IRAN'S FIRST REVOLUTION

Shi'ism and the Constitutional Revolution of 1905–1909

MANGOL BAYAT

IRAN'S FIRST REVOLUTION

Studies in Middle Eastern History

BERNARD LEWIS, ITAMAR RABINOVICH, AND ROGER SAVORY
General Editors

THE TURBAN FOR THE CROWN
The Islamic Revolution in Iran
Said Amir Arjomand

LANGUAGE AND CHANGE IN THE ARAB MIDDLE EAST
The Evolution of Modern Arabic Political Discourse
Ami Ayalon

IRAN'S FIRST REVOLUTION:
Shi'ism and the
Constitutional Revolution of 1905–1909
Mangol Bayat

ISLAMIC REFORM
Politics and Social Change in Late Ottoman Syria
David Dean Commins

KING HUSSEIN AND THE CHALLENGE
OF ARAB RADICALISM
Jordan, 1955–1967
Uriel Dann

EGYPT, ISLAM, AND THE ARABS
The Search for Egyptian Nationhood, 1900–1930
Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski

EAST ENCOUNTERS WEST
France and the Ottoman Empire
in the Eighteenth Century
Fatma Müge Göçek

THE FERTILE CRESCENT, 1800–1914
A Documentary Economic History
Edited by Charles Issawi

ESTRANGED BEDFELLOWS
Britain and France in the Middle East
during the Second World War
Aviel Roshwald

OTHER VOLUMES ARE IN PREPARATION

IRAN'S FIRST REVOLUTION

Shi'ism and the Constitutional Revolution of 1905–1909

MANGOL BAYAT

New York *Oxford*
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1991

Oxford University Press

Oxford New York Toronto
Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi
Petaling Jaya Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo
Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town
Melbourne Auckland

and associated companies in
Berlin Ibadan

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.,
200 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Bayat, Mangol.
Iran's first revolution : Shi'ism and the constitutional revolution of 1905–1909 / Mangol Bayat.
p. cm. (Studies in Middle Eastern history)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-19-506822-X
1. Iran—History—1905–1911. 2. Islam and politics—Iran. I. Title. II. Series: Studies in Middle Eastern history (New York, N.Y.)
DS313.B39 1991 955.05'1—dc20 91-16838

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

In memory of my father

Mohammad Ja'far Bayat

(1900–1986)

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

I began the research for this work, a sequel to my book *Mysticism and Dissent: Socioreligious Thought in Qajar Iran,* in the fall of 1983. I completed the first draft while holding a fellowship at the Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C., in 1984–1985. In May 1985 I presented a summary of my research findings at a colloqiuum organized by the center. I was awarded a generous IREX Developmental Fellowship, which enabled me to devote full time to studying Russian and Turkish languages from January 1986 to June 1987. The hard labor proved immensely rewarding, for I could then work with Soviet sources and thus substantiate my initial arguments on the Transcaucasian connection in the Constitutional Revolution. In the summer of 1988 I completed the last stage of my research at the Cambridge University Library, Cambridge, England.

I would like to convey my great appreciation to the Wilson Center, where I spent a wonderful and most fruitful year in one of the most pleasant and intellectually stimulating scholarly environments I have ever known. My thanks go also to Catherine Babayan, Ramsen Betfarhad, and Nazenin Ansari for their valuable assistance in preparing the first draft. I am indebted to John Emerson and David Partington of Harvard University's Widener Library and to Jill Butterworth of the Cambridge University Library for their help in locating sources. To Ervand Abrahamian and Gene Garthwaite I am forever grateful for steadfast support and friendship. I would also like to express my respect for Nikki Keddie. My work may contradict some of her own (that is in the nature of scholarship), but it also owes a great deal to her initial encouragement and professional advice through the years since I was her student at U.C.L.A.

A last word to the reader. My work has often been labeled controversial, and I have periodically been branded as belonging to one politico-religio-ideological grouping or another, depending on the inclination of the source. I welcome this opportunity to categorically deny adherence to any political group and profess my profound non-belief in, but deep respect for, all faiths.

Bräuningshof, Germany M. B.
February 1991

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

IRAN'S FIRST REVOLUTION

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

The Constitutional Revolution is generally viewed as a nationalist-religious movement led by concerned patriots, lay and clerical, whose political consciousness was aroused by European encroachment in the domestic affairs of Iran. "It was when they became convinced that their country was despised abroad," wrote Edward Granville Browne, the most important Western scholar of Iranian culture at the time, "that their interests were betrayed for a vile price, and that their religion and their independent existence as a nation were alike threatened with destruction, that they began to demand a share in the government of their country."[1] Though Browne described the Constitutionalist "party" as one that stood for progress, freedom, and tolerance, he insisted that nationalism, "Persia for the Persians," was the force that characterized the movement.[2] As late as in 1902, he still doubted the existence of pan-Islamism, which he defined as "a mare's nest discovered by the Vienna correspondent of the *Times,*" and by the time he came to write *The Persian Revolution of 1905–1909,* he was still raising objections to the use and implication of the term, yet he had come to think that there was "amongst the Muslim nations a sense of brotherhood and community of interests" and that the threat of European power had "awakened these states to a sense of their common dangers."[3] By then, the eminent British Orientalist had come across the myth of Jamal al-Din Asadabadi (al-Afghani) created by his Arab and Iranian disciples and admirers, which attributed to him personal virtues and political importance far exceeding reality. Browne spread the myth without checking the accuracy of his sources. He similarly described the events leading to the repeal of the tobacco concession as expressing popular resentment against the shah's government, with the alliance between the "clergy and the people" making the successful denouement possible.

No attempt was made to distinguish between the various types of olama, or the various schools of religious thought, that came to play a role in these events. Browne, one of the very rare scholars who was aware of the nature of the religious controversies and doctrinal disputes that had decisively divided the ranks of the religious institutions in the second half of the nineteenth century, and, more important, who was aware of the true religious identity of some of the main clerical participants in the revolution, went along with this monolithic analysis of the role of Islam and the olama in the politics of the day. He even translated long passages from an article by Rashid Redda, the contemporary Syrian-Egyptian disciple of Jamal al-Din. "Such are true men and such are true ulama! Now the effect of the influence of the clergy is fully manifested in Persia,

in as much as it hath changed the order of government and converted it from despotic to constitutional rule."[4]

Contemporary Western scholars who studied the history of modern Iran have focused on the issue of state–olama relations, stressing their confrontational nature. In an article that rapidly became the standard source for most, if not all, works on the Qajar period, Ann Lambton admitted there were many individual religious leaders who cooperated with the state, but she emphasized the general clerical opposition to plans for the reimposition of the power of the central government.[5] She viewed the feeble, unsuccessful attempts by some officials in the first half of the nineteenth century to reform the judicial system, to control the revenues of charity endowments, and to establish a new school to teach the modern sciences to future civil servants and military officers as evidence of the state's intention to "exert fuller control over the ulama and to limit shar'i jurisdiction."[6] The olama's opposition, she asserted, was aroused by fear of a loss of power and in reaction to the arbitrary and tyrannical power of the government, which was increasing as the government widened its sphere of activities. Russian and English intervention in domestic affairs, she argued, further provoked the olama's hostility to the government and led them to rise in defense of Islam, national independence, and the "Persian way of life." Their opposition, she concluded, "took on a religious and nationalist coloring." As a result of their success in forcing the government to repeal concessions it had granted to foreign firms, the olama "discovered their power," and their attitude "became more aggressive in proportion as their power increased."[8]

Hamid Algar developed, simultaneously, his own argument in an extensive study of the role of the olama in the Qajar period.[9] It is this study that popularized the view of the olama as natural leaders of the nation against domestic tyranny and foreign intervention in the country. Algar narrowed the scope of his investigation of the role of religion in Qajar society and politics down to state–olama relations. He stressed the confrontational attitude of the high-ranking religious leaders and described clerical influence in terms of the Shia doctrine of the Imamate, which regards any government in times of ghaibat, when the Twelfth Imam is in occulation, as illegitimate, conferring the "Prophetic mantle" on the mojtaheds. Selective references to sources allowed him to draw a picture of the religious institution as an independent center of power with considerable revenues, derived mostly from sources outside government jurisdiction. In a subsequent work, Algar pushed his theme further, arguing that "the monarch was theoretically bound, no less than his subjects, to submit to the authoritative guidance of a mujtahid and in effect to make the state the executive branch of the ulama authority."[10] He acknowledged the fact that in practice this was not always the case in the Qajar period, and that "therefore, there was a certain tension inherent in relations between the ulama and the monarchy." The Constitutional Revolution, which the olama originated and led, marked "a climax to a century of friction and conflicts between the state and the ulama."[11]

In her early works, Nikki Keddie's analysis of the role of religion in politics at the turn of the century attributed to the nonorthodox religious elements due credit for their role in the opposition to the state and viewed Anglo-Russian rivalry as a major factor for the outbreak of popular revolts.[12] However, in

"Roots of the Ulama's Power," she emphasized the idea of the illegitimacy of the state and offered a doctrinal and social basis for the olama's power. The olama, she wrote, "could frequently impose their will on a government" that was unpopular and had "little coercive force behind it."[13] She also stated that the religious leaders acted "consistently with the preservation of their own power" when they reacted to the Qajar's early attempts to secularize institutions they traditionally controlled and to foreign intervention and encroachment in national affairs. "The threat of Western conquest or Western inspired secularization is the key to explaining this surprising 'radical' role for a traditional religious class."[14]

More recent studies by Norman Calder[15] and Said Amir Arjomand[16] attempted to demonstrate the accommodationist aspects of olama–state relations in theory and in practice in the pre-Safavid, Safavid, and Qajar periods. Arjomand insisted that neither the Safavids nor the Qajars were denied legitimacy by the olama. Nonetheless, both assessments of the role of the olama in the opposition movements of the late nineteenth century merely echoed Lambton's, Algar's, and Keddie's. Both agreed that by the second half of the nineteenth century, misgovernment and increased foreign influence set the stage for olama opposition to the state. "The Shiʿite hierocracy," wrote Arjomand, "was increasingly alienated from the state and increasingly reliant on the people, by now massively opposed to it."[17] The olama's opposition, wrote Calder, "reflects clerical revulsion against the venality and incompetence of the Qajars, as well as, and even more important, clerical suspicion and distrust of Western influence and secularization."[18]

By now, there seems to be a consensus among scholars that premodern Shia Iran witnessed the gradual emergence of two distinct but interdependent centers of legitimate authority, religious (din) and temporal (daulat). A dual structure of authority was thus consolidated and effectively maintained in the Qajar period.[19] In his study of the genealogical development of the Shia concept of the "just ruler" in the classical juridical sources, Abdulaziz A. Sachedina argued that the jurists, while facing the question of the faqih's (jurist's) claim to political authority, were responding as individuals, and there was "a lack of any definite organization or a strict uniformity of response among them."[20] However, the jurists' administration of justice, he asserted, "became one of the most important institutions in preserving the popular sense of common justice." Although the central power of the rulers had disintegrated, he further added, the administration of justice remained "the only administrative institution committed to preserve the shariʿa as the embodiment of divine justice," and the jurists were regarded as "the protectors of the people against the license or tyranny of those in power."[21]

This view was originally perpetuated by Mohammad Nazem al-Islam Kermani, the author of the most important primary source for the revolution. His *Tarikh-e Bidari-ye Iranian,*[22] considered the standard clerical account, describes in detail the role of the olama, especially Abdollah Behbahani and Mohammad Tabataba'i, the two leading mojtaheds of Tehran, who supported the movement from the start, and the major events that climaxed with the promulgation of the constitution. It provided other contemporary and later historians with heretofore unchallenged data and analysis of the part religion played in the politics of Iran at the turn of the century. However, a careful reading of this voluminous work,

surprisingly, offers a very different perspective, even contradicting some basic assumptions attributed to its author.

The most fundamental assumption, which was accepted without challenge by other writers, is the portrayal of the olama as leaders of the opposition to the state, as initiators of the popular revolts against the shah's policies in the 1880s through the 1900s, rising in defense of Islam and the nation against the tyrannical rule of the Qajars. However, the heroes in the *Tarikh-e Bidari,* despite due credit given to Mirza Hasan Ashtiani, Abdollah Behbahani, and Mohammad Tabataba'i, are not the mojtaheds but members of the lower echelons of the religious hierarchy, mollahs who were charged in their own lifetime with heresy. Jamal al-Din Asadabadi heads the list, followed by Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani and Ahmad Ruhi, though their relation to Azali Babism is not mentioned. Mirza Reza Kermani, Naser al-Din shah's assassin, is glorified and his deed justified; his interrogation by government officials is fully transcribed in the text. Hadi Najmabadi, the mojtahed of Tehran who was declared heretical and prevented from fulfilling his clerical functions in public, is portrayed as an enlightened religious leader devoted to the task of combating despotism in both its temporal and religious forms. Nazem al-Islam's background, as we shall see, matches his protagonists'.

Other late nineteenth-century accounts, mostly Western, such as the British envoy's daily reports to the Foreign Office and the French physician Dr. J. B. Feuvrier's autobiography,[23] which covers the 1890s, depict the olama's role as that of agitators with potential power to stir public opinion. However, it was Nazem al-Islam who, as far as my research goes, was the first to have written in such sweeping terms on the "progressive," "liberal," "nationalist" olama, who, on their own initiative, rose to defend the nation and Islam against the tyranny of the state and the encroachment of foreign powers. Nonetheless, detailed textual analysis of Nazem al-Islam Kermani's account reveals no ideological differences with the secularist accounts. This clerical source, if read with careful attention to details, proves to be as secularist and, more significantly, as "anti-olama." This account sheds great light on the important part played by the religious dissidents, who, while retaining their traditional olama garb and the symbolic turban, covertly worked against the religious leaders and their collective institutional interests. It also displays the effectiveness of the time-honored Shia practice of taqiyya (concealment of one's true beliefs in time of danger for oneself or for the faith) and the wide use, to the point of abuse, of the traditional Moslem intellectuals' esoteric mode of self-expression. In the last analysis, this single clerical source describes the role of the olama in the revolution as one that provided the movement with an aura of religious legitimacy. The olama performed the vital function of nominal leaders, but they were not instigators; they did not constitute the force that finally broke the royalists' resistance to the major legislative reforms.

Of all the groups involved in the Constitutional Revolution, the Azali Babis were the most difficult to identify as such. Historians often noted their contributions to the major events leading to the promulgation of the constitution without studying their ideas, tactics, and ultimate goals. To be sure, standard Persian sources seldom acknowledged the religious affiliation of known Babis who participated in the revolution. Neither Mehdi Malekzada,[24] in his extensive biogra-

phy of Malek al-Motakallemin and account of the revolution, nor Yahya Daulatabadi, in his semiautobiographical account of the revolution,[25] admitted his Azali affiliation. Eqbal Yaghma'i's recent publication on Jamal al-Din Va'ez leaves the latter's background in the dark,[26] as did Mahmud Khalilpur in his introduction to the works of Ahmad Majd al-Islam Kermani.[27] Whereas these works acknowledged their protagonists' large part in the major events, Ahmad Kasravi[28] belittled or plainly overlooked the religious dissidents' contribution. Subsequent Iranian historians followed suit, referring to the most important preachers of the revolution as concerned mainly with the plight of Islam and the Moslems.[29]

In assessing the olama's role in the Constitutional Revolution, historians in the West argued that it was central to the national struggle against the state and the foreign powers. They pointed to the effective coalition of all oppositional forces as evidence of the traditional prevalence of a clerical–intellectual–bazaar alliance in late Qajar politics and of the peculiar brand of Iranian nationalism rallying two normally mutually exclusive forces, religious and nationalist.[30] More recent studies began to question this view of the olama as initiators of the constitutional movement.[31]

The chief problem of the conventional interpretation of the revolution lies in the dating and tracing of the origins of the movement in the last decade or so of the nineteenth century, when a European presence was initially felt, and in the diagnosis of the social and political malaise of the time as a symptomatic reaction to European imperialism. This interpretation overlooks the basic fact that social strife and the challenge to the existing sociopolitical order predate foreign loans and the expansion of foreign trade in the country. It fails to recognize the depth and significance of the popular revolts that exploded prior to those seen in world headlines in the 1890s and early 1900s. Though popular unrest was expressed in a variety of forms and was a response to a multitude of causes, religion and religious institutional issues often lay at the core of the movements of revolt, providing both the target and the justification, the means as well as the ends, the root and the purpose itself. Religious dissent had a long historical tradition in Shia Iran, and the Constitutional Revolution marked its effective climax, giving some of the dissenters a political opportunity to attain cherished social and cultural goals that they, and their predecessors, had failed to achieve through doctrinal reforms.

By the early nineteenth century, when the mojtaheds consolidated their religious authority on the basis of their expertise in the Shia law, any challenge to their views, any divergence from their prescribed norms, was declared heretical. The specter of heresy haunted both the guardians and the detractors of the "right religion," for religious controversies periodically erupted into popular revolts threatening the state and the Shia hierarchy alike. Deviators from the religious norms were mercilessly persecuted; guilt by association was often good enough reason for defamation of character. Hence, in the standard Qajar chronicles, Pahlavi historical annals, and published accounts of Qajar events, some of the most important episodes in and rationales for vital stages in the sociocultural development of premodern Iran are marginalized. Controversial ideas are either dismissed as pure heresy or discussed as esoteric ideas in the literature of Persian

mysticism and diverse schools of philosophical theology, completely out of their sociopolitical context.

"Mainstream" Shiʿism, that is, the views of the jurists, continues to attract a great deal of the attention of those scholars interested in the topic of religion and politics in modern Iran.[32] And yet neither Morteza Ansari, the most respected and most learned mojtahed of the Qajar period, nor any other established jurist left a great religiointellectual imprint on the major events of the turn of the century. It was not their conception of the jurist's authority in society and politics that shook the nation out of its torpor. To concentrate on mainstream Shiʿism and its hierocracy in a discussion of the revolutionary role of religion would be highly misleading. The ideas proposed by the genuinely constitutionalist mojtaheds (very few, indeed), preachers, journalists, anjomans, and majles deputies, which left a lasting legacy to the subsequent development of social institutions, bore the mark of the religious controversies more than that of Shia orthodoxy.

Some concepts survived, although in new forms and adapted to new circumstances. By the early 1900s, one view had become predominant, transcending ideological differences and rallying dissidents both lay and clerical. It conveyed the beliefs that the regulation of human beings' ultimate conditions of existence was no longer the monopoly of the clerical establishment or any religious group. However, its champions could not express their convictions openly. To attain their goals, they had to speak the language of the pious, tradition-bound masses they wished to mobilize. Religion as taught by the orthodox olama was a dominant factor in people's lives. The practice of taqiyya still held the double merit of protecting the "deviators" from persecution as well as maintaining the traditional Moslem intellectuals' elitist attitude toward the masses, deemed incapable of comprehending any language other than popular religion. Furthermore, the dissidents wished to avoid alarming unnecessarily those individuals and social groups who may have espoused their moderate program of reforms but not their extremist views.

In an essay entitled "The Return of the Sacred," Daniel Bell, the Harvard sociologist, attacks social scientists' view of secularization as a "one-way street." Arguing that cultural change arises in a very different way and follows a very different path than changes in social structures, he applies the term secularization to institutional changes leading to the "shrinking of the ecclesiastical authority in the temporal realm,"[33] and he distinguishes this from profanation, which applies to changes in culture. Only by making this distinction, he asserts, can one explain the recurrence at different times of religious beliefs, moods, and revivals. By taking into account these two different patterns of change—in other words, the double process at work, institutional change and change in culture, secularization, and profanation—one can clarify and further understand the sociocultural changes, loosely termed modernization, that occurred in Iran.

Long before I came across Bell's article, while I was attempting to explain the phenomenon of Khomeinism in modernized Iran (haunted by one question: Why in 1978 and not in 1963, or 1953, or 1906?), I had felt the need to understand the pattern of development that historically occurred in Iran, taking into consideration the various stages in the process before and after the adoption of Western ideas and institutions. To speak of modernization before the Western

impact was felt is often judged as anachronistic, paradoxical, even heretical. Indeed, the idea that the roots of modernization reach back to the nineteenth century, the so-called premodern period, does sound outrageously unorthodox, as does the notion of modernization of religion.

The fault lies in the general and simplistic conception of modernism as denoting almost exclusively secularism, that is, the disengagement of church authority from political and social life, which did not begin in Iran before the end of the first decade of the twentieth century and was not effective until the Pahlavis' accession. More importantly, the fault lies, I think, with the traditional cultural norms and modes of self-expression which persistently allowed no distinction to be made between the sacred and the profane, the religious and the temporal. Since education was almost exclusively controlled by the religious leaders, most of the intellectuals who were not in government or court service wore the turban as a sign indicating their learned status. The olama in Islamic Iran did not constitute a uniform, doctrinally cohesive, distinct class. Centuries-long traditions of dissent divided their ranks from within. Periodically the religious establishment was attacked and its teachings were challenged.

I have written elsewhere of the different expressions of revolt against the official socioreligious order in nineteenth-century Iran.[34] I have argued that a continuing adversarial stance originated within the religious institution and was directed against its high-ranking religious leaders, who were specialists on Islamic law and jurisprudence. I have observed that the antimojtahed controversies were eroding the base of clerical authority in society and paving the way for secularization of the social institutions they traditionally controlled. The discovery of the West—its knowledge and its institutions—added weight to the religious dissidents' classical argument against the ayatollahs' social influence and cultural dominance, and it caused a rapprochement between them and the lay reformers and political activists. Both the religious dissidents, who had realized the futility of any attempt at doctrinal reforms (following the bloody persecution of the Babis and the forced retreat of the milder reformist schools of Shia theology), and the lay activists were willing to call for institutional changes to curtail clerical authority in the public domain, without openly acknowledging the need for doctrinal change.

