanguineous Marriages*⁸

Relationship before marriage of wife to husband	Teheran	Torbat (country)
1. Daughter of paternal uncle	25.9%	32.5%
2. Daughter of paternal aunt	10.9	10.3
3. Daughter of another relative of father	9.4	18.7
TOTAL	46.2	61.5
1. Daughter of maternal uncle	21.0	12.5
2. Daughter of maternal aunt	20.1	18.2
3. Daughter of another relative of mother	12.7	7.8
TOTAL	53.8	38.5
FINAL TOTAL	100.0	100.0

From these studies it can be concluded that the proportion of marriages contracted within the maternal family is higher in the city, while in the country it is the alliance within the paternal family which is more predominant. In the two environments, at any rate, marriage with the daughter or son of a paternal uncle is the most frequent consanguineous marriage. If for certain reasons (lack of marriageable prospects within the group, for example), a consanguineous marriage is not possible, geographical isolation results in the men (whether they are from the city or the country) choosing their spouses from among the women of their same neighborhood or from the nearest village. Thus there appear different types of regional endogamy. Statistics comparing the place of residence of the spouses before marriage permit us to draw the following table of percentages:

⁸ H. T. Khizaneh, "A Study on Endogamy and Distances between Places of Birth of Spouses...", Tenth International Seminar on Family Research, Tehran, 1968.

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

	4 districts	Northern Villages	Teheran Suburbs
Within the same village	W. 66.4% M. 82.9	W. 56.4 M. 80.1	W. 4.0
Within the same district	W. 29.0 M. 13.6	W. 20.0 M. 5.1	

The study of the origin of the workers of Teheran shows that in the majority of cases, marriage is contracted within the *taïefé* (51%) or within the village (53%).

Thus, we see that marriage still takes place within the group of relatives, and that it contributes to its survival. Marriages contracted with neighboring groups, which are made on the basis of a political union, contribute to enlarging the dimensions of these groups. With this type of marriage the conditions become more difficult and the heads of the *taïfés* intervene directly, endeavoring to arrange other marriages within the two groups until the exchange is made in the most complete manner possible.

The rôle of the woman within the kinship group is tied to her fertility; this is a problem in which the group shows a particular interest, since its survival depends on it. For this reason an obsession with virginity before marriage makes room for the fear of sterility. The doctors which we encountered in the course of our survey in the suburbs of Teheran declared that couples were often inclined to limit the number of births, but that they did not know how to justify this in the eyes of the family.

* * *

It is evident that the kinship groups can no longer preserve their ancient form, and that a number of factors contribute to weakening them.

a. The most important factor is perhaps migration. The emigration from the country to the city or from one city to another frees to a certain extent the individual from the domination of the group. We say "to a certain extent" because the individual, even after long years of residence in a big city, is incapable of adapting himself to the urban way of life. Since he considers himself a stranger lost in the urban surroundings, he tries to salvage as much as he can his ties with his immediate family or

his village group: he chooses his mate from within the village, he returns home in the case of a long illness, he sends money to his relatives and they send him supplies, he sends his children to the country to introduce them to his *taiefé*, he takes care of his relatives who come to the city and serves as their guide. He tries also to make up for the lack of contacts with his relatives by keeping up relations and establishing friendships with the people from his village or his region who live in the city. He helps them in different ways (finding work for them, lending money, attending to the needs of their women and children) and protects them from the unknown perils of the city. The tea-houses where people meet in some cities and associations of people originating from the same province (whose number is growing in Teheran) both help to maintain these relations. There are in Teheran and in certain other large cities neighborhoods where the residents are for the most part natives of certain determined villages. It should be brought out here that this situation is not confined to those persons newly emigrated to the large cities, but is true also of the persons who have lived there for many years.

b. Another reason for the weakening of the kinship groups is the specialization of the young people in new branches of production and service, as well as their occupational mobility, which in general is tied to a mobility of residence. This occupational mobility is accompanied by an individualization of resources and increases the independence of the newly established families. It allows moreover the possibility of choice of a mate from a larger circle and tends to scatter the places of residence of the group members. We see that in the course of their installation in the city, the persons having a certain income choose their residence in particular quarters. This fact differs from the former situation, where rich and poor lived in the same quarters. In the past, the majority of the members of a kinship group had more or less the same level of income. Today their incomes differ as a function of their occupation and education, and as result they live in different neighborhoods. But, generally speaking, the persons who move away from the group to live in different neighborhoods or different cities retain their ties with the group. At the moment of choosing a mate they ask (even if only symbolically) the authorization of the group or of its

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

head, and they attend every year the weddings, funerals and celebrations of the group. The feeling of isolation of the families who have left the family group or the old neighborhood for a new one is very important in this regard. These persons are in search of new ties. They are not yet accustomed to the isolated life and one senses from them their need of protection. Homesickness for the kinship group results in the creation of a "neighborhood group." This situation exists with the majority of the immigrant families as well as in the major part of the disintegrated urban families.