In the present work, I attempt to demythologize and eliminate confusion. I distinguish not only ideologies but also realities, different logics interacting at different phases of the movement, different purposes served by seemingly identical symbols and rhetoric. On the other hand, I avoid class analysis. This approach is best applied by Ervand Abrahamian in his voluminous study of twentieth-century social history.[35] I use the term intelligentsia in its broadest possible sense. In late Qajar Iran, the intelligentsia mainly consisted of members of the ruling elite, essentially with modern educations or at least well acquainted with modern European concepts and practices. But it did not form a class in a Marxian sense, because it also included lay intellectuals and professionals born into a middle- or lower middle-class background. The journalists Dehkhoda, Jahangir Khan, Mohammad Reza Musavat, the Tarbiyyat brothers, to name only some of the better known activists, belonged to the latter category.

My research helped me revise the conventional view of religion and religious

leadership in the politics of Iran at the turn of the century and led me to conclude the following.

(1) Mainstream Shi'ism and the top hierarchy of the religious institutions, despite their highly visible role in the major events, were in fact the least important agents of constitutional change in society.

(2) Three major revolutionary trends were simultaneously at work in the constitutional struggle: Shia radicalism, Western liberalism, and Russian Social Democracy. The Shia radicals are not to be confused with the mojtaheds and other high-ranking olama who lent their support to the movement and are sometimes referred to as "progressive olama." I apply the term "radical Shi'ism" to individual religious dissidents who came to form a group that, despite noticeable disparity in their thought and the fluidity of their relationships with one another and with other groups, shared one ultimate goal, the curtailing of the mojtaheds' influence in Iranian culture and society. Many were formerly Azali Babis, some were freethinkers; others were merely disenchanted with prevailing teachings of the religious traditions and were open to sociocultural change, even willing to adopt the new learning from Europe. Many were philosophically or mystically inclined and therefore belonged to groups that periodically suffered persecution at the hands of the traditional guardians of the holy law. However, neither aimed at instituting doctrinal reforms, imposing their own religious authority, or establishing a new creed. To the contrary, they all retained their Shia identity, wore the symbolic turban and clerical garb, and studied with established mojtaheds whom they outwardly continued to serve.

(3) Modernist concepts and ideas were introduced by the religious dissidents who mobilized the masses, preaching the merits of the movement in mosques and religious schools, wrapping their innovative thought in the traditional language of the Koran and the holy texts. Far from attempting to safeguard Islamic traditions, they called for sociocultural and political changes which, they insisted, constituted a return to true Islam.

(4) The Moslem Social Democratic party of Baku, which founded a branch in Tabriz on the eve of the revolution and in other major Iranian cities later, was successful in recruiting members from among low-ranking olama and the religious dissidents.

(5) Whereas the merchant class, the constitutionalist mojtaheds, and most of the wellborn intelligentsia were aiming at reforms, Iranian Social Democrats and their clerical allies intended to transform radically the social and political structure of Iran. The coalition of the radical Shia and Russian Social Democratic forces determined the sociocultural successes but also, ironically, the political failures of the revolution.

The promulgation of the Iranian Constitution of 1906–1907 marked the triumph of the secularist trends. It ushered in the era of institutional changes and underscored the shrinking of olama authority in society. The process of secularization, however, occurred in Iran unaccompanied by official tolerance of the process of profanation.

1

The State and the Olama in Late Qajar Iran: A Reappraisal

Doctrinal Limitations to the Olama's Authority

Unlike the Sunnis, whose legal practices were based on the concept of ejma (consensus of the community, which was soon defined as the consensus of the olama) and who resorted to analogical reasoning in matters not covered by the Koran or the recorded deeds and sayings of the Prophet, the Imami Shias claimed the Imam's opinion alone is infallible, and thus it constitutes the sole source of the law. In the Imam's absence the Shia jurists sought various legal devices to discover his opinion with certainty before making legal pronouncements. Although this practice of ejtehad (the effort exerted by the mojtahed to determine with certainty the Imam's opinion) was limited in the tenth and eleventh centuries, by the seventeenth century it gained recognition. The mojtaheds' consensus, though theoretically disregarded as a proof in itself (since authority lies not in the person who reveals the Imam's opinion but in the opinion itself) came to be accepted as an evidence of the proof. Consequently, the mojtaheds emerged as powerful exponents of Shia jurisprudence and the legal custodians of the community. Nevertheless, because this office was still denied the quality of infallibility, no single jurist could lay claim to supreme authority within the religious institution. Ekhtelaf, or divergence of opinion in legal matters, was recognized, thus allowing a decentralization of leadership. Similarly, a mojtahed's pronouncement could not be legally binding upon individual followers, should they decide to seek guidance with another mojtahed. The mojtaheds stressed the primacy of the law in religious studies and upheld the classical Shia orthodox view that the gate to knowledge of the divine remained closed for the duration of the Occultation of the Imam, for only the Imam possesses the necessary qualifications for the progressive unveiling of the hidden truths of the Prophetic Revelation.[1]

The religious authority and function of the mojtahed was continually contested from within the ranks of the olama.[2] In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Akhbari school of theology, founded by Shaikh Mohammad Amin Astarabadi (d. 1624), rejected the practice of ejtehad as incompatible with the doctrine of the Imamate. It persisted in viewing the entire community of believers as followers (moqalled) of the Imam's teachings and argued that the Traditions of the Prophet and the Imams provide sufficient guidance for understand-

ing the Shia faith and doctrines. It accused the Osulis (those in favor of the mojtahed's practice) of emulating the Sunnis in accepting the olama's fallible opinion as proof and of basing their legal pronouncements on speculative reasoning and conjecture, which it believed to be identical to the Sunni method of analogical reasoning (qiyas).

When the Akhbaris suffered final defeat at the hands of the Osuli mojtahed Aqa Mohammad Baqer Behbahani and his son Mohammad Ali Behbahani around the turn of the nineteenth century, the struggle was taken over by the Shaikhi school of theology. Its founder, Shaikh Ahmad Ahsai (d. 1826), had not only carried on the anti-ejtehad argument but also had developed a new concept of religious leadership. He scorned the Osulis' "limited" knowledge of jurisprudence and their narrow "legalistic approach" to religious studies. He rejected the mojtaheds' frequent resort to conjecture to find evidence of proof in theological debates. Greatly influenced by Shia philosophy and mysticism, which were periodically declared heretical by the jurists, Ahsai offered the model of the Perfect Shia as the ideal human proof of the Imam, the latter's agent among the believers, and the gate to divine knowledge. Ahsai and his successors, Kazem Rashti (d. 1843) and Mohammad Karim Khan Kermani (d. 1871), proposed a blending of philosophical inquiry and mystical initiation as an alternative method for the understanding of the holy texts and the Imam's teachings. In contrast to the Osulis' conception of collective but decentralized religious authority based on expertise in jurisprudence, the Shaikhis' Perfect Shia stressed the absolute authority of a single spiritual leader as possessor of knowledge of the divine.[3]

Theological disputes came to involve various groups of the olama and their respective disciples in the religious centers of learning in Iran and Iraq. The increasing power of the mojtaheds, whose expertise in jurisprudence and practice of the religious law allowed greater social influence, was bitterly fought by the more philosophically or mystically inclined olama as well as the more reform-minded speculative theologians and intellectuals. Though the dispute was doctrinal in nature, more worldly considerations added to it a social dimension which, influenced by new socioeconomic and political factors during the second half of the nineteenth century, transformed it into a power struggle that further split the ranks of the olama active in politics.

The philosophers, the Sufis, and the Shaikhis could not succeed in gaining social influence beyond their immediate circle of devotees and followers. The Osulis consolidated their hold over society by imposing taqlid (following the religious rulings of a mojtahed) upon all believers, and thus enforcing the primacy of feqh (holy law) in regulating the religious life of the community. Whereas the Shaikhis argued that the best qualified mojtahed is the Perfect Shia, who is the "gate" to the Imam's knowledge and with whom ejtehad becomes permissible, the Osulis insisted that the mojtaheds' opinion based on ejtehad carries weight as proof.[4] Similarly, the Osulis, despite their general policy not to confer supreme authority on any single jurist, developed their own conception of the highest ranking clerical official. The status of marja'e taqlid a'lam (most knowledgeable source of taqlid) was introduced in the first half of the nineteenth century, at the height of the Akhbari–Shaikhi/Osuli controversy. It is no accident that Mollah Ahmad Naraqi's (d. 1829) idea of velayat-e faqih[5] was conceived at

the time Shaikh Ahmad Ahsai's view of the Perfect Shia was gaining acceptance in higher circles of the political and religious establishment. It may be that Naraqi's view of the faqih as the supreme religious leader was formulated in response to Ahsai. Departing from traditional Osuli views of collective leadership that allows ekhtelaf and grants the moqalled the right to abstain from following a particular mojtahed's ruling, Naraqi insisted on the absolute authority of the faqih over all issues pertaining to the personal life of the believer, and not just over matters of litigation, Koranic punishment, marriage, divorce, inheritance, and property settlement.

In his lengthy discussion of the faqih's authority, Naraqi referred to the masses and the subjects as the moqalled, who needed to follow the ruling of the faqih since they were ignorant and incapable of discerning the truth by themselves. He did not claim for the faqih the right to administer what traditionally fell under orf jurisdiction. (customary law). Naraqi's concern with establishing the faqih's authority in shar' matters left no room to discuss the relation of such a socially powerful faqih with the state. Naraqi enjoyed Fathali shah's patronage, receiving royal appointment for the administration of a mosque and its endowments in Kashan.[6] He fully supported the Qajar monarch, issuing upon request a fatwa (religious pronouncement) declaring jehad (holy war) against the Russians when Iran's forces were waging war against its northern neighbor. Rising in defense of the Osuli views, Naraqi went to the extreme and speculated with the ideal, current in some olama circles, of supreme religious leadership wielding tremendous socioreligious, not political, power.

Naraqi's most famous student, Morteza Ansari (d. 1864), argued against the faqih's right to absolute authority in all matters. He allowed the right to decide such matters as custody and property trust to individual believers, even if they were neither trained in the discipline of shar' law nor adherents of that law.[7] Shia annals portray Ansari as one of the most learned and least corruptible mojtaheds of Qajar Iran, staying aloof from politics and court intrigues. His influence on the development of Osuli jurisprudence by far surpassed Naraqi's, whose own concept of velayat-e faqih had little or no following. Both Naraqi and Ansari, like most Osuli foqaha (jurists), discussed their functions and authority in juridical terms, distinct from temporal government. The faqih's velayat was used to mean a legal agent[8] who assumed the right to execute functions theoretically ascribed to the Imam alone: collection of religious taxes, application of Koranic punishment, jehad, and leading Friday mosque prayer. The Osulis were combating not the state, but their rivals and opponents within the religious institution, the mystics and the philosophers, the Akhbaris and the Shaikhis, and, later, the Babis, who attempted to implement their beliefs through militant means.

In the absence of the Imam any actual government was considered non-shar'i, since the political aspects of the holy law were not—could not—be implemented. Consequently, the notion of shar'i-state remained an ideal, "visionary and apocalyptic";[9] as such it did not develop into a concrete theory of government. On the other hand, Imami jurisprudence generally advocated accommodation of de facto political power and recognized the state as a necessary part of the social order sanctioned by religion. The fact that the shar'i ideal was preserved, and the shahs generally ruled with the olama's sanction, could have allowed the

high-ranking members of the religious institution great influence in government. However, the effectiveness of this influence depended a great deal on the olama's ability to close ranks in a unified course of action and to achieve ideological cohesiveness.

The position of marjaʿe taqlid aʿlam gained ascendency in Osuli circles, but it did not establish a definite procedure for the selection of its holder.[10] In fact, fierce rivalry between two or more candidates often prevented the elevation of an individual mojtahed to this exalted rank. Moreover, rare were the cases when a marjaʿ-e aʿlam actually exploited his title to press his opinion on other leading mojtaheds resisting his rulings. The case of Abdollah Behbahani, who refused to abide by Ayatollah Hasan Shirazi's fatwa banning tobacco consumption in 1892 on the ground that a fatwa was binding for the moqalled but not for the mojtahed,[11] is a clear example of the limitation set on the marja's authority. Such limitations were based on the doctrine of the Imamate as the only infallible source of the law. Moreover, the Osuli concepts of ejtehad and taqlid obstructed any attempt by an individual mojtahed to assert in practice his absolute authority over his peers, be they fellow Osulis or members of other schools of Shia theology. The takfir (declaring an individual heretical) by a mojtahed was not necessarily endorsed by other religious leaders, nor was its enforcement possible without state and/or popular participation.

Social Limitations to the Olama's Authority

Doctrinal limitations were reinforced by geographic and socioeconomic factors that allowed the formation of semiautonomous, often competing, religious circles in the provinces that rarely coordinated their policies with those of Tehran. These circles provided individual mojtaheds with noninstitutional sources of revenue.

The financial independence of the religious institution, often stressed as the economic base of the olama's power in Iran, needs closer investigation. The olama did derive their income from their private estates, religious endowments, commercial investments, legal fees, religious taxes, and their followers' generous donations in cash and property. However, they were no less subject than lay members of the ruling elite to the hazards of the political and social instability that plagued the nation, or to the goodwill and whims of their patrons. Qajar sources provide ample evidence of the financial precariousness of individual olama, and of their shaky hold over mosque and school endowments. Often Qajar princes and monarchs, provincial governors, and rich individuals would found mosques and madrasas and entrust the administration to their loyal and favorite clerics. Periodically the trust was transferred from one religious leader to another either through an official proclamation or, as was often the case, through coercive means. The new trustee would send armed gangs to seize buildings and confiscate properties, with the tacit support of the donor. Though normally a religious leader enjoyed full rights to administer the trust without state interference, he had to contend with his clerical rivals, who would covet his privileges and, if powerful enough, would wage violent street fights and wars of nerves,

mobilizing all his political contacts. Thus, more often than not, the state would play an important role, even though indirect, in the transfer of waqf trust.[12] As late Qajar sources show, government officials, grandees, and members of the royal house both rewarded their trusted olama and sowed division among them through the manipulation of endowment trusts. They also had the privilege of bestowing titles on the olama, who thus acquired social status through royal patronage. Such titles, which did not relate to their holders' religious function, were the clerical equivalent to government and court titles; they equally proliferated and were heritable.[13] Titles attached to specific religious functions, such as Shaikh al-Islam and Imam Jomʿa, two essential clerical positions established in each main city or town, were conferred on individuals selected by the shah himself, in keeping with the early Safavid tradition, and were also heritable.

Many olama kept their integrity intact, remaining aloof from intrigues and shady deals. Nevertheless, those olama who were active in Iranian politics of the period under consideration, far from staying immune from the financial hazards of their office, were in constant need of sources of income. Though the collection of religious taxes, which the individual believers paid directly to the religious leaders of their choice, constituted one of the steadiest revenues, here too the olama's dependence was noticeable. Piety and scholarly reputation were the determining factors in the moqalled's choice of a religious guide, but more worldly considerations carried equal, if not greater, weight. A mojtahed's reputation depended largely on his ability to provide material support for his disciples. He had to pay stipends, room and board, and family allowance. The greater his largesse, the greater the number of tollab (students) who would flock to his mosque and school, the greater his prestige and power, the greater his ability to raise funds. Furthermore, a high-ranking cleric, or an aspiring one, had to maintain a lifestyle no less lavish than the temporal grandee's and a court no less status conscious than the government official's, complete with its retinue of devoted followers, assistants, bodyguards, admirers, and solicitors, all depending on his generosity for their livelihood. In addition, he had to maintain and equip his own private "army" composed of hired gangs.[14]

Like their lay counterparts in the ruling circles, high-ranking olama were often driven to borrow from private sources, mostly the wealthy and influential merchants and shopkeepers of the bazaar. By the turn of the century some came to rely increasingly on both the Russian and British banks in Tehran to raise cash. Indeed, Shaikh Fazlollah Nuri's heavy debt to the Russians at the time of the Constitutional Revolution was widely known. The olama resorted to foreign banks not just for private use but also for religious institutional needs. Both European powers were not averse to lending large sums to clerical leaders, aware as they were of the formidable leverage it provided them in religious circles. Thus, in 1903 the custodian of the Meshhad shrine applied to the Imperial Bank for a loan of 1,800 pounds to "meet expenses required in the shrine." Sir Arthur Hardinge, the British ambassador in Tehran, advised the bank to advance the sum; otherwise, he stated, "they would turn to the Russians who would be willing to make it for political objects in order to get the shrine into its debt and thereby gain influence over the clergy."[15]

With the "Indian money," British officials had at their disposal an even better

means to cultivate ties with clerical leaders. Its funds came from an endowment set up by a wealthy Shia ruling family from Lucknow, who entrusted the British consul in Baghdad with the distribution of its revenues among the olama of Najaf and Kerbala. It proved to be a British instrument for sustained contact with the mojtaheds of the holy cities, who were consulted in drawing the list of beneficiaries. The extent to which British officials actually made use of these funds to influence clerical opinion and policies remains to be investigated. However, judging from the sources, by the turn of the century British officials in India and Iran had found it increasingly important to win over the goodwill of high-ranking olama. Some Shia Indians, acting as their agents, helped them establish such contacts and offer "gifts" to facilitate their rapport with religious circles. Though some individual olama resisted the temptation to acquire ready cash, and some accepted only to give it up after realizing its source, a total of six hundred olama were reportedly listed as beneficiaries since the funds were first distributed in 1850.[16]

This financial dependence on followers, supporters, and institutional funds, with strings held by authorities who could at will withdraw stipends or transfer trusteeships, constituted an additional source of tension as well as a divisive element undermining further clerical unity. Even in the case of independently wealthy olama, such as Aqa Mohammad Baqer Najafi or Aqa Mohammad Baqer Shafti of Isfahan or the Ibrahimis of Kerman, personal motives determined the particular policies they chose to pursue. In the labyrinth of clerical politics of late Qajar Iran, neither doctrinal considerations nor institutional interests played a decisive role in shaping individual olama's participation in the cabals and intrigues of the time.[17]

The Olama in Politics

Most Qajar sources acknowledge the predominance of Iranian high-ranking olama in rival political factions. As Nazem al-Islam explained, it was then customary to form at least two competing alignments, one for and one against the current chief minister, one composed of flattering friends and one of resentful foes working to erode his power.[18] These alignments were remarkably transient in character, rarely outliving short-term goals and exacerbating friction among rival religious leaders. For instance, during the ministry of Mirza Hosain Khan Moshir al-Daula, known as Sepahsalar-e Aʿzam, a prominent mojtahed, Mirza Mohammad Saleh Arab (Abdollah Behbahani's father-in-law), sided with the Qajar prince and governor of Isfahan, Masud Mirza Zell al-Soltan, against the Sepahsalar, before accepting gifts and switching to the latter's camp to intrigue against his former ally.[19] On the other hand, his colleague Shaikh Mohammad Baqer, the powerful mojtahed of Isfahan and father of the no less powerful and notorious Shaikh Mohammad Taqi, known as Aqa Najafi, continued to support the governor and was financially compensated for his loyalty.[20]

Although personal loyalty or hostility occasionally lasted a lifetime, alignments shifted so often that particularly shrewd politicians, whether in or out of office, could survive intrigues and maintain their hold over Iranian politics.

Mirza Ali Asghar Khan Amin al-Soltan, the Atabak Aʿzam, who dominated the court and religious circles in Tehran for decades from the second half of the nineteenth century until his assassination in 1907, is a good case in point. No political faction, no lay or clerical group with worldly concerns, could afford to ignore him. He mastered the art of manipulation, skillfully pulling several strings simultaneously, pitting one alliance against another, shifting tactics and sides when necessary. In the years before the revolution and after, he remained the key figure, the central axis around which factions were formed to promote or depose him. In the 1890–1892 political crisis created by the tobacco concession granted to a British firm (which Amin al-Soltan had negotiated), three leading clerics of Tehran, Abdollah Behbahani, Ali Akbar Tafrashi, and the Imam Jomʿa, supported him, while their colleague Mirza Hasan Ashtiani led the opposition. When in 1897 Amin al-Soltan was dismissed by the new shah, Mozaffar al-Din, and replaced by the reformist Amin al-Daula, he was able to engineer his return to power within a year. He successfully rallied the support not only of his clerical allies Behbahani and Tafrashi but also of his former opponents Ashtiani and Fazlollah Nuri, against Amin al-Daula.[21] No sooner was he reinstated as chief minister in 1898 than the same group of olama, together with others in the provinces and in Najaf and Kerbala, joined a broad coalition of court and government officials, members of revolutionary secret societies, and reformers to bring about his downfall and force him to resign in 1903. On the eve of the revolution, and at the height of the struggle for the constitution, Amin al-Soltan was once more able to penetrate newly formed networks and stage his comeback in 1907.

The high-ranking religious leaders of Iran more often than not supported, or were compelled to support, government policies, and they helped the authorities in executing their rulings. For instance, in 1891 the workers at a British-owned carpet manufacturing company staged a riot against their employers. Calm was restored when the local mojtahed, Aqa Mohsen Araki, cooperated with Tehran officials and British diplomats.[22] In 1892, the mojtahed of Hamadan, Abdollah Hamadani, who was enforcing the rule that Jews had to wear distinct clothing for identification, was called to Tehran for a reprimand by order of the shah, who, upon the British consul's protest, had instructed Amin al-Soltan to punish the "crazy mollah."[23] It was indeed a court practice to express its displeasure with a provincial official or religious leader by having him come to the capital, where he would be kept under surveillance until he repented, when he would be sent back home. The court enforced its authority over the olama even in religious cases involving clerical policies toward the religious minorities or heritics. Aqa Najafi and his brother, Mollah Mohammad Ali of Isfahan, who periodically ordered massacres of the Babis in and near the town, would be called to the capital and forced to spend some time there before being allowed to return.[24] Zell al-Soltan, who at times instigated the Isfahan religious leaders to foment trouble in the city or unleash fanaticism of the populace when it suited his current policy or helped him attain his political ends,[25] would be powerless to protect his clerical allies against such royal displeasure or foreign powers' protest. In 1904, following riot protesting the presence of foreigners after the death of two Isfahan inhabitants allegedly caused by coal fumes, he was ordered to "advise" the religious leaders to stop the riots and to remind them of the Treaty of Turkmanchai clause exempt-

ing foreigners from shar' laws. The death of two "insignificant commoners," he was told, did not justify jeopardizing foreign relations.[26] Zell al-Soltan subsequently brought the incident to an end.

Qajar sources offer ample evidence of clerical accommodationism to sustain the view that opposition to tyranny and, by implication, to Western influence, though in theory a fundamental characteristic of Twelver Shi'ism, was not always observed in practice. The sources also demonstrate the fact that the religious hierarchy in Iran did not constitute a highly centralized, ideologically cohesive institution, nor were the olama independent from the state. Institutional interests, as opposed to individual olama's interests, seldom determined clerical policies. Nor can one find any instance of united coherent olama group action against the state or government policies. How, then, can one account for the role of the olama in the tobacco régie affair of 1890–1892, a movement generally considered the prelude to the Constitutional Revolution?

The Olama and the Tobacco Régie

The two authoritative Western studies of the régie, Nikki Keddie's and Ann Lambton's, basically follow the same line of argument and reach identical conclusions. Both show how Great Britain supported British commercial expansion in Iran, which they wished to open to international trade, whereas Russia adamantly opposed it, viewing any concession granted to European, and especially British firms as detrimental to its own interests and influence in the country. Both reveal the extent of British and Russian manipulative power in exerting pressure on the shah and his ministers. Both discuss the various stages of the Anglo-Russian proxy war over the tobacco concession, a war in which Britain and Russia, using their respective protéges and clients in the Iranian government, finally dealt a blow to British prestige and marked Russian ascendence in Iranian politics. Both depict Mirza Hasan Ashtiani, the mojtahed of Tehran who took a prominent part in the movement of protest, as a religious leader who stood firm in his opposition, preparing to leave the capital rather than giving in to the shah's demands, and finally forcing the shah to repeal the concession. They also portray the mojtaheds of Tabriz, Shiraz, and Isfahan as masters of the situation in their respective cities, with Aqa Najafi of Isfahan in November 1891 initiating the boycott of tobacco, which was to be declared general a month later by Mirza Hasan Shirazi, the highest ranking cleric residing in Samara, Iraq. Both Keddie and Lambton state that the popular protest was used and encouraged by the Russians, and even "became vocal in the first instance largely at Russian instigation,"[27] that the anti–Amin al-Soltan faction promoted it, but that, once it was organized, it turned into a semireligious, seminationalist movement of opposition. Keddie argues that the reformers, especially those in exile, were influential in arousing the olama's sentiment and were skillful at manipulating clerical leadership for their own ends. "The movement had demonstrated," she writes, "how the leading olama, from their position of relative impunity, could mobilize both the resentment and the religious feelings of the masses in a way that the reformers could never hope to duplicate on their own."[28]

In a recently published study of the régie, Feridun Adamiyat, relying on the same British documents but drawing more heavily on Persian sources, acknowledges Russia's role and effectiveness in the movement yet denies it the initiative. He recognizes the contribution of Ashtiani and Shirazi but insists the olama were not the leaders, merely the followers of the merchants and the "people."[29] Adamiyat convincingly argues that the olama in Iran, and Hasan Shirazi himself, were at first unwilling to raise the banner of revolt, that many olama refused to join it to the very end, and that local politics determined their choice.

Persian sources substantiate his claims. The two telegrams sent to the shah by Shirazi, in July and September 1891, were composed by the mojtahed's aides, who pushed for their own goals.[30] The famous fatwa of December 1891 banning tobacco consumption, although attributed to Shirazi, was indeed forged, possibly by Hajj Mohammad Kazem Malek al-Tojjar, a wealthy merchant, with Ashtiani's help and with the full approval of Nayeb al-Saltana, a Qajar prince and Amin al-Soltan's avowed enemy, and of Yahya Khan Moshir al-Daula, the pro-Russian minister of foreign affairs.[31] The shah reportedly gave in not to the olama's pressure but to the fear of a Russian-inspired popular uprising against his rule. Indeed, what he feared most was not takfir but the effect of the olama's agitation on the masses.[32] This fear was reinforced by the British envoy, who raised the specter of a possible alliance between Russia and the mollahs taking his "kingdom out of his hand,"[33] and by the Russian consul, who threatened him with a military invasion to restore order unless he cancelled the concession.[34]

Throughout the crisis, the shah's tone in addressing the olama of Iran remained stern and commanding, no matter how exalted their rank or essential their social function. He scolded them for not fulfilling his wishes promptly, admonishing them to prove their loyalty to the government. He expected obedience and loyalty from them no less than from his own court and government officials. When a meeting of Tehran olama and government officials to discuss the concession was convened, and Ashtiani failed to attend it, Naser al-Din shah did not conceal his irritation. He wrote Ashtiani: "I do not understand the reason for and meaning of this that you should be summoned for such a matter by our order and do not appear. . . . What do you mean by all this? Do you think the time has come to deceive the people by demagoguery, or do you want by these means to give prestige to your office, and still in your assemblies to talk against the government and its officials instead of commanding and praising it?"[35] Zell al-Soltan expressed his surprise at Aqa Najafi's action, wondering how the mojtahed, who "never had the courage for such a behavior," was then "doing wonders."[36]

Adamiyat demonstrates how Naser al-Din shah had already discussed the possibility of canceling the concession a month and a half before Aqa Najafi's ban and a month before Shirazi's second telegram of September 1891.[37] He also notes how the major olama of Tehran, and Ashtiani himself, were persuaded, two weeks after the December 3 proclamation outlawing the use of tobacco attributed to Shirazi, to accept the royal compromise, which repealed the domestic monopoly but retained the monopoly for export, and to write to Shirazi the concession was canceled, advising him to lift the ban.[38] Adamiyat's account

corroborates those of Keddie and Lambton, who show that in the summer of 1891 the shah had expressed his anxious desire to cancel the concession for fear of disturbances,[39] and that by December the newly appointed British envoy advised the Foreign Office against supporting the British firm.[40]

Persian sources show that the radical element in the opposition had taken over the streets of the capital by late December 1891. On December 25 they posted placards on the walls calling for jehad against the government, the clerical collaborators, and the foreigners. Rumors were spread that Shirazi had issued a fatwa to that effect. The radicals were aiming at breaking the negotiations in progress, which were bringing the crisis to an end, and at sowing division between the olama and the court.[41] The olama of Tehran lost no time in denying the authenticity of the fatwa and in denouncing in strong terms the "seditious" element wishing to cause friction between the government and the nation. The next day the Russian consul saw the shah and demanded the repeal of the concession in its entirety. By December 27 the court officially announced the repeal of the domestic monopoly, not mentioning the export monopoly. Tension in the city did not diminish, and Ashtiani found himself unable to lift the ban, fearing the mob's reaction. In a series of confidential letters he exchanged with the shah, where he openly denied the royal charges of disloyalty, he expressed his willingness to restore calm but stated his inability, being the spokesman of the people, to do so unless the concession was revoked in its entirety.[42] The British envoy's report on Ashtiani's conversation with an unnamed court official confirms the mojtahed's statement. Ashtiani reportedly said, "If I made peace before receiving all the guarantees I demand, the people would put a cord round my neck and lead me before the door of the Russian Legation to implore aid and protection."[43] One of the guarantees he had demanded was the nomination of the Russian consul to supervise the repeal.

To a certain extent Ashtiani's consideration of the "people" was justified. His colleagues who were then reputed to have sided with the court and had accepted "gifts" from the company's director, most notably Abdollah Behbahani, were harassed and even prevented from going to their mosque.[44] Pamphlets addressed to the collaborating olama and Ashtiani himself were distributed, warning them of popular retribution. The shah's decision to reverse his tactics and adopt coercive means to break the boycott left Ashtiani with no choice but side with the "people." When he received the shah's ultimatum to lift the sanction or leave town, he prepared to depart. The news spread rapidly, and within a few hours an olama front was formed which included Nuri and Tafrashi, who had not previously joined the opposition. The situation was also ripe for the radicals to exploit to the maximum. A serious riot erupting in Tehran on January 4, 1892, lasted three hours. The crisis was not allowed to explode, as the shah swiftly denied having issued the ultimatum and officially revoked the concession in its entirety. Ashtiani fully cooperated with government officials; he dispersed the mob and began negotiations. Hajj Kazem Malek al-Tojjar, the wealthy merchant and chief organizer of the protest movement—allegedly an agent of the Russians, banished from the capital as a consequence—was by then appalled by the radical turn of events. He deplored and feared the lawlessness that threatened to prevail unless the mob was forced to silence. He intervened to restore order and acted as

a mediator between Amin al-Soltan and the government.[45] Ashtiani withdrew his demands for the cancellation of all concessions granted to foreigners, and he advised Shilazi to pursue a course of moderation, as the government was not in a position to confront the foreign powers all at once.[46]

Adamiyat's, Keddie's, and Lambton's assessments of the role of the olama in the revolt against the tobacco concession are basically similar. All give due credit to the olama's ability as agitators, stressing clerical power to mobilize the masses. All three agree that ultimately the strings visible in the hands of Ashtiani and other clerics were in fact pulled by other interested parties: the Russians, the merchants, the anti–Amin al-Soltan court faction, and, to a much lesser extent, the reformers. Persian sources generally corroborate this view. Writing his own account of the affair in 1908, Majd al-Islam asserted that the merchants did not instigate it and the Malek al-Tojjar was merely following Russian instructions. The real cause of protest was the Anglo-Russian rivalry and Russian opposition to the concession.[47]

The Olama and the State

Unlike Keddie and Lambton, Adamiyat notes the all-important fact that the olama and the state were, contrary to the commonly held view, united in their concern with the threat presented to their authority, religious and temporal, by the radical elements. He also states that Shirazi was aware of the sedition aimed at sowing division between the religious hierarchy and the court for "dishonorable" ends.[48] Like Keddie, Adamiyat observed the reformers' and radicals' attempts to manipulate the olama, but he goes further in stating that they had overlooked the very significant traditional role of the olama in enforcing obedience to the monarch as a religious duty.[49]

Sources show how the shah and the olama viewed the two centers of authority—daulat and din, state and religion—as separate yet mutually dependent. To be sure, each needed the other to survive the complex political climate of nineteenth-century Iran, where no political institutions or codified systems of law existed to delimit and check the abuse of power. The olama repeatedly stated the classical Shia view on the necessity for a state to protect the shariat and the Moslems. At the height of the tobacco controversy, Ashtiani, in his correspondence with both the shah and Amin al-Soltan, never failed to express his belief in the state as protector of religion,[50] and the monarch consistently attempted to appease the mojtaheds even though he assumed a superior attitude—almost contemptuous when angered—toward them. The Qajar shahs needed the goodwill of the olama, but so did the mojtaheds, as their religious authority was persistently challenged from within their institution. The Babi uprising of the mid-nineteenth century, the most serious of these challenges, was finally suppressed when the state decided to intervene. Naser al-Din shah reminded Ashtiani of that dependence for the survival of the "right" religion and suppression of heresy. "Do you not know that if, God forbid, there was no government, those same Babis would cut off your heads?"[51] Amin al-Soltan explicitly warned Ashtiani that the subversive faction—responsible for circulating, in the name of

the mojtaheds, inflammatory messages, inciting the populace to rise against the government—was undermining both government and religious authorities.[52]

Fear of heresy and violence, which the shah and his officials shrewdly manipulated to control the olama, was well-founded. Sources provide enough evidence on the clandestine activities of the religious dissidents and political revolutionaries to justify the government's and the olama's apprehensions.[53] The top hierarchy of the olama was no less immune than the state from the rising tide of popular discontent and the new socioeconomic and cultural forces at work in the last decade of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. During the 1890s several clandestine organizations gathered discontented or out-of-office officials, lay political and intellectual reformers, and religious dissidents, including former Azali Babis who had by then transformed their call from a religious to a political revolution. This unholy alliance was responsible for fomenting troubles mainly in Tehran but also in the provincial capitals. The Azalis, concealing their former identity and beliefs, were most successful in mobilizing the tollab and infiltrating the higher religious ranks, composing and distributing pamphlets in defense of "true" and "progressive" Islam with references from the holy texts. But not all religious dissidents were Babis; the former Azalis certainly had no intention of establishing a Babi state. They, together with other groups active in the tobacco régie affair, exerted pressure on the mojtaheds, including Shirazi, to lead the movement. They did not hesitate to use threats to achieve their ends. Among the leaflets that were distributed in the cities in 1891, when the movement was beginning to gather momentum, was one addressed specifically to the olama. It accused them of neglecting their religious duties and closing their eyes to the wretched condition prevailing at the time. It reminded them of the fact that material wealth and comfort, and even their authority and prestige, were bestowed on them by the people, who humbly recognized them as their masters and accepted their own "abjectness." In return, it went on, the "masters" had turned a deaf ear to their "slaves' " laments and remained insensitive to their misery, failing to protect them against tyranny, tolerating injustice committed by the rulers.[54]

When analyzed carefully, the letters that Jamal al-Din Asadabadi (al-Afghani) sent to Mirza Hasan Shirazi in Samara and to all the major olama in Iran, with all the flattering and obsequious language adopted, were no less threatening than the anonymous pamphlets. Jamal al-Din Asadabadi played a pivotal role in the circle of religious dissidents involved in the major political events at the turn of the century. Most of them had met him during his 1886–1887 visit to Iran, his first return to his native country after acquiring a solid reputation as champion of the Moslems and spokesman for Islam in the Middle East and Europe.

The leader of the pan-Islamic movement was in fact a persona non grata in the established centers of Islamic learning, and his political activities in the Moslem lands were directed against the clerical establishment as much as, if not more than, against the temporal government. He was declared a heretic in Najaf and Kerbala, as well as in Iran, by most high-ranking olama.[55] He did not succeed in convincing any Moslem monarch of the viability of his plan for Moslem political unity. In Afghanistan, in Egypt, in Iran, he failed to win the confidence of the ruler and was forced to leave the country. He finally reached

Istanbul, where Soltan Abdol Hamid invited him to reside, attracted as he was in the beginning by the idea of reviving and assuming the old Islamic title of caliph. In the Turkish capital, Jamal al-Din enjoyed for a while royal patronage, until he lost yet another ruler's trust. He retained the support, nominal or real, of some of his original followers. His circle consisted of the political malcontents, free-thinkers and former Azalis, secular reformers or revolutionists, as well as opponents of the current minister in power in Iran. His so-called pan-Islamic society included men like Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani and his companion Ahmad Ruhi, also of Kerman, two well-known former Azalis living in Istanbul at that time; Mirza Reza Kermani, an aide to Asadabadi who was later to assassinate Naser al-Din shah; Abol Hasan Mirza Shaikh al-Ra'is, the Qajar prince-mollah activist known for his sympathy for Babism; and many other religious dissidents who were to play an important part in the Constitutional Revolution. Asadabadi himself suffered persecution and harassment at the hands of the religious establishment as well as the political authorities. As he complained in his letter to Shirazi, his detractors had wrongly charged him with heresy. Regardless of his ulterior motives and true beliefs, he certainly belonged to a group of activists among whom the former Azali network figured prominently.

Writing to Shirazi to gain his endorsement of the opposition to the tobacco concession and to encourage him to assume a leading role in it, Asadabadi referred to the mojtahed with exalted titles, "the leader of religion," the "seat of religion," the "spokesman of the shariat," the "special deputy of the Imam of the Age," chosen by God from among the Shia community to lead the nation and rescue religion. The Islamic nation, he asserted, the mighty and the weak, the rich and the poor, all humbly bow and prostrate themselves in cognizance of his "divine grandeur." Following this bombastic, ingratiating opening, Asadabadi reminded Shirazi of his religious duty and took him to task for not fulfilling it. The nation, he went on, was helpless and powerless; if left on its own, even for only a short while, it would lose faith and despair. Doubt, unbelief, religious deviation, and apostasy would prevail, for the "ignorant masses" relied totally on their religious leaders as guarantors and proofs of their faith. He went on: "Why had you remained silent when observing Iran and Islam falling into the hands of the foreigners?" Why not rise in their defense? All Iranians were nowadays asking themselves why he choose to keep silent; why he was not fulfilling his obligation; why he had allowed religion and the faithful to fall in the hands of the Infidels. He informed Shirazi that some people had already lost faith in him, in religion, and in its leaders; that, should the nation continue to witness his own inertia, the people would feel justified in passively surrendering to the enemy. Then Asadabadi complained of the olama of Iran, their dissension, their inability to unite and coordinate the opposition efforts to save the nation, thus creating an ideal situation for the enemy to exploit. You alone, he told Shirazi, can lift the dissension that was dividing their ranks and unite all in one common action. Finally, he explicitly warned Shirazi that, should he miss this opportunity to commit himself to the righteous cause, he would have no "good name" in the historical annals.[56]

In the other letter addressed to individual olama of Iran, Asadabadi's tone was more militant and less subtle. He referred to the shah's wrongdoing in general, intimidating and silencing the olama, rendering them powerless. The

Europeans, he claimed, realized that the leaders of the nation and of religion were defenseless, stripped of their authority; consequently, they felt free to take power. Do not allow the Pharaoh to destroy religion, Asadabadi cried out, do not allow Satan to triumph. The nation is at your command, he told them. It would obey the olama should they depose the ruler. "Death to this monarch!," he exclaimed. Asadabadi promised the olama supreme political control should they decide to demonstrate in action the full exercise of their power in deposing the monarch. Then the entire nation would be under the protection of God and of the "party of the olama." He assured them they needed neither army nor weapons to depose a king. One command—"to oppose the olama is tantamount to opposing God"—would suffice.[57]

Asadabadi's tactics used to mobilize the olama, simultaneously flattering and threatening them, reminding them of their exalted position as guardians of the faith and yet dependent on the masses' following and goodwill, promising a greater share in the political process and even political authority should they join the cause and support the opposition, were to be emulated by most actors in the subsequent events, especially the anticlerical radicals and religious dissidents.

Keddie, Lambton, and Adamiyat all assert that in consequence of the tobacco régie affair, the olama's power and influence in Iranian politics increased. But here lies the question: Was there a rise in the olama's power? All sources agree that following the repeal, there was a rapprochement between the state and the olama who led the movement. The clerical ascent to power, which some British diplomats reportedly had feared, and the specter of the mollahs introducing a "fanatical and anti-European regime" that would destroy British hope of "seeing the regeneration of Persia by means of a commercial enterprise," simply did not materialize. As Lascelles, the British diplomat in Tehran, admitted, "It is by no means evident yet that the mollahs could exert this power in respect to these matters."[58]

Persian sources portray Mirza Hasan Shirazi, the widely respected mojtahed recognized by most Shia olama of the time as the marjaʿ-e taqlid-e motlaq, as a pious, quietist man of religion, known for his reluctance to interfere in temporal politics. His major contribution to the success of the movement for the repeal of the tobacco concession was the famous fatwa declaring the consumption of tobacco unlawful. As most sources assert, the fatwa was written by the merchants of Tehran with the full collaboration of Mirza Ashtiani. Shirazi did not deny the attribution; he went along with the Iranian olama involved in the movement and, upon Ashtiani's final advice, lifted the ban.

With the death of Shirazi in 1895, the position of marjaʿ-e taqlid-e motlaq was not filled, as fierce rivalry between the two main contenders in Tehran, Ashtiani and Nuri, divided the olama's ranks. Moreover, British and Persian sources leave no doubt as to the corruptibility of some leading olama of Tehran. Abdollah Behbahani, known for his "susceptibility to British gifts,"[59] remained consistent to his habit of backing British policy in Iran. Five years after the repeal of the tobacco concession, when troubles erupted in the south involving local olama who supported a cabal against the governor, he rendered services duly appreciated by the British envoy in Tehran. The envoy wrote to London that the mojtahed, "who stood by this Legation at the time of the Régie, and with whom

we are still on excellent terms . . . sent me messages to ask the views and wishes of the Legation. . . . A reply was given that the aim of this Legation was to support His Majesty the shah, and that he should discourage the Mollahs in their present course."[60] Ashtiani, the so-called leader of the tobacco protest, reportedly had accepted gifts and a pension for his part in negotiating the lifting of the ban and his reconciliation with Amin al-Soltan, and, five years later, for staying aloof from the troubles in the south.[61] The Imam Jomʿa of Tehran, a relative of the shah, was also given British credit for the "most useful role" he played in "sowing division among the mojtaheds."[62]

These were the activist mojtaheds of the capital, commanding respect throughout the nation. Given the evidence, could one really speak of their independent position or of their alienation from the shah and his government? In their corruptibility, their susceptibility to court and foreign intrigues as well as to manipulation by individuals and groups—no different from and no less prevalent than the corruptibility of government officials—they were indistinguishable from the ruling class, which increasingly alienated the discontented masses. Pressure brought them into the political arena, and pressure forced them to negotiate. The historical significance to the régie lay in the deliberate and calculated use of clerical influence over the masses by interested parties on a national and international scale never before attempted. With the emergence of new economic and social forces, there came about a blurring of traditional lines separating temporal and religious affairs. The blurring was the direct consequences of the olama's participation in national and international politics, where they were cynically and ruthlessly exploited by various interested parties for nonreligious ends. They were also duly and skillfully manipulated by the foreign powers, which had by then realized the effectiveness of the olama as spokesmen through whom public opinion could be controlled. Diverse, often conflicting views could be propagated and sanctioned by individual olama competing with one another to impose upon the public their acquired opinions. The legacy of the so-called semi-religious, seminationalist movement of 1890–1892 was precisely this, the confusion of issues and of concepts related to Islam and Iranian nationalism, religion and state, clerical and temporal authority.