c. It goes without saying that there are other reasons for the weakening of the kinship group, arising from the fact that it lives within a society in transition, in a society in which the social and cultural system is deteriorating, and in which a new system, based on new economic relationships, is trying to establish itself. Differentiations based on education, profession, and way of life provoke the separation of the group members, who then ally themselves with different associations or secondary groups. New cultural motivations appear, and the younger generations believe in a new system of new values in opposition to the traditional system. These factors taken together contribute to the interior splintering of the group. Sociological writing of recent years has studied the problem sufficiently so that it seems unnecessary to go over it again here.

d. In the villages, the partition of the land, new farming methods, literacy, the spread of radio and cinema (and sometimes television) are important factors of change which, without doubt, will have an effect on the transformation of the kinship groups. But, in the country, we can expect only a restructuring of the forms and not the complete disappearance of the groups. Accordingly, a survey made in a certain number of rural cooperatives has shown that in 15.3% of the cooperatives, 100% of the members were from the same family; this proportion was 75% in 11.5% of the cooperatives, and 50% in 3.47% of the societies.⁹

As opposed to the reasons for the weakening of the group that we have brought out above, we should mention as well the

⁹ According to a study made by M.H. Sarmadi in the villages of the region of Gorgan (in the north of Iran).

causes of its survival and the importance which its members attach to it. In a phase of evolution in which the relations of an individual with society are not yet direct, and in which the new social and political groups (parties, unions, clubs, associations) are not yet solidly established, belonging to a group of relatives helps in the integration of individuals into society. The group is no longer capable of solving the problems of its members but, because of its great unity, it can protect them. By uniting with other groups (stronger and richer) the kinship group can become a real "pressure group" in political and economic affairs. We see often young people from lower class groups who, having obtained a higher education, utilize this advantage to enter by marriage into the more privileged classes.

In a society where face to face relationships have great importance and where a system of social security has not yet been established on solid bases, the group acts to furnish financial assistance, work, etc. Surveys have shown that in emergencies, people appeal first to their relatives. In the same way, it appears from the surveys made in the cities of the provinces that a great number of families live, without paying any rent, in the houses of members of the family group.

The importance of the kinship groups is equally visible in economic affairs and investments. Many commercial and industrial firms are established with the pooled investments of several relatives (brother, nephews, etc.). Prospective investors consider it important to know the directors of the companies to which they propose to entrust their money, and purchase in preference shares in firms directed by their relatives. This fact is very important for the study of the reasons for which the corporation as known in the West is not common and does not progress in the developing countries. The directors of corporations and of small and medium-sized establishments prefer to employ their own relatives, whether it is because they have confidence in them, or because they have been recommended by the kinship group. It is only in certain specializations that this factor loses importance. It is evident that as the firms increase in size, this particularity will disappear.

A similar state of things has been observed in other countries where family values have a primordial importance. We cite here

Nuclear Families and Kinship Groups in Iran

the example of Japan, a country in which, nearly all researchers are convinced, the existence of a kinship system has played an essential rôle in the development of capitalism.

* * *

One can, in consideration of the above, conclude that the nuclear family, in the Western sense of the term and not in the sense of basic cell of the extended family, has taken a place of great importance in the Iran of today, and the kinship group, inasmuch as it is a link between the family and global society, plays a new rôle. At the same time, the fundamental rôle of the group as base element of the different milestones of the economic and social development of numerous countries cannot ever be forgotten.

A comparison of the characteristics of the kinship groups in different cultures would be of great interest; one could compare, for example, the groups in Iran with the traditional Japanese family system, called *ie*, or with the family systems in Islamic countries, etc.¹⁰

The studies made up to now show that in the industrial countries, contrary to what one might think, relatives have a decisive influence on the life of the nuclear families. In the United States, Litwak and Sussman have established in a series of studies that the help received from relatives plays an important rôle in urban life, and that middle class families continue in effect to receive assistance from their relatives on the occasion of a birth or an illness, even if they live hundreds of miles apart. Firth (in England) and Hansans and Schneider (in the United States) have conducted research on the measure in which blood relatives are aware of each other. Some family groups including more than 800 individuals, each one having certain recognized obligations, have been observed in Colorado.¹¹

The evocation of these different questions leads us to think that more profound studies concerning family groups in all the

¹⁰ J. Cuisinier, *Matériaux et hypothèse pour une étude des structures de la parenté en Turquie*, "L'Homme," vol. IV, n. 1, 1964.

P. Bourdieu, *Sociologie de l'Algérie*, P.U.F., 1958.

T. Nakuno, *Etudes récentes sur l'évolution de la famille japonaise*, "Revue internationale des sciences sociales," vol. XIV, n. 3, 1962.

¹¹ J. Moge, *Les progrès des recherches sur la famille*, "Revue Internationale des sciences sociales," vol. XIV, n. 2, p. 441-442.

countries of the world, whether industrial or developing, should be undertaken. These would be of capital importance in the revision of theories concerning the passage from the extended family to the conjugal family, theories which are based on the study of the historical evolution of the Western family and which, despite the efforts made in recent years by sociologists to analyze and complete them, leave yet something to be desired.