British Clerical Policy at the Turn of the Century

The decade following the repeal of the tobacco concession marked the emergence of a British clerical policy aimed at attracting the olama to the British side and using them as leaders of movements potentially more favorable to British interests and designs in the region.

Great Britain's dual policy in Iran at the turn of the century sought to keep the balance of power with Russia in the region while strengthening the British position following the 1892 setback. It simultaneously cultivated ties with the shah and his government and with the opposition, instigating agitation against pro-Russian officials and arousing anti-Russian sentiment. Thus, it adopted strategies designed to promote British influence while seemingly championing nationalist and religious causes. The chief architects of this policy were Sir

George Curzon, viceroy of India from 1899 to 1905, and Sir Arthur Hardinge, minister in Tehran from 1901 to 1905.

Curzon, who in 1892 had published the most comprehensive English study of Iran, was generally referred to as the father of the "new imperialism." Despite a deep-rooted distrust of Russian expansionism in central and western Asia, he was convinced that Russia's influence in Tehran at that time was grossly exaggerated by some fellow British analysts. "I found that the control exercised by Russia, in spite of her tremendous physical superiority, to be by no means so great, as I had been led to believe. I found that Persian Ministers declined to be brow-beaten by Russian Ministers, that Russian diplomacy was by no means uniformly successful; and that the shah, if properly backed, could even return a decided No to his very good friend the Csar."[63] However, Curzon was willing to concede to the Russians rights over the northern provinces of Iran. "A superiority of influence in North Persia, and in the districts coterminous with her own borders, is an advantage to which Russia from her position is entitled, and which no fair man will be disposed to grudge her."[64] Such a pragmatic approach to Anglo-Russian rivalry led the viceroy to contemplate, though with some reservations, "the experiment of an understanding with Russia as to future spheres of interest . . . in the interests of both Persia itself, and still more of harmony between the two Great Powers."[65]

Hardinge, on the other hand, held a more alarmist view of the Iranian political scene. The shah, he believed, was "an elderly child," "a broken reed"; the monarchy was an "old long mismanaged estate, ready to be knocked down at once to whatever Foreign Power bid highest, or threatened most loudly its degenerate and defenceless rulers."[66] Like his predecessors in Tehran, he strongly advocated intensive trade and commercial ties with Iran as a means to ensure British supremacy there. He tended to exaggerate Russian influence to the point of depicting the shah and his ministers "in a state of complete vassalage to Russia, owing to their reckless extravagance and folly."[67] Perhaps because of this alarmist view he favored, even more strongly than Curzon at that time, an Anglo-Russian agreement.

The situation, however, was not as bleak as Hardinge assumed. He was in a position to know that the "sympathies" of Amin al-soltan, whom he described in mostly friendly terms, "were not at heart Russian."[68] Despite his moral revulsion for the shah's follies, Hardinge did find means to "knock the bottom out of the Russian monopoly of financial supply to the shah," as he so colorfully put it, and thus restore British influence, by "ministering to the shah's insurmountable extravagance" and furnishing the necessary funds.[69] These funds were raised through the oil concession granted to the Australian-born entrepreneur Knox d'Arcy signed on May 28, 1901, and the loan advanced by the Imperial Bank of Persia in 1903. Both deals constituted Hardinge's most important contribution to the promotion of British interests, and both were negotiated through the good offices of Amin al-Soltan, the so-called Russian tool.[70]

Amin al-Soltan proved to be a crucial Iranian contact through whom the British could exert pressure to acquire commercial agreements competitive with the Russians'. In 1901, at the height of the anti-Atabak hostilities in the capital, Hardinge wrote to the Foreign Office to recommend continuing his support,

arguing that "a minister agreeable to and trusted by the Russians . . . but who would still 'hedge' and coquet with the British was better at the moment than an overtly anti-Russian one, who would bring many conflicts into the open."[71] The Russo-Persian trade agreement signed in October 1901, which gave Russia commercial privileges and tax advantages detrimental to British interests, led to a comparable Anglo-Persian trade agreement signed in February 1903.[72] Significantly, neither the secret negotiations nor the friendly relations Amin al-Soltan maintained with the British during his second term of office were unknown to the Russians. Hardinge and his Russian counterpart often exchanged views and information and even consulted each other.[73] Provisions were made to exclude the northern provinces from d'Arcy's oil concession, thus tacitly conceding to the Russians their interests there. Furthermore, despite great secrecy, the Russians found out about the negotiations but raised few objections.[74]

As Ferrier reveals, d'Arcy's intention not to "give umbrage to Russia" by excluding the northern provinces was calculated to obtain, in return, an Iranian promise not to grant "to any other person" (that is, the Russians) the right of constructing a pipeline to the rivers in southern Iran. "Russian reaction was furious, not so much to the d'Arcy's concession as a whole but to the pipeline restriction in particular."[75] The Russians were considering constructing a pipeline to counter American competition in kerosene in the markets of the Persian Gulf and India.[76] When the Iranian government requested another loan from the Russians, they made it dependent on a solution to the pipeline issue. It took the Iranian ministers' ingenuity, a cash advance from d'Arcy, and, most important, Hardinge's adroit maneuvering for the issue to diffuse before the loan agreement was signed in April 1902.[77]

Hardinge had skillfully cultivated ties with the olama in Tehran, Najaf, and Kerbala. He had observed how the Russians had "used them" at the time of the tobacco régie protest and thought the British could "profit by their example."[78] In Tehran his chief clerical contact was, once more, Behbahani. In February 1902, despite his lasting friendship for Amin al-Soltan, Behbahani agreed to establish in Tehran and elsewhere an olama-led opposition to the government's pro-Russian policy. He reportedly asked for large sums in cash to "warm the hearts" of Tehran olama, but he warned his British contact there would be no receipt. "It must be carefully concealed that there were any foreigners interested in the movement, otherwise certain people might say 'you are only taking us from one set of *kuffar* (infidels) to hand us over to another.' "[79] Hardinge himself was careful in avoiding any official association with the opposition.

Behbahani, provided with "expense money," organized the protest. In addition, letters were sent to the holy cities of Najaf and Kerbala, passionately appealing to their mojtaheds, referred to as "leading lights of the faith," to condemn the loan. "The most sacred ties are under the control of the foreigners. All power is taken from the olama. How is Islam humbled! Were you to repudiate and cast off this second loan they could not but obey you."[80] The olama's protest did not halt the negotiations or prevent the signing of the loan agreement. Hardinge's intention was not to obstruct the negotiations entirely but to prevent the inclusion of unacceptable clauses and conditions. It is interesting that, when the British a year later negotiated a new loan with the Iranian govern-

ment through the Imperial Bank of Persia, to be paid back with the income of the Caspian fisheries and customs receipts from southern ports and possibly the post and telegraph,[81] no protest was made against the "humbling of Islam." Nor had the 1901 oil concession to d'Archy stirred a ripple in religious circles. Hardinge maintained good relations with his clerical contacts, eager as he was to "control to some extent their action and keep it if possible within safe and reasonable bounds." He was also convinced that, despite the fact that there were "very few leaders among whom religious zeal is proof against bribes," they would not deviate from their commitments for fear of loss of prestige.[82] In the summer of 1902, he discussed at great length with the Foreign Office his policy of countering Russian influence by "subsidizing the clergy and supporting Anglophil Persian officials" while inducing the Russians to reach an agreement.[83] He wrote to his colleague in Baghdad, "It is desirable at present to strengthen our influence with the Persian government. . . . But I should also wish myself to enter into such friendly personal relations with the Chief Priests as would enable me to use them as a lever, if necessary, with the Persian government should the latter show signs of contacting fresh loans with Russia or following an unfriendly policy.[84]

Hardinge's best allies in Najaf were Aqa Sharabiani and Mehdi Bahr al-Olum, two leading mojtaheds with sizable followings. The British diplomat described them as learned and cultivated theologians "well acquainted with the main features of world politics."[85] Until his death in 1904, Sharabiani acted as the chief spokesman for the mojtaheds of Kerbala and Najaf for all matters related to government and politics in Iran. Realizing the opportunities the Indian bequest afforded him for influencing the leading olama, Hardinge explained how he utilized it "for the purpose of maintaining my own contacts with the chiefs of that powerful class."[86] He carefully supervised the distribution of revenues from the Indian bequest. Lord Curzon himself was confident that eventually the British would "be in a position to exercise control over the principal people of Kerbala and Najaf."[87]

How much control the British officials achieved is a moot point. Algar concedes that "there was an obvious community of interest between the olama and the British and a desire on the part of the latter to give this practical effect," but he insists that Hardinge's clerical policy "terminated inconclusively."[88] The official documents, however, indicated the extent to which the administration of the funds gave the British officials "final say in who was to receive funds," and proved to be "an instrument of the greatest political efficacy."[89] For instance, in the summer of 1903, when the intrigue against Amin al-Soltan had reached its peak, Zell al-Soltan, the governor of Isfahan and one of Amin al-Soltan's fiercest and most persistent opponents, incited the local mojtahed, Aqa Najafi, to stage popular religious demonstrations and riots against the foreigners and the Babis. The government had continued to support the Belgian official Joseph Naus, hired by Amin al-Daula to reform and direct the tax system of the country. Although many merchants deemed the reforms detrimental to their trade interests and therefore instigated widespread protests, opposition to Naus was primarily aimed at discrediting Amin al-Soltan. A letter, allegedly written by Sharabiani to warn the shah against Amin al-Soltan's policies, was circulating in the capital and provincial cities. It encouraged opposition to the minister. Hardinge

lost no time in instructing his colleague in Baghdad, upon Foreign Office approval, to send a discreet but firm warning to Aqa Sharabiani.

> The political interests of the British Government are identical with those of Persia, of whose independence it is a firm supporter. To take a small matter, its administration of the Oudh bequest is one of many proofs of the respect with which it regards the Mohammedan religion. . . . Appeals to religious hatred are, however, likely to do more harm than good. . . . Not only Russia, but Turkey and England have agreed to the new Persian Tariff, whatever may be said for or against it, and it is only by negotiations with these three powers that it can be changed, and such negotiations would entail great difficulties. Let the Hazarat [the mojtaheds] address, in a loyal and respectful manner, to the Shah or Grand Vizier any complaints which they may have against the Persian Government, and at the same time discourage the clergy here from making use of any language which might be misunderstood by the ignorant as an incitement to violence or riots.[90]

By July 9, Hardinge was able to report to London that the shah had received a cable from Najaf signed by the four leading mojtaheds disavowing the anti-Christian and anti-European agitation but approving the executions of the Babis.[91] Throughout July and part of August 1903, the British agent in Najaf held extensive interviews with Sharabiani, who promised to keep the olama in Iran "quiet."[92]

As Hardinge explained, the suspicion that the British might influence the mojtaheds had served the purpose of keeping the Iranian politicians and officials in line.[93] It proved to be a "wholesome deterrent" to Amin al-Soltan, as Hardinge at times threatened him with the olama's opposition and at others promised him interference to quell disturbances led by religious forces provided Amin al-Soltan complied with his demands.[94] Some of Hardinge's colleagues in the legation did not share his reliance on the religious leaders, whose dissension and corruptibility cast doubt on the effectiveness of their influence on Iranian statesmen and government.[95] Nevertheless, Hardinge was adamant in his determination to use the olama until the very end of his term in Tehran. In 1904 he reacted very strongly to reports of the Ottoman and Iranian governments' expressed displeasure with the mojtaheds' activism, turning down all suggestions to lessen the olama's power. He argued,

> The destruction of the power of the priesthood would in the present condition of Persia be, from our point of view, a very questionable gain. Ignorant, greedy of lucre, and hostile to real progress, as the Mollah class with comparatively few exceptions is, it represents, or rather the great mojtaheds of Kerbala and Najaf represent, the one independent element of public opinion which can stand up to and inspire a wholesome fear in the selfish and corrupt temporal leaders of this country. Its interests are on the whole identified with antagonism to the extension of Russian influence, whose dangers its leading members show a growing disposition to realize, whilst it is, for various reason into which I need not now enter in detail, a good deal less unfriendly to ourselves.[96]

Though Hardinge did not remain in Tehran to witness the outbreak of the revolution in the fall and winter of 1905–1906, he bequeathed to his successors a

well-tried policy of carefully balanced support of moderate, clerically led, loyalist opposition that was not aiming at shaking the Qajar throne or the status quo in the region. Throughout his stay in Iran, he and his colleagues rejected requests for aid from anyone other than high-ranking traditionalist olama. Hardinge's memoirs and the dispatches sent to the Foreign Office displayed not only a conservative Tory distaste for revolutionaries, nihilists, and anarchists—all viewed as the same—but an astonishing ignorance of the political climate, religion, and culture in general.[97] He was poorly informed about Shia Islam, the doctrine of the Imamate and its application by the theologians, and the role of the mojtaheds. He tended to compare the olama to Christian ecclesiastics, referring to them as the "church party," and failed to assess adequately their function and power. A fatwa condemning government officials was erroneously taken as "amounting almost, in its effect, to their excommunication."[98] Ejtehad was wrongly translated as the "doctrine that God's divine 'revelation' . . . is not, and perhaps never will or indeed can be closed. This view assumes new discoveries in revealed Divine truths and may thus add to the doctrine of the Koran and traditions expressing these new revelations to the general body of Orthodox Shiah belief, much as good Roman Catholics include the pronouncements of the Pope, on contested or uncertain questions, in the steadily and constantly increasing body or compendium of the Christian or Moselm Faith."[99] Though Hardinge hastened to admit that "no formal enunciation of a new doctrine or new interpretation of the Koran . . . had been accepted," he insisted that such a doctrine could "probably carry weight."[100] In fact, the mojtaheds had for centuries maintained that the gate to knowledge of the divine was indefinitely closed for as long as the Imam remained in Occultation. This doctrine, which indeed could allow a new interpretation of the texts, was upheld by mystics, philosophers, and religious dissidents, all equally condemned as heretical by the mojtaheds.

On the other hand, Hardinge was undoubtedly naive in taking at face value what some of his clerical contacts, trained in the centuries-long tradition of taqiyya and the art of esoteric self-expression, wished him to know. For example, he frequently conversed and discussed theology and politics with Mohammad Abū Taleb Zanjani, whom he perceived as a liberal-minded pan-Islamicist who opposed violence and believed the olama's task was to educate the public about the danger of Russian influence on religion and national independence.[101] In the Persian sources Zanjani is described as a follower of Shaikh Fazlollah Nuri and supporter of the reactionary minister Ain al-daula (no pan-Islamic sympathizers), reluctant to join the ranks of the moderate clerical constitutionalists[102] and finally siding with the reactionaries against the latter groups. As already stated, pan-Islamicists at the turn of the century were almost exclusively the political and/or religious dissidents who collaborated with Jamal al-Din Asadabadi. Pan-Islamicism never succeeded in becoming a movement in Iran. Neither Asadabadi nor any of his collaborators ever promoted the idea of establishing a "theocratic republic ruled by the Moslem clergy," as Hardinge reported.[103]

It is highly significant that neither of the dissidents who sought British support in the early 1900s was taken seriously, being dismissed as "more interested in security and safety for themselves than in national goals."[104] British failure to fully realize and understand the depth of the lay opposition and the religious

dissent underscores the shallow relations between the British and an opposition they needed for their own ends.

Conclusion

The Shia religious institution in Qajar Iran was neither united nor ideologically cohesive. Doctrinal disputes and personal rivalry, which had traditionally divided its ranks, constituted formidable obstacles to the formation of a disciplined, organized, autonomous "national church." Although the majority of the olama generally remained politically acquiescent, the few who participated in the wordly politics of their time did not enjoy full institutional backing, nor were their motives doctrinally based. In fact, the activist olama, competing with one another, sought and received support from outside the religious institution, from among government officials, politicians, and interest groups that included merchants and members of the ruling family. Such powerful connections and financial backing from without helped the activist olama to consolidate their power within the religious institution. Thus, the activist olama's power was determined not only by the merits of their scholarship or the degree of their piety but also by their political clout: their access to the centers of temporal power, the importance of the mosque and religious endowments entrusted to them by wealthy individuals whose patronage needed cultivation, the size of their entourage of students, disciples, and private guards, all depending financially on them. On the other hand, the mojtaheds' privileged status as interpreters and guardians of the holy law, their influence on the masses of believers, their ability to command crowds and shape public opinion motivated rival political factions to seek their individual support. Clerical and lay power politics often overshadowed religious considerations in determining the activist olama's views and stands.

The 1891–1892 disturbances leading to the repeal of the tobacco concession granted by Naser al-Din shah to a British firm marked a spectacular increase in the olama's activities. Viewed as a watershed in the history of Iranian nationalism, in that it witnessed the birth of a peculiar modern Iranian tradition of mosque–bazaar–intelligentsia alliance against the state, the tobacco affair brought some activist olama center stage in the arena of national politics. However, a careful examination of the sources show that they were neither the instigators nor the actual leaders of the protest movement. They were persuaded to take a strong stand against the concessions by forces outside the religious institution.

The importance of the mosque as a center of propaganda and mass mobilization attracted the attention of two European powers, Britain and Russia. Britain then took the lead in increasing its association, direct or indirect, with members of the religious establishment in Tehran, in the provincial capitals, and in Najaf and Kerbala. British diplomats and agents projected an image of the Empire as an ardent champion of Iran's independence and national sovereignty against Russian expansionism. Kept informed by members of their entourage and by the political activists who penetrated their circles to solicit support for their cause, the religious leaders recognized Iran's vulnerability to foreign domination. Seemingly as aware as their informers of the potentially greater threat posed by their northern neigh-

bor, they were often responsive to British overtures and amenable to British suggestions and advice. Here, one must note that the activist olama vacillated between their desire to attain and maintain power and their need to preserve their personal integrity intact, vulnerable as they were to factional attacks. Thus, most demanded their relationship with the British be held in utmost secrecy. Less scrupulous olama, nonetheless, were able to turn these contacts to their personal advantage. In the last analysis, the activist olama proved to be easily manipulated by foreign agents, government officials, and conservative and radical groups, whose interests and goals did not always correspond to religious or national interests, despite repeated assurances to the contrary.

But here lies a most pertinent question: Why did these officials and opposition groups, especially the religious dissidents, so persistently court the olama for their respective causes? To answer this question, one must bear in mind the peculiar socioreligious climate of Iran at the turn of the century, which allowed the traditional patron–client system to flourish. The patronage system in Qajar Iran was played to perfection by all the major actors in the political arena. The leaders of any movement or faction, no matter how popular and worthy their cause, if not wellborn, well-connected, or supported by powerful individuals, could not possibly achieve their ends. Qajar society may not have been as rigidly stratified as some other traditional societies of the time. In fact, historical annals provide numerous examples of men of modest origins climbing the social ladder. The right connections often took precedence over individual merit in ensuring a rapid promotion or successful enterprise. The term parti-bazi (literally playing the game of political parties, but generally meaning having the right connections) supposedly gained currency at this time, but it certainly reflected a long tradition of "networking" deeply rooted in Iranian political culture.

The high-ranking olama, whether respected for their scholarship and professional integrity or for their status, wielded social influence equal to the lay grandees'. In fact, the two centers of authority in Qajar Iran formed one socially integrated ruling elite. Highly gifted low-ranking mollahs, like their counterparts in government service, if not well-connected, could not hope to attain higher status solely on their personal merits. Again like their counterparts in civil service, they had to seek the patronage of higher ranking members of the socioreligious establishment.

Much has been written about the religious legitimacy of the mojtaheds' role in Shia Iran, as opposed to the precarious nature, and some would say illegitimacy, of the monarch's rule, in the believers' mind. Without wishing to underestimate the religious aspect of the olama's authority, one should point out that not all the activist olama who participated in the events leading to the Constitutional Revolution and its aftermath were respected or known for their personal integrity. Both Nuri and Behbahani, who sided with opposite political camps—royalist and constitutionalist, respectively—and laid equal claims for legitimacy to their diametrically opposed views, acquired such a highly visible role by virtue of their leadership status in Tehran ruling circles. They had proper connections, and they had political clout, which proved to be supremely attractive to those groups that assiduously sought their patronage and backing.

In neighboring Ottoman Turkey and Egypt, where modernization started

much earlier, the political opposition and the intelligentsia calling for reforms to check the rulers' abuse of power could find leadership and institutional support from among the cadres of modern, educated military officers and government officials. In contrast, the Iranian opposition had neither an army nor a bureaucracy to lean on in their struggle against the Qajars' power. Only the olama could, in theory, provide them with what may be interpreted as institutional backing. But the ranks of the activist olama were notoriously divided. The religious dissidents and some lay members of the political opposition were to turn this weakness to their own advantage. They would fan personal animosity and rivalry existing among competing olama who were active in politics, while simultaneously turning to the generally quietist and respected olama in Iraq as arbiters. Mirza Hasan Shirazi was thus drawn into Iranian politics with the tobacco affair, as were his successors and colleagues at the time of the revolution. Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and his collaborators were carrying on their expedient tactics when they approached Shirazi, urging him to take a strong stand against the tobacco concession and calling upon his legitimate right to supreme authority over the temporal monarch's. As far as my research goes, no mojtahed in late Qajar times ever laid claim so explicitly, or even implicitly, to political power. It was the religious dissidents who attempted, unsuccessfully, to incite Shirazi to do so, not to establish an Islamic state headed by the mojtaheds but as an expedient means to weaken the shah's authority.[105]

A no less important reason for the opposition's need to win the olama's goodwill lay in the lessons of the past. The religious controversies and revolts of the mid-nineteenth century, and the resulting repressive policies of the olama toward the dissidents, had demonstrated the futility of any attempt at openly challenging institutionalized religion and its protectors. For, put on their defensive, the guardians of orthodox Shia Islam had increasingly used takfir to denounce all religious deviators as well as their opponents from within the religious institutions and without. Although individual olama's takfir was not necessarily universally binding, it served the purpose of discrediting their opponents' influence, especially when backed by powerful lay members of the ruling elite. It was therefore difficult for dissident groups or individuals to attain and maintain public standing if ever tainted, rightly or wrongly, in such a fashion. To avoid such a stigma, they reverted to the time-honored practice of concealing their true beliefs, ideas, or motives, and they strove to gain the patronage of well-established olama. As the struggle became fiercer and takfir was used abusively as a deadly weapon to undercut the growing popularity of the constitutionalists, the latter were to realize their imperative need for a shield. The traditional tendencies of the Iranians to practice taqiyya, cloaking their innovative ideas and radical goals in the respectable garb of religious orthodoxy, were to be reinforced.

2

The Intelligentsia and the Merchants

In the introduction to his excellent analysis of fin de siècle Viennese politics and culture, Carl Schorske asserts, "The word 'modern' acquired something of the ring of a war cry . . . as an antithesis of 'ancient'—implying contrast with classical antiquity."[1] This "war cry" rang loud and clear in Iran, its echo sounding among Moslem thinkers in the throes of an intellectual crisis. This crisis did not necessarily originate with Western contact, nor was this the direct cause. Rather, modern European thought offered viable answers to a quest for new modes of being and thinking. Modernity—a historical phenomenon developing from a set of particular economic, scientific, and cultural developments in the late fifteenth century in Western Europe—caught the imagination and inflamed the spirit of those already in rebellion against traditional sociointellectual norms. For them, it became a new faith, powerful and indisputable, breaking ground for what was perceived as an irreversible, invincible march toward the destruction of time-honored traditions and institutions that obstructed the path to human progress. These rebellious thinkers were too unfamiliar with European history, culture, and society to grasp the significance of Western thought and social systems. Yet no matter how unsystematic and shallow their comprehension may have been, they understood that principles such as human rights, rationalism, scientism, and belief in the indefinitely progressive development of the human mind lay at the basis for the new social system that checked exploitation and domination of humans by humans.

The Intelligentsia

Nazem al-Islam translated the term intelligentsia as oqala (possessors of aql, intellect). He used this term, together with the word daneshmandan (possessors of knowledge), to contrast the lay modern educated group to the olama, learned in the traditional religious sciences. The term raushanfekran (enlightened thinkers, those imbued with the spirit and ideals of the European Enlightenment) also gained currency at the turn of the century to refer to lay "liberal," "progressive" intellectuals. Prior to the period under consideration in this study, no such distinction separated the sacred from the profane, since knowledge was basically defined as knowledge of the divine. Generally, mystics and philosophers, theologians and jurisconsults, doctors trained in traditional medicine and scientists, the orthodox and the deviators—all wore the turben symbolic of their status as learned men.

With the discovery of the West, Western thought and science, the Persian root word danesh (knowledge) acquired a strictly lay connotation, and the Arabic root word ilm came to mean science in the Western sense, in addition to retaining its traditional religious meaning (knowledge of the divine). The laicization of the concept of knowledge gradually began to enforce the view of the olama's expertise as limited to the traditional fields of religious sciences proper, thus narrowing their professional function to that of spiritual leaders guiding the religious and personal life of the believers, but not their public life. To be sure, in legal terms, matters pertaining to the public realm (orfi) were traditionally separate from those pertaining to the religious realm (sharʿi), ensuring the distinction of temporal from religious authority. However, no clear-cut delineation of the two spheres had been officially attempted until then, as there existed no codified legal system to be uniformly applied throughout the nation. Separate temporal and religious courts shared the responsibility of administering justice. Nonetheless, even in clear-cut cases related to religious law, the religious court could only pronounce judgments, in most cases leaving the sentencing and its execution to the temporal authorities, for it did not have the necessary means of enforcement. Moreover, the religious authorities extended their jurisdiction over matters pertaining to aspects of the personal life of the Moslem believer which, in the modern Western world, were considered public: education as well as all issues related to the intellectual life of the country, including publication and censorship; public morality; and commercial law. These became vital issues for the reformers, the revolutionists, and the religious dissidents alike, in their common struggle for the establishment of a constitutional regime in Iran.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, disastrous military defeats suffered at Russian hands in Transcaucasia and no less humiliating encounters with British forces on the eastern frontier compelled the Iranian rulers to realize the general state of decay of their armed forces. Not surprisingly, the first reforms attempted by the Qajar state aimed at creating a modern, well-equipped army. As in other Moslem countries that had experimented earlier with military reforms, intellectual curiosity and political necessity created the urge to further explore European knowledge and languages. The gate to Western "new learning" was opened; Iranian culture, like other non-Western cultures that underwent similar phases of modernization, was at the point of no return.

Europe was first discovered chiefly by government officials who, during the course of their political careers, traveled extensively in Western capitals, and thus had the opportunity to witness the scientific progress in the factories, harbors, railroads, printing presses, and other displays of Western technological achievements. Concerned ministers called for the acquisition of European scientific and technological know-how in order to develop national trade and industries on a competitive basis with Europe. Qajar rulers respected and encouraged the idea. In 1811, Crown Prince Abbas Mirza sent two young men from Tabriz to study medicine in London. In 1815, five more students went to England to study engineering, artillery, locksmithing and the English language.[2]

By the time Naser al-Din shah acceded to the throne in 1848, a small but increasingly vocal circle of reform-minded officials who had also traveled to the Ottoman Empire, where extensive reforms were being legislated, believed that if

Iran emulated Europe in developing its trade and industry and in facilitating the exploration of its mines, constructing roads and railroads, "it would soon become like the European countries" and would regain its former position among the most advanced nations in the world.[3] Naser al-Din shah shared the optimism of his officials, and he became an enthusiastic traveler to Europe. He appointed to high government posts men who championed the idea of reforms, and he encouraged members of his entourage to send their sons to study abroad. A degree from some European schools, or sometimes just knowledge of a European language or a prolonged trip to Europe, came to be viewed as a key to success and political prominence.

The first serious attempt at instituting reforms was undertaken by Mirza Taqi Khan Amir Kabir, Naser al-Din shah's first minister, whom he inherited together with the throne upon his father's death. The Amir Kabir's effort lay especially in restructuring, or rather structuring, since there was really no system worth speaking about, the judiciary. Fierce opposition from the mojtaheds most hard hit by the reforms, in addition to court intrigues and factionalism, defeated his purpose. He was, however, successful in founding a state school in Tehran, modeled after European schools, for the education of future officers and government officials. The Dar al-Fonun, established in 1851, survived the olama's opposition and proved to be one of the most important sources of recruitment and support for the circle of nationalist reformers. In the first year of its foundation, 105 students were admitted; by the early 1890s, the number reached 387.[4] Its faculty was mostly foreign, especially Austrians and Prussians, with some French and Italians; but young Iranian graduates of European institutions soon began to fill the teaching positions as new courses were offered and foreign teachers resigned to return home. The administration was entirely in the hands of Iranian officials, and the school enjoyed royal patronage, regardless of the political climate prevailing at the time. More importantly, the Dar al-Fonun's translations of European textbooks into Persian by educated Iranians, with foreign teachers' assistance, helped in the dissemination of European "new learning."

The French diplomat-scholar-essayist Arthur de Gobineau, who was stationed at the embassy in Tehran in the 1850s and early 1860s, had observed that Iranians imported books in great number from western Europe, particularly from Germany. He had also expressed his surprise to see how well acquainted some Iranian intellectuals were with the works of Kant and Spinoza.[5] Delighted with their positive response to his own lectures on Descartes, Gobineau commissioned the translation of the seventeenth-century French philopher's famous work *Discours sur la Méthode.* It was a joint Iranian-French employees' venture at the embassy; its publication in 1862 was sponsored by the minister of sciences. Descartes's statement "I think, therefore I am" reportedly greatly impressed the small circle of Iranian thinkers;[6] in the introduction to the Persian text, the translators explained how controversial descartes's views were in his own lifetime, how the Church had severely condemned him as a heretic, and how, nonetheless, his ideas survived as a result of the French government intervention.[7] In addition to the introduction, the translators included a section in which they summarized some of the most important European scientific theories, Newton's in particular. Newton had already been introduced to the Iranian public

with the publication, a year earlier, of an essay by Ali Qoli Mirza E'tezad al-Saltana, the minister of sciences. In this work, E'tezad al-Saltana rose in defense of Newton and other European scientists' theories, and he declared obsolete the "knowledge of the ancient." Nowadays, he stated, there can be no doubt that the earth is round; nor can one deny the heliocentricity of the universe as a scientific fact. "Only a few ignorant people in Iran" believe otherwise.[8] In 1870, eleven years after Charles Darwin published his controversial *On the Origin of Species,* an Iranian physician who taught at the Dar al-Fonun translated segments of it.[9]

Though Darwin's theory was not always correctly comprehended, and the Cartesian method not always properly followed,[10] the free spirit of European philosophical inquiry, traditionally denied to Moslem thinkers through the ages, was readily understood, admired, and desired by members of the intelligentsia. However, their commitment was not to philosophy or metaphysics, or even religious reforms, but to social and institutional changes, to the adoption of Western technology, and to the adaptation of Western liberal concepts of government to a reformed Iranian political system. They were convinced that, to attain their objectives, a constitution had first to be established.

The second half of the nineteenth century is a period that saw that development of new ideas, Western-inspired and generally secularly oriented, and formulated not only by revolutionists and religious dissidents, but, essentially, by men who held high government posts and were, albeit temporarily, in a position to implement some of their cherished ideas for reforms. In their writings, these officials were no less virulently critical of Qajar society than were the dissidents; nor were they less adamant in their intention to uproot some of the socioreligious practices they deemed too archaic and harmful to national development. They spared the monarchy from the vehemence of their attacks, but they called for the creation of a new system of government. They respected religion, the religious law, and the olama, but they insisted on the separation of national and public affairs from religion. More important, they introduced a new conception of the nature of government–people relations. Traditional Islamic political thought, be it Sunni or Shia, enforces the view that the government has a religious obligation to ensure the well-being of its Moslem subjects; but the ruler, though accountable to God and, at least theoretically, compelled to respect and follow the holy law, was not answerable to his nation. In a famous essay,[11] considered a masterpiece of the new literary genre of social criticism that developed in this period, Mirza Mohammad Khan Sinaki Majd al-Molk argued that the people constituted the raison d'être of the state. Majd al-Molk, an influential, reform-minded official who held several important posts during Naser al-Din shah's reign and was the father of the better known liberal minister Mirza Ali Khan Amin al-Daula, used his acerbic pen to denounce the corruption and incompetence of the Qajar administration and to call for far-reaching reforms at all government levels. Expressing a profound disenchantment with the existing form of bureaucracy and a genuine concern for the nation-wide economic, political, and social decline, he insisted on the government's moral obligation to safeguard the interests and material well-being of its subjects. The people, he believed, formed one of the basic foundations of state power.

Throughout the 1870s, the idea of reforms carried weight in government

circles and at the royal court, as the shah gave free rein to the liberal minister Mirza Hosain Khan Moshir al-Daula, known as the Sepahsalar. Profoundly imbued with the spirit of reforms and inspired by the Ottoman example, which he closely watched while serving at the Iranian embassy in Istanbul, the Sepahsalar rallied round him many of the most outstanding and enterprising young members of the intelligentsia. Chief among them, were Mirza Malkom Khan and Mirza Yusef Khan Mostashar al-Daula (who had collaborated in writing the proposals for reforms which the Sepahsalar submitted to the shah) and Majd al-Molk. As Adamiyat correctly observed, great was the number of reform proposals written in this period; most, however, remained on shelves, never given the slightest chance for consideration, let alone implementation.[12] However, Malkom Khan and Mostashar al-Daula's proposals had some impact as a result of the authors' friendship with the Sepahsalar. Both had spent some time in Western European capitals and in Transcaucasia; both were familiar with the Ottoman reform movement and with modernist trends that were then gaining ground in the Moslem world under Russian rule.

Indicative of the priority he gave to judicial reforms, the Sepahsalar set up a new Ministry of Justice, which he entrusted to the Mostashar al-Daula. Influenced by the Napoleonic Code, which he had translated in part, Mostashar al-Daula carefully worded his proposal for a new codified system. On the one hand, wishing to avoid challenging the shah's authority, he made the judiciary subject to executive power. On the other hand, exercising caution in the face of the olama's sensitivity, he avoided terminology that might run counter to the Islamic conception of the law as God-given, and not man-made. Nonetheless, in practice, the proposed system ensured the independence of the judiciary from the executive. It also allowed the coexistence of separate religious and state courts but granted individuals the right to choose which court to refer to. The Sepahsalar aimed at consolidating the orfi court system, setting a clear demarcation line which the shar'i court would have to accept. The religious courts were not allowed to infringe on matters of public and national affairs.[13]

The olama were alarmed, and their opposition grew and strengthened as political factions opposed to the Sepahsalar were willing to lend them support. They declared Malkom Khan and Mostashar al-Daula heretical and condemned their proposals. In self-defense, the two reformers insisted on the religious respectability of their ideas. They coined the terms "mashrutiyyat" (constitutionalism) and "mashru'iyyat" (from shariat, the holy law) and argued that the two concepts, far from being incompatible, were in fact identical in spirit.[14] This intentionally obscurantist terminology, aimed at masking the non-Islamic Western origins of constitutionalism, was to be picked up by the various groups active in the first phase of the Constitutional Revolution. It was subsequently torn apart by all parties concerned, once the National Assembly was established and heated debates over the formulation and implementation of the constitution began.

Neither these proposals nor the Sepahsalar's effort to implement them bore any fruit. A coalition of olama–government officials hostile to the minister secured his dismissal in 1872. Eventually, Malkom Khan fell in disgrace, chiefly as a result of shady business deals. He lived in self-imposed exile in London, where he established a Persian-language periodical, appropriately called *Qanun* (Law).

This paper, which began publication in 1890, served as a vehicle for the opposition, both lay and religious; Malkom attracted the company of leading figures such as Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and other religious dissidents. His articles sounded the alarm: Iran's extinction as a sovereign nation was imminent unless Qajar despotism was checked, a constitution was established, and a national consultative assembly was convened by popular vote.

A capricious, self-indulging monarch, surrounded by a rapacious aristocracy; incompetent officials competing with one another for self-promotion; general clerical fears of government reforms and innovative policies; Anglo-Russian rivalry in obtaining lucrative concessions for their nationals; not to mention the shaky foundation, and shady deals, of these concessions—all were serious factors contributing to the failure of the reforms undertaken by the state in this period. However, the idea of reform never died, as it found zealous advocates among an increasingly widening circle of reform-minded individuals. Dar al-Fonun, the lay school founded under the auspices of the first genuine reformer, and the only institution that survived the demise of the reform projects of the 1850s to the 1880s, produced new generations of modern, educated Iranians, mostly sons of the aristocracy, court and government officials, and wealthy merchants, who became the champions of the "new learning." Concepts such as patriotism, nationalism, individuals' rights and freedom, equality of all before the law, and representative government gained currency among them. The Sepahsalar's fall from power and the temporary eclipse of other reform-minded officials did not break the spirit of the eighteenth-century European Enlightenment in high government circles. The cause was taken over by a number of other officials, torchbearers of "truth," "reason," "science," "progress," and the rule of the law.

Mirza Ali Khan Amin al-Daula was perhaps the most prominent liberal politician of the last two decades of the nineteenth century. He grew up imbued with the ideals and goals of modernization cultivated by his father, the influential Majd al-Molk, with whom he worked closely in the early years of his career. With his paternal contacts, he readily obtained access to the shah's inner circle, traveling abroad with the shah's entourage. He became involved with major new development projects, such as reforming the postal service in the country, the construction of highways, and reorganizing the government mint system and the state treasury. He also headed a council of ministers, which, it was hoped, would execute government policies more efficiently. He supported Malkom Khan's proposals for political reforms. Amin al-Daula's most cherished project, however, lay in the field of education. While serving in Tabriz, he had met a local teacher, Mirza Hasan Roshdiyya, who, inspired by the modern lay schools he had visited in Russian Transcaucasia, had founded one in his native town. Roshdiyya began his studies in a religious school, wearing the clerical garb and turban, and preparing for a career as a mollah-instructor in a maktab (elementary school). A lasting friendship, based on a common concern for educational reforms, was forged between the aristocratic statesman and the former mollah turned modern educator. In the beginning of Mozaffer al-Din shah's reign, when Amin al-Daula briefly held the post of chief minister, Roshdiyya was invited to Tehran and given all the necessary facilities and funds for the establishment of modern lay schools in the capital.

Amin al-Daula also sponsored a social–cultural club, anjoman-e maʿaref, for the dissemination of the new learning. Other such schools, clubs, and libraries were founded, and their administration was entrusted to advocates of modern education. Amin al-Daula also attempted to curb the judiciary power of the olama, convinced as he was that a government-reformed legal system would compete successfully with sharʿi courts. He reportedly had told the late Naser al-Din shah that following the repeal of the tobacco concession in 1892, the people turned to the olama not out of belief and trust, but because of their lack of trust and ill-treatment at the hands of government officials. Should the government establish a just, smoothly functioning system that protected the people's rights, the olama's influence and jurisdiction would be reduced to matters of mere religious ritual, he added.[15] These views alarmed some of the mojtaheds in the capital, who then readily joined the political factions that intrigued to stage his dismissal in 1898. Amin al-Daula did not live long enough to witness the outbreak of the Constitutional Revolution. Nonetheless, on its eve, he had been instrumental in forging ties among groups of religious dissidents, reform-minded officials, and members of the ruling classes, who were to play a role in the subsequent events.

Reza Qoli Hedayat Mokhber al-Daula, one of the earliest directors of the Dar al-Fonun and a prominent official at Naser al-Din shah's court, sent his teenaged sons, Morteza Qoli Khan Saniʿ al-Daula and Mehdi Qoli Khan Mokhber al-Saltana, to school in Berlin. These future leaders of the Constitutional Revolution were instructed by their father "to acquire knowledge, so that, on your return, people would be in need of you, and not you of them. What is now of great interest in our country is science. Engineering, trigonometry, physics, chemistry, mining. . . . It is whatever contributes to progress that is most worthy of attention."[16] Upon their return to Tehran, the brothers already had secure careers as a result of the social prominence of the Hedayat family, the influence of their father, who was then minister of sciences, the extensive network of colleagues, acquaintances, close and distant relatives, and, in Saniʿ al-Daula's case, access to Mozaffar al-Din shah's intimate circle through marriage to one of his daughters. Both brothers were to skillfully use their social advantages and their acquired knowledge of the new learning to promote not only their careers, but also the cause they championed. They studied in Germany; they were duly impressed with German achievements and the German work ethic and self-discipline. But it was the English model of constitutional monarchy they desired for Iran. They were attracted by the ideas of the Enlightenment but repelled by the excesses of the French Revolution. "The French Revolution seemed to me groundless, even though words such as liberty, equality and, especially fraternity, appealed to me," Mokhber al-Saltana wrote in his memoirs, adding "a republic looks like a school without a headmaster."[17] Fully committed to the task of modernizing their country, the brothers were convinced that political reforms undertaken by them and fellow members of the intelligentsia were needed to ensure its success. Such views were shared by many of their peers, not all of whom were descendents of such an illustrious family of intellectuals.

A member of the Qajar ruling family, Mirza Mahmud Ehtesham al-Saltana[18] studied at the Dar al-Fonun and held prestigious diplomatic positions in St.

Petersburg, Baghdad, Istanbul, and Berlin. He was in charge of settling border disputes with the Ottoman authorities. On the eve of the revolution, he returned to Tehran and joined the small circle of officials who supported the constitutionalist cause. He proved to be the most ardent champion of the new learning and of the secularization of the judicial and educational systems, working closely with members of the lay opposition and with court officials who had switched to the side of the constitutionalists.

Mirza Ibrahim Khan Mo'tamed al-Saltana's two sons, Ahmad Khan Qavam al-Saltana and Hasan Khan Vosuq al-Daula, unlike their peers, had not studied at the Dar al-Fonun. They had received a traditional education in a madrasa in the capital and then studied French and French literature with private tutors. They, too, began their careers in the shadow of their father, who was in charge of finances in Azerbaijan, controlling the government budget. Both were also highly influenced by the ideas of reform cherished by their maternal uncle, Mirza Ali Khan Amin al-Daula. Qavam al-Saltana was especially close to the latter, whom he served as private secretary in 1897–1898. The liberal minister's fall from power did not necessarily result in Ahmad Khan's dismissal. He kept the same post with Ain al-Daula, the conservative Qajar patriarch, who became chief minister and the chief target of the opposition in 1905–1906. It was in this capacity that Ahmad Khan was to join the ranks of the constitutionalists, acting as a liaison between Mohammad Tabataba'i, the constitutionalist mojtahed, and members of his circle of officials favoring political reforms. His brother followed suit.

Two other brothers, Mirza Hasan Khan and Mirza Hosain Khan Pirnia, came from a much more modest social background. Their father, Mirza Nasrollah Khan Moshir al-Daula, was a self-made man, according to his biographer.[19] Born in Nai'in, a small town close to Isfahan, Mirza Nasrollah belonged to a family of local Sufi leaders of modest means. He came to Tehran as a young man, penniless and without contacts, but full of ambition and determination to ensure for himself a brilliant government career. He began with low-paid jobs as a scribe in various ministries, gradually working his way up, attracting the attention and trust of his superiors. He was duly promoted, eventually gaining Amin al-Soltan's favor. It was as a protégé of the latter that Nasrollah Khan finally rose to the level of cabinet minister, put in charge of foreign affairs in 1898, a position he was to keep even after Amin al-Soltan once again fell from power in 1903. His sons were sent abroad to study, Mirza Hasan to Moscow and Mirza Hosain to London and Paris. They joined the government service upon their return. Mirza Hasan first worked to institute a department of political science at the Dar al-Fonun, which essentially offered courses in foreign affairs and foreign governments and politics. He was then appointed minister at the Iranian embassy in St. Petersburg, despite his young age. With the outbreak of events leading to the revolution, he came back to Tehran to support the constitutionalists. He and his brother were able to persuade their father, who was then minister of foreign affairs in Ain al-Daula's cabinet, to secretly switch sides. It was the Moshir al-Daula and his sons who were to negotiate with the constitutionalists camping in the British legation.

A protégé of Moshir al-Daula, Mirza Ismail Khan Momtaz al-Daula,[20] was to follow suit. Born in Tabriz, Momtaz al-Daula was first given a traditional elemen-

tary education in a local maktab. At the age of sixteen, however, he traveled to Istanbul and enrolled in a modern school. He learned French and took some courses at the law school before returning to Iran to join the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His first diplomatic mission was in the Ottoman capital, where he was able to study further the reforms pertaining to the judiciary. He reportedly translated the Ottoman judicial reforms into Persian, hoping to see them applied in Iran as well. In 1904–1905 he was back again in Tehran, promoted to a higher rank, and turned constitutionalist.

A relative of the Moshir al-Daula followed the same steps to promote his career but was to end slightly deviating from the moderate course to constitutionalism adopted by his colleagues. Abolhasan Moʿazed al-Saltana[21] was born in Na'in, into the same modest family of the Pirnias. He studied in the local maktab before going to Najaf to pursue his religious studies in the higher religious institutions of learning. However, within a year he left the holy city, and, with Moshir al-Daula's backing, obtained a position in the government of Tabriz. The mollah-turned-civil servant rapidly rose through the echelons of government service; by the 1890s he had attained the enviable position of the Crown Prince Mozaffar al-Din Mirza's private secretary in charge of secret correspondence. Upon Naser al-Din shah's death, Moʿazed al-Saltana returned to Tehran as a member of the new shah's retinue. He then began a diplomatic career which, again with his relative's support, landed him in Tiflis, then in Baku, as consul general. In the oil capital of the Russian empire, Moʿazed al-Saltana's ideological education truly began. As chief diplomatic representative of the Iranian government, he was in charge of the safety of thousands of Iranian expatriates living in a city torn by religioethnic conflicts. During the notorious bloody massacres of February and August 1905, Moʿazed al-Saltana joined the local Azerbaijani defense force, assuming a leading role in its organization. This activity brought him into contact with the liberal, reform-minded Hajj Zain al-Abedin Taqiev, the Moslem oil and shipping magnate of Baku, and with members of the Russian Azerbaijani intelligentsia. At that time, both the radical and the moderate factions collaborated under the auspices of the wealthy Moslem bourgeoisie. Upon his return to Iran, Moʿazed al-Saltana turned constitutionalist and was to be most active with the Tabriz radicals, forming a lasting friendship and collaboration with Hasan Taqizada.

One of the better known students of the Dar al-Fonun, Mirza Abbas Qoli Khan Qazvini, who later assumed the surname of Adamiyat, formed a small though important secret society on the eve of the revolution.[22] Recruiting members from among the school's graduates and the government and court officials who espoused the liberal ideals of the French Enlightenment, the jamaʿa ye or majmaʿ-e adamiyat (Society of Humanity), which he directed, basically adopted Malkom Khan's views of reforms deemed necessary to rescue the nation from extinction allegedly caused by political and religious despotism. Ehtesham al-Saltana, Saniʿ al-Daula and his brother Mokhber al-Saltana, and Mirza Javad Khan Saʿd al-Daula figured among its most active members. Saʿd al-Daula held high positions in the government, after nearly a decade serving as the Iranian envoy in Brussels. In the early 1900s he was appointed minister of commerce, a post he held until he clashed with Joseph Naus, the Belgian official hired by

Amin al-Daula to restructure the customs and postal tax system. Following Amin al-Daula's dismissal from office, Naus continued to be employed by the Iranian government, enjoying the support of Amin al-Soltan and his successor, Ain al-Daula. Court intrigues and his open hostility to Naus led to Sa'd al-Daula's dismissal, forcing him to seek asylum in the British consulate in Yazd. He had nonetheless kept his ties with Mirza Abbas Qoli Khan and his society, resurfacing in Tehran with the outbreak of the revolution. He was to play a leading role—indeed, that of chief architect—in the formulation and promulgation of the constitution. The constitutionalists were to choose the Belgian constitution as the model to emulate.

Conflicts of interest and ideological disputes were to split the ranks of the Society of Humanity. Sa'd al-Daula would eventually defect to the royalist camp; the two Qajar brothers, Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, Dar al-Fonun graduates recruited by Mirza Abbas Qoli Khan, were to move in the opposite direction and join the ranks of the more radical elements during the fierce debate over the supplement to the constitution.

Wellborn citizens and government officials, whether in or out of office, formed the backbone of the intelligentsia involved in the revolution. However, the intelligentsia also included individuals with more modest family background, who did not hold public office, or, if they did, for a brief period only. Though they lacked the social influence that came by birthright and the access to power that came with a career in the civil service, they were to rapidly gain national prominence through the newspapers they founded and the articles they regularly published. The professional politicians and statesmen were to be the main architects of the constitution; the men of the pen were to be the collective public conscience, ensuring its survival while simultaneously calling for national allegiance to it.

Mirza Ali Akbar Qazvini, known by his nom de plume Dehkhoda (sometimes Dehkho), was truly the best major literary star who rose with the constitutional movement. Born in Tehran to a small land-owning family of Qazvin, he grew up in the capital in the 1880s and 1890s, exposed to all the intellectual trends that prevailed at that time. Having lost his father at the age of nine, and left penniless as a result of the embezzlement of the family estate by his guardian's relatives, he received his elementary education free of charge, in the neighborhood maktab, with a friendly mollah. Upon completion of his basic studies in the traditional disciplines, he regularly attended the private, informal lectures of Shaikh Hadi Najmabadi, the mojtahed declared heretical for his alleged Azali Babist sympathies, who also lived in the neighborhood. Dehkhoda felt greatly indebted to the open-minded cleric for having "strengthened my intellect."[23] As we shall see, Dehkhoda's views of Islam to a large extent echoed those of Najmabadi, Asadabadi, and other religious dissidents who were in favor of adopting the new learning and were critical of the olama's general traditional approach to religion and culture.

Dehkhoda then enrolled in the newly opened department of political science at the Dar al-Fonun, where he also studied French and was introduced to the ideas of the French Enlightenment. After graduation, he joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which sent him to the Balkans and Vienna. He returned two years later and accepted a position as translator and deputy to a Belgian engineer

contracted to construct a highway in Khorasan, on lands owned by Hajj Mohammad Hosain Amin al-Zarb, a wealthy and influential merchant. Barely six months later Dehkhoda resigned to collaborate with Mirza Jahangir Khan Shirazi in founding, editing, and contributing to the newspaper *Sur-e Israfil,* which was to become the voice of the more radical constitutionalists and the best paper published during the period of the first majles. It was financed by Mirza Qasem Khan, a wealthy Tabrizi. Jahangir Khan was a native of Shiraz, an alleged Azali Babi turned nationalist, secularist, and constitutionalist, like most other former Azalis who played a role in revolution. However, unlike them, he did not wear the clerical garb and turban; nor did he attempt to associate or work with the olama to achieve his ends.

The term intelligentsia commonly refers to modern educated lay intellectuals, or other professionals, committed to the cause of modernization and secular nationalism. However, as already stated, intellectuals in premodern Iran generally wore the turban as a sign of their learned status. Many mollahs, especially those of middle rank, continued to do so during the period of the revolution, even though they began to substitute modern professions, such as journalism, for traditional preaching and religious ritualistic recitals, adopting the newspaper as a vehicle for the dissemination of their views. Thus, quite a number of the papers most dedicated to modern reforms and constitutionalism were edited by such "turbaned" men of the pen. *Habl al-Matin,* originally published in Calcutta years before the revolution and considered the most important Persian paper of the opposition in exile, was edited by Mo'ayyed al-Islam; *Ruznama-ye Majles* by Sadeq Tabataba'i (the constitutionalist mojtahed Mohammad Tabataba'i's son), who was not to abandon his clerical garb until after the period of the first majles; *Nedaye Vatan* by Majd al-Islam; *Roh al-Qods* by Soltan al-Olama; *Kaukab al-Darri* by Nazem al-Islam; *Tadayyon* by Fakhr al-Islam. Most of these editors lacked journalistic experience when they ventured into this new profession. Despite their loud proclamation that they meant to serve Truth, their chief purpose was to win support for their ideas. Hence, the burgeoning Iranian press of the constitutional period was essentially comprised of journals of opinion. The press was primarily put at the service of the sociocultural revolution it wished to undertake. And it was from within the ranks of this press that the "war cry" against the "ancient" was to be heard loudest. But here again, the peculiar socioreligious climate then prevailing in Iran dulled its resonance and garbled its message. The writers knew that any attempt at openly declaring war to abolish the concrete symbols of the values and customs of their society would be defeated. Eager as they were to dispel any charges of heresy, they were compelled to revert to Islamic rhetoric, symbols, and images. And the gap between myth and reality, the outward and the hidden meaning of the message, was to be rendered even more problematic.

The Merchants

The merchants[24] generally enjoyed a good working relationship with the shah and his government and with the provincial governors. They were given almost

total freedom of action in return for expected contributions in cash and kind, not as taxes but as gifts. The shah appointed in each city or town a malek al-tojjar, or chief merchant, to represent the local mercantile community. The office, which usually was hereditary within the same prominent family, was honorary; the malek al-tojjar was not paid a salary and did not belong to any government department. He acted as the mediator between the merchants and the authorities as well as the foreign merchants. He settled disputes between merchants and negotiated claims of creditors in cases of bankruptcy. The malek al-tojjar of the capital was regarded as superior to his provincial counterparts, having access to the center of political power. In fact, he often advised the shah and his officials on economic issues. The merchants had the wherewithal to advance loans to the government and the court. They also sponsored and financed the construction of bridges, bazaars, caravansaries, canals, schools, and mosques.

The merchants traded in manufactured goods and agricultural produce, in domestic and foreign markets. But trade was only one of their businesses. They were also the "bankers," in the traditional Iranian sense. Together with the sarrafs, or moneychangers, they controlled all money transactions in the country and financed many small-town bazaar activities. They handled letters of credit, commercial papers, and buying and selling bills in foreign capitals. They remitted payments in cash within the country and abroad, and they exchanged currencies—a slow and complicated process, since they were forbidden to deal with gold and silver was increasingly depreciating in value in the European markets. Wealthy merchants also invested in land, cultivating cash crops for export, especially raw silk, cotton, and opium. They controlled the distribution of agricultural produce, and, by periodically hoarding some crops, controlled its market price as well.

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, new socioeconomic and political conditions created tension between the court and the merchants, a tension that was to lead to the merchants' participation in the Constitutional Revolution. The merchants' lack of sufficient capital to expand their international trade; the archaic monetary system that no longer suited—and sometimes even hampered—mercantile activities in the world markets; the decline of local industries, which lost the ability to compete with the foreign manufactured goods that were flooding the Iranian bazaars; the absence of means to protect life and property; the bad roads and inadequate transport systems—these serious grievances all contributed to the merchants' increasing participation in national politics. Foreign merchants, not surprisingly, shared with their Iranian competitors an identical list of grievances, but they enjoyed extraterritorial rights and privileges, which the natives bitterly resented. Russia was the first to extract these rights from a defeated Iranian government. The treaties of Golistan (1813) and Turkmanchai (1828) forced the shah to grant Russian subjects complete immunity from prosecution in Iranian courts and the right to travel and trade freely, having to pay a uniform 5 percent ad valorem duty on imported or exported goods. Britain quickly demanded the same privileges for its citizens; other European nations followed suit. The Iranian merchants, who were subjected to road taxes and various imposts in addition to a flat 3 percent ad valorem duty, were at a disadvantage.

While foreign trade, especially Russian and British, was expanding rapidly, Iranian merchants set about learning and emulating the European system of international economics. The process was not free of risks; many a merchant learned his harsh lesson. In the 1830s, for instance, Tabriz merchants with business contacts in Istanbul used credit to finance huge imports of European goods, for which there were no buyers in the Iranian market. In 1837 many went bankrupt, destroying the Istanbul firms with which they dealt and seriously impairing Iranian merchants' credit in the Ottoman capital. Such circumstances created an ideal situation for a foreign firm to establish local businesses by disbursing ample funds through good international commercial networks. In the late 1830s, the trading house of Ralli was founded in Tabriz. Owned by a Greek-born naturalized Russian resident of Istanbul, who later became a British subject, it had offices in Manchester, Marseilles, and Odessa. By offering generous credits and concessions, it was able to win over the reluctant Tabriz merchants, and, with their cooperation and their facilities, it rapidly spread its imports to the main cities in Iran. Lacking capital and international credit, some individual Iranian merchants became agents for foreign firms. Others, seeking extraterritorial rights and fiscal advantages granted to foreign nationals, became naturalized Russian or British subjects.

But the Iranian merchants, shrewd and quick enough to seize any occasion for financial gain, were neither shortsighted nor oblivious to the fact that serious nationwide problems and obstacles could, and should, be removed in order for them to attain wealth and status equal to their foreign competitors'. They favored and encouraged public and private debates on issues pertaining to national economic development. During the Sepahsalar's term of office in the 1860s and early 1870s, essays on the subject were circulated freely in court and government circles; articles were published in the Tehran official gazette. Generally nationalist and moralist in tone, these essays deplored the abject poverty prevailing in the rural areas and the rampant unemployment in the urban centers, condemning the widespread illiteracy that kept the nation in a state of overwhelming ignorance. Reminding the government of its moral obligation to help in alleviating these ills, the authors expressed their strong conviction that prosperous trade was the nation's road to wealth and power. They called on the government to formulate economic policies promoting domestic and international trade, favoring Iranian merchants while restricting foreign competition. They urged the adoption of European banking style and the formation of typically European commercial companies paying dividends to shareholders, who invest their capital for joint ventures.

It is interesting to note here that in 1872, when the shah granted the British entrepreneur Baron Julius Reuter a major concession, which was backed by both Malkom Khan and the Sepahsalar, the major merchants in Tehran fully endorsed it. The concession, in Lord Curzon's famous words, was "the most complete and extraordinary surrender of the entire industrial resources of a kingdom into foreign hands that has probably ever been dreamt of, much less accomplished, in history."[25] In addition to the right to explore and exploit all mineral resources of the country, it allowed the establishment of a bank with exclusive rights to issue banknotes as well as the construction of roads and railroads. The big merchants

stood to gain from this gigantic project, which attracted foreign capital and technology but could not be successfully undertaken without their full participation. They refused to go along when a court–olama coalition opposed the concession. Nonetheless, the shah was forced to repeal it in 1873, and the Sepahsalar fell from office. A group of merchants then reportedly volunteered to take over the project of economic development as originally proposed in the ill-fated concession, but with no success.

The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed the growth of a mercantile bourgeoisie born out of the European economic penetration of the country. It became increasingly self-assertive in demanding the government's attention to the urgent problems of national economic development. At first, Naser al-Din shah seemed to lend his enthusiastic support to some suggestions offered by this group. Indeed, in 1884, he allowed the formation of a Council of Merchants in Tehran, with branches in all major cities and towns. Each council was composed of prominent merchants elected by the local mercantile community, freely and without any interference on the part of the political authorities. The Council of Tehran set up the rules and regulations to be uniformly applied by all.

Proclaiming the merchants' representatives truly represented the people, the council viewed itself as a board of trustees, self-appointed to oversee national economic development on the one hand and to defend national interests against foreign encroachment on the other. As the voice of the people, and as the organ of a profession on whose activities national survival totally depended, it also gave itself the right to criticize government officials. In a series of documents[26] submitted to the shah, the council assessed the general state of economic decline, for which they held the government, past and present, responsible. While sparing the shah from harsh personal attacks, the merchants mercilessly criticized officials and provincial governors. Government officials in the capital and in the provinces, they asserted, regarded their offices as means to plunder the nation's wealth and subject the people to extortionate demands. Incompetent, irresponsible, and neglectful of their duties, such officials had to be dismissed and replaced by knowledgeable experts.

Deploring the special privileges granted to foreign merchants, the council demanded equal treatment, the abolition of road taxes, and the right to pay a one-time, flat rate for their export–import merchandise. It called for government protectionist measures that would curb foreign competition and promote domestic trade and industry. For instance, it suggested a ban on import of some foreign manufactured goods for a few years, until the domestic industries had time to improve their productivity, qualitatively and quantitatively, to a competitive level. It also requested a ban on the import of unnecessary manufactured goods, recalling the disastrous year of 1837, when many Tabriz merchants went bankrupt as a result of massive stocks of unsold goods. Finally, the council asked the government's help in the construction of roads and railroads and in establishing a small Iranian commercial bank, modeled after the European system.

The council gave itself the right to found new industries, importing machinery from Europe to exploit mineral resources, and to issue and control commercial papers, letters of credit, and bills, to settle bad debts and bankruptcy cases; it also forbade the use of foreign banknotes and coins. Of greater significance to

the merchants' rising power was the council's decision regarding commercial deeds. It had given top priority to ensuring safety of property and life, by preventing embezzlement, cheating, confiscation or usurpation of property, and dispossession of lawful owners through coercive means. It proposed the establishment of a bureau of registration for all sale, purchase, and lease of land, including waqf (charity endowment) land, and for all commercial enterprises. No sale, purchase, or lease of land would be considered legal if it was not registered at the proper bureau, with the documents bearing its official seal. This decision constituted a sharp departure from traditional legal practice. The religious courts and the mojtahed's personal seal had legalized all commercial transactions. The council declared the bureau of registration had to have the documents subsequently sealed before they were recognized as fully legal. Moreover, the council extended its jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the commercial life of the country, contending that its authority superseded that of the shar'i courts, even over commercial litigation cases. It conceded to the government the power to enforce any council legal decisions that involved government employees or members of the religious class.

The Council of Merchants was in fact moving in the direction that ultimately would lead to the laicization of the commercial penal code. The shah endorsed the merchants' proposals and ordered elections for such councils to be held in all the provincial towns. He also issued a command to all government officials and governors to refrain from intervening in commercial affairs. Tabriz was the last to see these elections take place. A strong opposition, led by the local mojtahed, was backed by many discontended elements who stood to lose most with the establishment of such a powerful council. Support also came from the capital and other provinces, and the opposition rapidly spread in most towns. Amin al-Soltan, the chief minister, and two powerful Qajar princes—Zell al-Soltan, the governor of Isfahan, and Nayeb al-Saltana, the governor of Tehran—together with other court and government officials, finally succeeded in convincing the shah to abolish the council in Tehran and the provinces and repeal all the new laws it enacted. The council had lasted barely a year.

The idea of a Council of Merchants, invested with absolute authority to oversee the economic life of the country, was doomed, given the nature of the Iranian sociopolitical power structure. A handful of big merchants, no matter how wealthy and influential, could not succeed in radically altering a system that, in practice though not in theory, tolerated neither centralization of power nor even a rigid delineation of spheres of influence. The orfi–shar'i dual court system, as already stated, was not sharply defined. Similarly, trade and commercial endeavors were not exclusive to the merchants; many prominent members of the ruling political elite engaged in commerce and diverse financial enterprises. Zell al-Soltan headed the list; Sa'd al-Daula and Sani' al-Daula, two leading government officials, had vested interests in several commercial and industrial deals. A great number of civil servants and members of the religious classes similarly participated in the economic life of the country. Consequently, any attempt on the part of the merchants to restrict these activities would encounter opposition from all sides.

The big merchants' political defeat did not hamper their financial successes. Hajj Mohammad Hasan Amin al-Zarb, the wealthiest and most powerful merchant of Iran at that time, who had controlled the Council of Merchants, continued to enjoy the shah's full trust and support. In fact, Naser al-Din shah ordered that the merchant should be given all the facilities to import machinery from Europe and set up his factories. Amin al-Zarb invested capital in industry and diversified commercial enterprises, including construction of roads and railroads and gas and electrical power plants. He traded with the Middles East, Europe, Russia, Asia, including China; and he had agencies in London, Paris, Istanbul, Cairo, Beirut, and Marseilles. He owned land not only in Iran but also in Russia. He handled vast money transactions involving foreigners, and he carried out banking operations throughout Iran and abroad. For a while he also was in charge of the royal mint; hence his title. His son Hajj Mohammad Hosain Amin al-Zarb carried on the family business upon his death in 1896, inheriting the title and appointment as custodian of the royal mint. Both Amin al-Zarbs, father and son, proved to be staunch supporters of reform-minded officials, intellectuals, and religious dissidents, with whom they shared a common desire for sociopolitical and economic reforms. As burgeoning capitalists, they were attracted to the ideas of nationalism, liberalism, and the separation of religion from politics. They knew Asadabadi personally, and they mixed with his circle of followers in Tehran. In the early 1900s, Hajj Mohammad Hosain also financed the liberals' projects for new schools, a public library, and cultural clubs for the dissemination of the new learning.

Several other merchants, though not as wealthy or as powerful as the Amin al-Zarb father and son, played a leading role in the development of the Iranian economy and its involvement in the world capitalist system. Hajj Mohammad Kazem Malek al-Tojjar of Tehran, who enjoyed Russian protection, and Hajj Mohammed Ismail Maghaza'i of Tabriz and Hajj Aqa Mohammad Mo'in al-Tojjar of Bushehr, who enjoyed British protection, ranked among the most active entrepreneurs, with business offices in Europe, Russia, and the Middle East. The Tumaniants brothers owned one of the largest business firm that dealt with export–import, banking, and farming, and which played an important part in the economic life of the country. The Tumaniants family was Armenian from Tabriz; family members reportedly were Russian subjects. The Zoroastrian trading community was led by the Jahanian and the Jamshidian families, who had extensive contacts with fellow Zoroastrians among the Parsees of India. The Parsee merchants, as British subjects, traded extensively with Iran, independently or as agents for British firms, often as partners with Moslem Iranian merchants. Non-Moslem merchants also supported liberal reform projects, and, in fact, were to financially back the constitutionalists before and after the establishment of the first majles. They were especially interested in promoting Moslem preachers who propagated the idea of equality before the law and in sponsoring the publication of newspapers that advocated nationalism, liberalism, and secularism. Moslem preachers' services were also sought by wealthy Moslem merchants, who wished to see their firms and their manufactured products promoted in the mosque sermons. One such leading firm, the sherkat-e islami

(Islamic Company), was founded in Isfahan in the late 1890s by Hajj Mohammad Hosain Kazeruni and his partners. The company was one of the earliest established in Iran that closely followed the Western capitalist system. Among its shareholders, Zell al-Soltan, the governor, and Aqa Najafi, the mojtahed, figured prominently. Kazeruni had acquired for his company the religious sanction of the leading mojtaheds of Najaf, and he hired Seyyed Jamal al-Din Va'ez and Malek al-Motakallemin, two of the best preacher–orators of the time, to advertise it in their sermons.

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, business was flourishing for the entrepreneurial class in Iran. "The 1880s," writes a Soviet scholar, "saw the appearance of the first national, united, merchant capital investment, engaged in large-scale internal and foreign trade. . . . The rise of trading and banking companies and societies was not accidental; they began to appear even in the smaller towns."[27] National capital was indispensable for the financing of large commercial operations. Some of the merchants were wealthy enough, whereas others found the idea of companies with shareholders a pragmatic way to pool individuals' funds; the sarrafs' traditional banking operations also boomed. Despite the boom, foreign competition kept increasing, and the government was less and less willing, or simply unable, to help in protecting national economic interests. Worsening conditions created tensions between the court and the merchants.

Increasing expenditures and decreasing revenues kept the central treasury in a state of perpetual deficit. The shah's extravagant trips to Europe, generous allowances and pensions paid to members of the royal family and high government officials, and inflated costs of running state affairs kept the treasury empty. Bad crops, periodic famines and epidemics, a poorly administered fiscal system, and rapacious provincial officials who sent to Tehran a fraction of the local taxes kept government revenues to a record low. The practice of granting concessions to foreign firms in return for cash advance, along with contracting loans from foreign governments and banks, merely exacerbated the problem. Servicing debt and remitting compensation for repealed concessions were added burdens for a depleted treasury, which further alienated the merchants. They formed a united front and opposed the tobacco concession, which the shah was forced to cancel in 1892. Moreover, foreign governments demanded guaranteed revenues as security for the loans. Customs revenues being the best guarantee, the Iranian government was advised to entrust the task of administrative and fiscal reforms of the customs system to Belgian experts. Joseph Naus was hired. Improved conditions helped to increase the revenues but failed to solve the government's dire financial problems. More importantly, new customs regulations, though beneficial to the merchants in some ways, in others merely succeeded in further antagonizing them.

The merchants' economic position was also severely challenged by the establishment in Tehran of the British and Russian banks. Although they had been in favor of a modern Western system of banking, the merchants deeply resented the monopoly the foreign banks acquired. The British Imperial Bank, founded in 1890, had the sole right to issue banknotes, to mention only one of the privileges it obtained from the Iranian government. Shortly afterwards, the Russian Discount and Loan Bank was established, competing with the British

in the lucrative Iranian financial market. The Iranian merchants concentrated their efforts in opposing European influence by performing their own banking operations, but they failed to attain their goals. Nor did they succeed in changing their old sarraf method. The Constitutional Revolution was to give them the opportunity to bring about the sociopolitical changes they deemed necessary for the promotion of their own mercantile interests and the economic development of the nation.

Contact with the West aroused not only the sociopolitical and cultural consciousness of the intelligentsia but also, more importantly, the interest of the mercantile class, which dominated the economic life of the country. Western capitalism, as practiced by European firms and concessionaires dealing with Iran in the second half of the nineteenth century, dramatically altered the Iranian merchants' thinking. Foreign competition, which they fiercely combated, paradoxically, caused the emergence of a new breed of internationally oriented capitalist entrepreneurs, who were quick to realize the golden opportunities for amassing great personal fortunes awaiting them with the opening of Iran to the West.

While the intelligentsia was attracted to and wrote about the sociopolitical ideals of the Enlightenment, the merchants and the more enterprising members of the intelligentsia were fascinated with the idea of economic liberalism and laissez faire. Reading through the available literature on the subject during that period, one cannot but be struck by the fact that the Iranian merchants, and the intellectuals who defended their mercantile interests, while resisting foreign competition, ultimately sought not to halt the European economic penetration but to firmly control it themselves. Just as the intelligentsia wished to adopt Western science and thought and adapt aspects of the Western parliamentary system of government, the merchants were no less eager to import Western technology and financial and industrial know-how. Foreign nationals were invited to teach in newly founded schools; foreign expertise was sought to reform the armed forces and the government fiscal system; and foreign trade firms were to be emulated.

Attempts at reform, as undertaken by Amir Kabir, Sepahsalar, Amin al-Daula, or the Council of Merchants, had failed. Both the intelligentsia and the merchants realized that in order for them to ensure the sociocultural and economic development they wished for Iran, they had to restructure, or, to be more accurate, to institute a new form of government that would effectively enforce the rule of the law. The law they envisioned was Western in conception, though not all dared to admit it openly. Regardless of their personal religious beliefs, they unanimously insisted on the laicization of the educational and judicial systems, leaving to the shar'i court and the olama jurisdiction over matters pertaining only to religious, not public, affairs. Many proposals and essays written in the second half of the nineteenth century broached the idea of a strong, highly centralized government. These manuscripts mostly were left on shelves to gather dust as Naser al-Din shah and his successor, Mozaffar al-Din shah, lost interest in national development projects. These proposals viewed the state as morally obligated to guarantee national education, to promote and protect national trade and industry, to ensure safety of life and property, to

grant all its subjects equality before the law, regardless of their social background. A government that enforces the just rule of the law, it was believed, would "cut off the hand of tyranny."[28] Even the monarch would have to abide by it.

The intelligentsia and the nascent capitalist bourgeoisie, in pursuing their objectives, ultimately aimed at the laicization of society, were to attract the staunch and active support of lower ranking members of the religious classes, some individual open-minded mojtaheds, and the religious dissidents.

3

The Religious Dissidents

Imani Shi'ism dominated Iranian thought for centuries, proving to be an important vehicle for intellectual continuity and change. In a remarkable fashion, despite the great hostility the established orthodox leadership displayed toward heterodox views, especially in the Safavid and Qajar periods, it had accommodated novel, sometimes radical, ideas propounded by progressive-minded men in revolt against the alleged "stifling narrow-mindedness" of the official religion. It kept a door open to divergent outlooks that reflected the changing conditions and mood of the time, and thus it periodically offered a more or less direct challenge to the conservative views of the sociocultural establishment.

Dissent in Iranian intellectual life was almost always expressed in terms of the sociopolitical situation of the age.[1] In the Safavid and early Qajar periods, when individual consciousness and identity were indistinguishable from the Shia consciousness, both at he "mass" and "elite" levels, mystics and philosophers channeled their opposition exclusively into metaphysics and theology, aiming at the orthodox olama's intellectual dominance. The Shaikhi reform movement, progressive as far as the dogma was concerned, was politically and socially conservative, reinforcing the traditional elitist conception of knowledge and leadership. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the Babi episode represented the tradition of messianic revolts in Iranian history as well as the beginning of radicalization and socialization of religious dissent.

In 1844 a young merchant from Shiraz, Mirza Ali Mohammad, known as the Bab (1819–1850), founded a religious movement of revolt against the teaching and leadership of the high-ranking Shia olama. The movement transformed some of the ideas of different schools of Shia thought, considered unorthodox, into a concrete program of action. Encountering hostility, followed very rapidly by persecution from the clerical authorities and finally imprisonment, the Bab raised the standard of revolt against the state as well. His followers, who regarded him as the Prophet in his own right, led the insurrections and fought fiercely in bloody battles against government forces. Hundreds died martyrs for the cause. Babism, as the new religion came to be known, by no means constituted a modern, liberal movement with democratic ideals. On the contrary, it sought to establish a theocracy, a reign of the saints on earth, in the tradition of Shia messianic tendencies, which, for centuries in the pre-Safavid, and post-Safavid periods, had been restrained by the established religious hierarchy.

The new religion appealed to potential adherents through its insistence on the evolutionary nature of divine revelations, which correspond to human evolu-

tionary development, and on the fact that there can be no end to the prophetic cycles, that religious laws have to be altered, some abrogated and replaced by more perfect laws capable of adapting religion to the time and circumstances. With these innovations, in addition to the reforms instituted, such as lifting the ban on usury, allowing women to mix with men in public, the adoption of Persian over Arabic as the holy language and of a new Iranian calendar that accommodated ancient Iranian festivals, and the proclamation of Iranian centers of pilgrimage to replace those in Arabia and Iraq, Babism constituted a revolutionary social movement irreconcilably hostile to the established political and religious order. Moreover, the strong laicization trends implicit in the Babi system—which aimed at destroying the clerical hierarchy and its power by declaring its positions obsolete, or unlawful, and its functions taken over by laymen—proved to be extremely appealing to those members of the religious institutions who traditionally rebelled against the authority and social influence of the mojtaheds. It was no accident that most of the converts came, at least at the beginning, from the lower ranks of the religious institutions.

With the death of the Bab, the nascent community of believers rapidly split into two sects. The majority sect accepted the leadership of Mirza Hosain Ali Nuri Baha'ollah, who, within a few years after the Bab's death, proclaimed a new dispensation and undertook the immense task of transforming primitive Babism into a universal faith. A small minority sect followed the leadership of Mirza Yahya Nuri Sobh-e Azal, Baha'ollah's half-brother, who remained faithful to the militant spirit of original Babism. While the Bahais adopted an apolitical attitude toward the state, the Azalis carried on the struggle against the Qajars, practicing taqiyya to escape persecution and undertake their subservient underground activities.

Because of their practice of taqiyya, it is difficult, sometimes impossible, for the historian to identify the Azalis as such. However, a careful analysis of their political views and activities leads to the definitive conclusion that the Azalis had expediently transformed their call for doctrinal reforms and institutional changes into a broader, nationalist political revolution. By the 1890s no known Azali was fighting for the rule of Sobh-e Azal; nor was there any attempt at instituting radical religious reforms comparable to those of their hated rivals, the Bahais. In fact, the Azalis retained their membership in the olama groups, studied with established mojtaheds, and kept their Islamic identity, complete with the turban and religious garb symbolic of their Shia olama status. Thus, they met with other types of religious dissidents within the Shia religious institutions in Iran and Iraq. Some were secretly freethinkers; others were merely disenchanted with prevailing traditionalism and more open to change. Many were philosophically or mystically inclined, and therefore belonged to olama groups that traditionally suffered persecution at the hands of the mojtaheds. Those members of the religious institutions here termed religious dissidents came to form a group that, despite noticeable disparity in their thought and in their ideological coherence and consistency, nevertheless shared one ultimate goal, the curtailing of the power and social influence of the mojtaheds.

By the end of the nineteenth century, with the arrival of fresh ideas from the West and the simultaneous rise of national consciousness, Shia dissent was effec-

tively secularized. Appalled by their nation's scientific and political backwardness, the dissidents turned against the traditional sciences of theology, metaphysics, and mysticism on the one hand, and against the traditional Qajar power structure on the other. By the extreme force and vehemence of their convictions, they succeeded in turning purely religious disputes into a political and social movement for change.

One must bear in mind that in premodern Iran, and in the Moslem world generally, education was obtained almost exclusively in religious schools, the maktabs (elementary schools) and the madrasas (higher institutions of learning), or privately, with individual religious teachers. The tollab, students in the religious schools, pursued their intellectual interests with different types of religious scholars. Not all of them aspired to a feqh-oriented career; many rejected this exclusive, traditionalist approach to knowledge. Some increasingly turned their attention to social and political causes, without necessarily rejecting Islam as a faith. The mosque and the madrasa proved to be effective forums for the dissemination of new ideas. Their walls harbored devout religious scholars, or would-be scholars, as well as political activists, sociocultural conservatives, and the new radicals. However, effective though they may have been in organizing underground networks and mastering, as they indeed did, the art of manipulation, the dissidents lacked the social status, power, and funds necessary to mobilize and lead the masses. Fearing takfir and desiring legitimacy for their struggle against the Qajar government, they exploited fully the latent hostility and potential conflicts inherent in the Shia doctrine of the Imamate.

It was no accident that the demand for greater olama participation in Iranian politics and the idea that the mojtaheds' authority, by divine right, overrules the shah's were first enunciated by the religious dissidents. At the time of the revolt against the tobacco concession in 1891–1892, neither Mirza Mohammad Hasan Shirazi nor Mirza Hasan Ashtiani (or any other high-ranking cleric in Iran) ever laid claim to political authority. It was Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and his disciples, especially those living in exile, who used the idea as an incentive for the quietist, apolitical religious leaders living in Iraq and Iran. In London, Malkom Khan, the Iranian former government official who closely collaborated with Asadabadi and other religious dissidents, published in his newspaper, *Qanun,* a strong message to the olama. The olama of Islam, he wrote, have all the power to arouse Moslem public opinion against "the instrument of tyranny" (that is, the Qajar government), to rescue the Islamic government from the clutches of the "nation-devouring beasts," and to restore "the creed of divine justice"—all this without bloodshed, relying on the power of the Word. "The attainment of this great blessing today lies in the hands of the learned men of religion," he argued, urging them to destroy the "root of tyranny" and revive religion and the Islamic government. One fatwa would suffice.[2] In a subsequent issue of the paper, Malkom Khan called for the establishment of a national consultative assembly where the olama, together with members of the Iranian intelligentsia, would determine the rights and limitations of the government and the nation in accordance with the holy law.[3]

Neither Asadabadi, the Shia religious dissident, nor Malkom Khan, the Armenian-born Moslem convert lay politician, was interested in theocracy, or

even in an olama-dominated government. By the early 1890s Asadabadi had already acquired in the Moslem world and in Europe a solid reputation as a champion of Moslem unity against the imperialist powers and Moslem despotic governments. However, as Nikki Keddie explained in her extensive biography, Jamal al-Din's defense of Islam had "very little content that can be called religious"; it was "designed rather to create political unity and solidarity."[4] Asadabadi believed, as did many dissidents and reformers, be they turbaned or lay, that mass appeal could be successful only in the name of religion, rational argument being understood by very few educated individuals. Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani, the Azali living in exile in Istanbul, explicitly stated to Malkom Khan that he shared Asadabadi's view. One could, "up to a certain extent," he wrote in a letter, make use of the support of this "half-alive" class of mollah to attain one's own goal. He was convinced that the olama would be an improvement over the despised Qajars as leaders of the nation, provided they were duly initiated into the arts of politics and worldly affairs. They might even excel in these arts within a few months, he added.[5]

The dissidents believed the olama were the effective instrument for the destruction of the Qajar government and the old political order. With the establishment of a new system in the name of religion, the old socioreligious order would be destroyed. Jamal al-Din's instructions to his disciples were quite clear. "We do not cut the head of religion except with the sword of religion."[6]

The three-hour-long riot that erupted in Tehran on January 4, 1892, saw the extremist underground networks in action. Pamphlets posted on the walls and leaflets distributed in the streets threatened to shed the blood of the "tyrants," be they crowned or turbaned. Two of the writers of these inflammatory materials, when arrested, were suspected of being Babis.[7] As noted in the previous chapter, the unruly mob, reported by various sources to range from some twenty to three thousand people, frightened both government officials and religious leaders. It caused Ashtiani to cooperate with the government forces to restore order in the capital, asking the crowd to dissipate while concluding the negotiations with the court. Threats of violence, Adamiyat explains, succeeded only in consolidating the strong bonds, based on mutual dependence, that traditionally united the two centers of power.[8] By the same token, one must add here, such a rapprochement, caused in part by the olama's natural distaste for, if not fear of, heresy and sedition, induced the opposition to deny all charges of heresy and insist on the respectability and legitimacy of their religious views.

The repeal of the tobacco concession cost the nation dearly. It forced the government to contract loans from foreign banks to pay back the company. Heavy taxes were levied to service the debts. Of more disastrous consequence to the producers and consumers of tobacco alike was the fact that the Iranian merchants exploited their victory, buying the crops from the farmers at a price far below that offered by the British traders. Nazem al-Islam conceded that the cancellation of the concession proved onerous. But he insisted that the newly merging national consciousness and the people's realization of their own power amply compensated for the financial losses. The nation, he wrote, set aside religious conflicts and formed a united front to force the government to reconsider its policy.[9]

Indeed, it was the group of religious dissidents, rather than the religious leaders, who, in alliance with lay reformers and the discontended elements from among the ruling elite, sustained the opposition to the Qajar government. In their private correspondence and writings, the religious dissidents expressed their desire to continue with their strategy, the 1891–1892 events having demonstrated the benefits and usefulness of the clerical leadership when guided to the right cause. As early as September 1893, Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani wrote from Istanbul to Malkom Khan in London, one must make use of the olama "as long as they are in a dancing mood."[10]

In Tehran, Asadabadi's followers established a secret society which, though officially adhering to his pan-Islamic ideal, in fact was nationalist oriented. The society secretly worked to undermine the shah's despotic rule and to awaken the nation. Its membership included Hadi Daulatabadi, who was then recognized as the heir to Sobh-e Azal, leader of the Azali Babis; Hajj Mohammad Ali Mahallati, known as Sayyah, the world traveler and religious dissident; Shaikh Hadi Najmabadi, the ranking religious leader of Tehran and alleged Azali Babi, who was forced to give up his mosque by the olama in the capital; and Mirza Reza Kermani, the fanatic devotee of Asadabadi. They maintained close contacts with their leader and his collaborators in Istanbul, and they helped distribute newspapers and pamphlets published by the Iranian opposition abroad. They wrote leaflets attacking the shah and his government, as well as the two leading mojtaheds of Tehran, Ashtiani and Nuri, whom they accused of conduct unbecoming their position. In the Persian sources, members of this group are referred to as "freedom seekers," or nationalists, or "enlightened" Iranians, and never as pan-Islamicists. They were soon joined by Amin al-Daula and his brother Majd al-Daula along with other members of the ruling elite in or out of office, opponents of Amin al-Soltan as well as genuine reformers. The group also included powerful merchants such as Hajj Mohammad Hasan Amin al-Zarb and his son Hajj Mohammad Hosain (who was to assume his father's title later), Asadabadi's hosts during both his visits to Iran, in 1886–1887 and 1889–1890.[11]

In 1891, Sayyah and Reza Kermani were arrested on charges of heresy and sedition and forced to serve a prison term of some eighteen to twenty months. When Mirza Reza was released, he fled to Istanbul to join Asadabadi, Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani, and Shaikh Ahmad Ruhi, Mirza Aqa Khan's companion and fellow Azali. Mirza Reza returned to Iran incognito together with Ruhi's brother's. On April 19, 1896, he shot Naser al-Din shah to death in Shahabdolazim. The assassin was arrested immediately. Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani and Shaikh Ahmad Ruhi were deported from Istanbul to Tabriz, where they were charged with conspiracy in the murder and executed in July 1896. Asadabadi died a few months later of cancer, while still residing in the Ottoman capital.

The assassination of Naser al-Din shah is recorded as the deed of political extremists and nationalists resorting to violence to attain their goals. Mirza Reza during his interrogation defended his act as necessary to put an end to tyranny.[12] Some sources, though, convincingly argued that Amin al-Soltan may have been behind it.[13] Apparently, the minister had been aware of the fact that the shah was thinking seriously of dismissing him from office, pushed to do so by Kamran Mirza Nayeb al-Saltana, the minister of war and one of the most influential

Qajar prince. Nayeb al-Saltana reportedly was contemplating staging a coup against both Amin al-Soltan and his brother Mozaffer al-Din Mirza, the crown prince and governor of Azerbaijan. He coveted the throne for himself, enjoying the support of Ain al-Daula, another powerful member of the Qajar family and declared enemy of Amin al-Soltan. In his memoirs, Colonel V. A. Kosogovski, the Russian commander of the Cossack brigade at this time, described in detail the volatile political situation that prevailed in the capital following the shah's death. Though he dismissed the rumors incriminating Amin al-Soltan, he showed how the minister emerged as the sole authority in Tehran, outmaneuvering Nayeb al-Saltana and his faction and holding firm the reins of power until the crown prince reached town six weeks later. In this, he was fully backed by both the British and Russian envoys, who did not favor Nayeb al-Saltana's ambition.[14]

Nayeb al-Saltana and his faction fell from power, albeit temporarily. The shah's assassin was sentenced to death and publicly executed. Some of his accomplices were arrested. However, as Kosogovski revealed in his diary, Amin al-Soltan decided against apprehending a group of suspected Babis, a decision that the Russian officer, in charge of security in the capital, did not fail to appreciate fully. Any arrest of the Babis, he wrote, would only provoke further acts of terrorism and civil disturbances. The minister ordered the Cossack commander to spread the news in town that the new shah would grant religious tolerance and personal safety to the Babis, on the condition that they lay down their arms and refrain from any future antigovernment activity. The Bahais, according to Kosogovski, welcomed the new policy; but the "followers of the anarchist Jamal al-Din" (Asadabadi) continued with their underground activities.[15]

The religious dissidents were not in a position to undertake any action on their own. Revolutionary politics thus remained entangled with court and government intrigues. Naser al-Din Shah's death marked the beginning of a decade of intense activism, covert and overt, grouping together moderate lay reformers, religious dissidents, and radical secularists, culminating in the first phase of the Constitutional Revolution, when some of the activist mojtaheds once more emerged center stage.

Nazem al-Islam and the Azali Connection

Mohammad Kermani Nazem al-Islam (1864–1919) did not belong to a clerical family. He was born in Kerman into a family of modest background. At the age of seven he was acquainted with Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani, with whom he studied and who introduced him to Shaikh Ahmad Ruhi and the latter's father, Akhund Mollah Mohammad Ja'far, a lower ranking cleric charged with Babism by the local authorities. He learned from them the "true Islam," and he sought to emulate them in fighting against the "religious fanaticism of the ignorant people."[16] In 1891 he left his native town to study in Tehran. He was reportedly attracted to the philosophical disciplines more than to jurisprudence and the study of the Traditions (religious documents), which normally constituted the main subjects of the formal madrasa curriculum. He attended Ashtiani's lec-

tures, but, according to his biographer, he proved to be a mediocre religious scholar, committed as he was to seeking liberty and the new learning. Following the assassination of Naser al-Din shah, we are told, he joined a circle of "freedom seekers" who led a secret political life and practiced taqiyya. He then attached himself to Mohammad Tabataba'i's inner circle and formed a lasting collaboration and friendship with the mojtahed's son, Mohammad Sadeq. A new phase in his professional life thus began. In 1899, Mohammad Sadeq had opened a school that offered a modern curriculum, teaching the new learning, which was then opposed by the religious establishment. The Islam school, as it was known, enjoyed the patronage of a mojtahed of Mohammad Tabataba'i's stature, even though it had hired a graduate of the Dar al-Fonun, the first government-sponsored secular modern school, to act as its principal. For a short duration, Nazem al-Islam was its director. In addition to his administrative duties, Nazem al-Islam intensified his commitment to political goals, writing and publishing pamphlets.

Nazem al-Islam's views lacked the moderation and respect for established institutions that characterized the olama's attitude at this time. Unlike Ashtiani, Behbahani, and other religious leaders who, at one time or another, came to adopt a confrontational position vis-à-vis some state policies without denying legitimacy to the shah and his government, he was anti-Qajar from the very beginning.[17] As already stated, he was one of the first, if not the first, to have publicly commended Mirza Reza Kermani's regicide as a political necessity.[18] Moreover, his account emphasized a degree of state–religion confrontation that was not supported by the facts. He was in reality carrying on the old Babi, and Azali, antistate militancy which the established religious hierarchy did not share. It is significant that Nazem al-Islam, a friend of taqiyya-practicing freedom seekers, did associate with a high-ranking religious leader of Tabataba'i's temperament and sociopolitical preferences. He depicted the religious leader as a foe of despotism in all its varieties and a determined opponent of the government.[19] Tabataba'i's family background and clerical relations, his character and natural inclinations, made him the ideal focus for the religious dissidents who were seeking individual mojtaheds' backing.

Seyyed Mohammad Tabataba'i was born in 1843 or 1844 in Kerbala into an influential family of respected mojtaheds. His father, Seyyed Sadeq Tabataba'i, was a well-known mojtahed of Tehran and an active member of liberal circles of reform-minded government officials, including Malkom Khan's famous secret society modeled after European Freemasonic lodges. Seyyed Sadeq also associated freely with religious dissidents, especially Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and Hadi Najmabadi.[20] Reportedly Najmabadi urged Asadabadi and others to teach "the concept of freedom . . . by means of instruction in Koranic exegis."[21] Upon his father's advice, Mohammad Tabataba'i studied with Najmabadi before pursuing his higher education in Samara, Iraq, with the famous mojtahed Mirza Hasan Shirazi, from whom he obtained a license to practice ejtehad.

Mohammad Tabataba'i figured prominently in Mirza Shirazi's small inner circle of disciples and advisers, often acting as his chief counsel for political affairs. It must be remembered that Tabataba'i was, both personally and through his father, connected with Asadabadi's group of activists. Following the repeal of

the tobacco concession in 1892, upon Naser al-Din shah's request for a new, "trustworthy," Iranian-born mojtahed for the capital, Shirazi recommended Mohammad Tabataba'i.[22] The latter returned to Tehran, where, following his late father's footsteps, he established a large circle of devoted disciples and supporters, competing with high-ranking olama, notably Ashtiani, Nuri, and Behbahani. In politics, he sided with the liberal government officials, especially Amin al-Daula, whose educational and judicial reforms he fully backed.

According to Nazem al-Islam, Mohammad Tabataba'i and his son Sadeq were in favor of the new sciences, which they believed to be essential in enlightening new generations of committed, patriotic Iranians who would be devoted to the reconstruction of the nation. They understood that their first critical task was to awaken the people, to help them realize that their duty lay in challenging oppression and their destiny was in their own hands. They were fully aware of the need for new schools, even for women, who had to be educated and no longer kept in seclusion. But they were equally aware of the fact that reforms, if unaccompanied by a restructuring of the political system, and if not accomplished through legislation guaranteed by a constitution, would be futile.[23]

Despite all the precautions adopted, practicing taqiyya and using Islamic symbols and rhetoric, Nazem al-Islam periodically inserted in his narrative more radical statements and ideas that clearly contradicted, or even belied, earlier or subsequent assertions. He wrote, "Without a revolution that would destroy the rotten foundation and build anew, there can be no reforms"; "revolution awakens"[24]—it is not enough to call for a majles and a code of law, for the same people and their sons would continue to amass fortunes and govern in the same corrupt way; ignorance must be eradicated, knowledge spread, and absolute true freedom established.[25] At times, Nazem al-Islam could not restrain his antagonism to the ruling elite. A prince cannot tolerate justice, he would say; the son of a minister cannot work to perfect the Iranian system of education; anyone who has "drunk the blood of the poor for years" cannot tolerate justice and reforms; only the poor, or the intelligentsia (oqala, a term used by all the religious dissidents in contrast to olama), can establish reforms and justice.[26] Though he glorified the role of the "progressive" olama in his accounts of the revolution, he did not spare their reputation, not even that of Tabataba'i, to whom he remained consistently partial in a benevolent way. He displayed the sordid aspects of their character, their corruption and self-serving motives, their petty rivalry and discord, mutual distrust and disunity that crippled their activities and severely broke their ranks, even in times when their institutional interests were at stake.

Nazem al-Islam's closest collaborators and fellow members of the secret society he was to found on the eve of the revolution included other religious dissidents: Shaikh Mehdi Bahr al-Olum, the brother of the late Azali revolutionist Ahmad Ruhi; and Shaikh Yahya of Kerman. Shaikh Yahya was the youngest son of Hajj Aqa Ahmad, a prominent mojtahed of Kerman (d. 1878). Orphaned at the age of eight, he was raised by his older brother Shaikh Abu Ja'far (d. 1896), Nazem al-Islam's teacher. Shaikh Abu Ja'far entrusted Yahya's education to Nazem al-Islam. A close relationship developed through the ten years the latter spent instructing Shaikh Yahya while still in Kerman. Bastani-Parizi writes that Nazem al-Islam was Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani's spiritual heir, and Shaikh

Yahya was his spiritual heir. Shaikh Yahya, under his mentor's influence, parted from his original clerical milieu and devoted his time to political activities.[27] He naturally joined Nazem al-Islam's circle, where his contacts with Kerman olama proved useful to the cause, and where he met Zol-Riyasatin and Shaikh Mohammad Shirazi, known as the "philosopher," two clerics holding "unorthodox" religious views. The circle was also to include Shaikh Ahmad Majd al-Islam Kermani, a former pupil of his, and Jamal al-din Va'ez, when the two preachers came to the capital to escape persecution in Isfahan. Nazem al-Islam maintained contacts with Yahya Daulatabadi and his brother Ali Mohammad Daulatabadi, as well as with Malek al-Motakallemin, who also came to Tehran to escape persecution in Isfahan.

The Isfahan Azalis

Isfahan was the nucleus of religious dissension, home to a number of Azalis and other clerical dissidents and freethinkers. In this former capital of the Safavids—center of Shia thought, both official and speculative, seat of power of one of the most ambitious and unscrupulous Qajar prince-governors, Zell al-Soltan, and of no less notorious mojtaheds such as Aqa Najafi—here it was that Jamal al-Din Asadabadi in 1886 met his most ardent followers and disciples. Malek al-Motakallemin, Hajj Sayyah, and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, among others, were inspired by his ideas and tactics, which they were to emulate promoting their own cause, and which he did not live long enough to espouse. A few years later Shaikh Ahmad Majd al-Islam Kermani was to join the circle of freedom seekers, together with many other Azalis, religious and lay dissidents. The circle was fluid in composition, the tactics both expedient and flexible. Its members did not hesitate to change patrons when convenient, even seeking the sponsorship of most unlikely individuals as long as they delivered needed services, financial contributions, contacts within the political and religious centers of power, networks within factions sharing common enemies or short-term goals. In this sense Zell al-Soltan and Aqa Najafi figured prominently at some time or another in the freedom seekers' plans and intrigues, often making it impossible for the analyst to determine who was pulling which string to which end.

Mirza Nosratollah Beheshti Malek al-Motakallemin (1861–1908) was born in Isfahan. After completing a traditional education in religious studies and Islamic philosophy, he went to India by way of Mecca. He spent two years in Bombay, where he met Iranian expatriates and, more important for his future activities, some leading Parsee merchants, who reportedly financed the publication of his first major work, *Min al Khalq ila al-Haqq*.[28] Judging from Malekzada's paraphrasing, the essay was essentially a polemical criticism of the sociopolitical conditions prevalent in Iran at the time, blaming the political and religious establishment for the cultural and social decline of the nation. The essay was mostly anticlerical, glorifying the pre-Islamic past and promoting the new learning. Its unorthodoxy caused Malek al-Motakallemin troubles with the local Moslem population, and he was forced to leave India. In 1886, he returned to Iran via Bushehr, where he met Jamal al-Din Asadabadi for the first time. According

to Ibrahim Safa'i, it was in this period that, back in his native town, Malek al-Motakallemin became acquainted with Babism; he was involved in public denunciation of the sociocultural system and, more specifically, the religious schools and their alleged archaic curriculum. He met regularly with other dissidents, with whom he planned to open a new school to teach the new learning. But it was raided by a gang of tollab and closed down. The Imam Jom'a of Isfahan denounced him as a Babi; once more he was forced to leave town. In 1893 he went to Tabriz, where he stayed two years, gaining fame as a talented and eloquent orator, attracting the crown prince's lavish praise and gifts, including a title.[29] Malekzada asserts his father had pleased Mozaffar al-Din Mirza with his sermon on kingly justice as examplified by the Sasanian ruler Anushiravan, whom historians refer to as the Lawgiver.[30] This lecture was in keeping with Malek al-Motakallemin's repertoire of sermons aimed at reviving the pre-Islamic heritage and arousing people's consciousness of their rich Zoroastrian past. Upon his return to Isfahan, which was secured by Zell al-Soltan, to whom he had apparently written, and by a Babi acquaintance who worked for the latter,[31] Malek al-Motakallemin resumed his preaching and collaborated with other freedom seekers, discussing and lecturing on the urgent need to reform society.

Seyyed Jamal al-Din Va'ez (1863–1908) was born in Hamadan into a clerical family. Having lost his father at the age of five, he went with his mother to live in Tehran with his maternal aunt and her husband. Until the age of fourteen he earned his living as a weaver in his uncle's workshop. Reportedly he gave up his craft to follow his father's religious profession. In his early twenties he arrived in Isfahan, where he met Malek al-Motakallemin and other "liberal preachers." He interrupted his formal education to engage full time in the group's pursuit of freedom, as his official biographers tell us. He, too, attracted the attention of the temporal authorities with his eloquence and oratorical talents. In the 1890s he was granted a modest government salary by order of Naser al-Din shah. He similarly received the protection of the Isfahan prince-governor and later, when he was forced to leave the city upon the olama's charges of Babism, that of the governor of Shiraz, before he was expelled from Shiraz as well.

Ahmad Majd al-Islam Kermani (1872–1926) was born in Kerman. He received his elementary religious studies with Nazem al-Islam, who was barely eight years his senior, before following the classes of the local mojtahed Shaikh abu Ja'far. In 1890 he went to Isfahan, ostensibly to continue his formal education in Islamic jurisprudence and tradition, but in fact to work together with Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and their group.

While in Isfahan, the three preachers formed a secret society named, according to Majd al-Islam, anjoman-e taraqi, the society for progress, which met regularly in its members' homes. Its objectives were to disseminate the participants' views, through sermons in mosques and religious assemblies, through the writing and publication of essays, and through articles contributed to the Persian newspapers published abroad, especially in Calcutta and Cairo. Efforts to establish a new school to teach the new learning were not as successful, as it became an obvious target of the religious establishment. As already stated, the preachers did enjoy for a while the protection of government authorities who, less touchy over the question of heresy than were the olama, used the preachers' oratorical

talents when needed to promote their own interests. In that sense, the religious dissidents were no different from the orthodox olama and tollab who participated in cabal politics, siding with one faction or another, depending on the circumstances and prospects for material gain. However, as sources reveal, the group did not relinquish their underground activities or their anticlerical campaigns, even when working for the establishment.

In 1897 they opened a new school, this time left unharmed by the tollab and the olama's armed gangs. Apparently in this period Malek al-Motakallemin and his collaborators, especially Majd al-Islam and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, were enjoying the authorities' protection as a result of their contribution for the promotion of a newly founded trading company, sherkat-e islami. The company was founded by Hajj Mohammad Hosain Kazeruni of Isfahan, who initially raised the capital of 150,000 tomans by selling shares to local wealthy merchants and members of the nobility and the olama. It enjoyed the patronage of the governor and the mojtaheds, including Aqa Najafi. Kazeruni was an influential entrepreneur who wished to eliminate European competition in the Iranian market, which had been flooded with foreign imports since the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1897 he encouraged the preachers to form an association, the anjoman-e islami, to assume the patriotic and holy task of combating European economic penetration—and to advertise his own company.[32]

While still engaged in promoting the sherkat-e islami, the company owned by the local notables and officially sponsored by Zell al-Soltan, the three preachers wrote a long essay, *Ro'aya-ye Sadeqa,* a fiery anticlerical, anti–government official polemic that brought trouble to all three, including charges of heresy. Reportedly written in Isfahan, it was first published in St. Petersburg, where it was sent by Mirza Asadollah, the Babi who worked in the Russian consulate, through diplomatic channels without the consul's knowledge. Copies of the publication were smuggled back into Iran and circulated clandestinely.[33]

The essay recounts the imaginary trial of the Isfahan authorities on the last Day of Judgment, when they are asked to account for the sinful neglect of their obligations as religious and temporal leaders of the Moslem nation. Aqa Najafi and his father, the equally powerful deceased mojtahed, as well as Zell al-Soltan and some of his officials, are named as chief defendants standing trial at the divine court. The olama is general are depicted as selfish, corrupt, irresponsible leaders, blamed for the spread of ignorance and the obstruction of progress and knowledge. The authors decry the proliferation of clerical titles among unworthy individuals, charging them with brutality and unlawful conduct, such as the closing down of schools that offer courses in the new learning, spying on individuals, invading their privacy and raiding their homes, declaring them heretics, and ordering the killing of innocent people. They accuse the olama of misunderstanding Islamic laws, which they proclaim to be the "most perfect of all laws,"[34] if properly taught and implemented. As the essay progresses, the tone becomes bolder, and some of the most fundamental religious duties are denounced as fruitless and irrelevant. It takes to task the Islamic obligation of pilgrimage to Mecca and Shia holy cities, describing it as a waste of the believers' time, energy, and, more important, money. Pilgrimage is incumbent only if poverty is eliminated entirely in the nation, the essay emphatically asserts.[35]

Whereas the attack on the olama was ideologically motivated, taking the whole profession to task, the denunciation of government officials was on a personal level, charging misrule and corruption not by the entire political power structure, or the government generally, but by individuals. Moreover, although the anticlerical attacks were deadly serious and vicious, the sections dealing with the lay officials presented humorous caricatures, objects of ridicule. The olama were held responsible for the backwardness and lawlessness prevailing in the entire nation; the grandees and officials were blamed for their personal shortcomings and conduct in office. The essay remarkably avoided denunciation of political despotism. Of great significance, given the authors' current service for the sherkat the essay accused the director and the founder, who were mentioned by name, of embezzling company funds, of doubling the price of local textiles while encouraging the patriotic buyers to shun foreign products, of taking unnecessary risks in investing people's money and asking them to absorb the losses. It blamed Kazeruni personally for the decline in the shares' value.[36]

The personal attack on the management of the sherkat-e islami was surprising. For, according to the sources, Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and Majd al-Islam were still involved in its promotion, advertising it in Shiraz, Tabriz, and other cities. In fact, Va'ez's essay *Lebas-e taqva* reportedly was written in 1900 in Shiraz, where he was sent by the company to campaign for its products.[37]

In *Lebas-e taqva,* Va'ez's tone was highly respectful toward the temporal and religious authorities, referring to the shah, Zell al-Soltan, and Amin al-Soltan in flattering terms. It mentioned the fatwas of the eight most prominent olama of Najaf and Kerbala, which urged the faithful to shun foreign textiles and buy the sherkat products and to support its enterprise by contributing financially to its development, regarding it as the best means to promote Islam and ensure national progress. The preacher also emphatically declared the company constituted the first step toward regenerating trade in Iran, competing successfully with the foreigners, and thus reducing the nation's dependence on Christian products. To serve this company is to serve Islam; the triumph of its trade is a triumph for Islam, he added with grand eloquence.[38]

The greater part of the argument was traditional, orthodox, conservative, in keeping with the centuries-long practice of accommodation and cooperation between the state and the olama. The Islamic nation, Va'ez declared, is a social organization comprising the shah and his subjects, princes, government ministers, soldiers, mollahs and tollab, merchants and peasants; all are essential members of the nation, all are working together in harmony with a common goal, the safeguarding of Islam. The poor and the rich, the servant and the master—all serve the shariat.

In the midst of this traditional argument, the preacher switched his tone, turning polemical. He deplored prevailing discord among the leaders of the nation, and their selfish struggles against one another, holding them responsible for allowing and facilitating foreign enrichment at the nation's expense and for fostering ignorance and sloth. "We are drowned in the sea of ignorance. We have lost our path to Truth, and have sown the seeds of disunity and dissension in our hearts," thus preparing the way for the foreign plunderer.[39] "Fellow countrymen!

O you people of Iran! O Moslems! To love one's fatherland is an article of faith. . . . To each people, its own nation."[40] This passionate defense of patriotism, which Va'ez declared compatible with Islamic principles, recognizing no contradiction between fatherland and religion, Iran and Islam, was followed by a no less passionate plea for the adoption and promotion of science and technology. "A country where the rays of knowledge do not shine is an oppressed land," blind and soulless, a "moving corpse."[41]

Remembering his sponsors, the preacher then resumed his praise of the company, repeating his earlier statement that it constituted the first step toward progress and the elimination of economic dependence on Europe. He viewed trade as the basis of national wealth, and he pointed at England's trade expansion as the secret of its might and progress. He called for the formation of European-style shareholding companies, of which the sherkat-e islami was a good example. At this juncture the essay turned into an advertisement, promoting not only the sherkat but capitalism in general, though Va'ez hastened to argue that capitalistic endeavors, such as this company, ran risks (implying they were therefore lawful since they complied with the Islamic rule that forbids the accrual of interest on money unless risk is involved), and the profits were shared by the entire nation and not just a few individuals (again implying conformity to Islamic rules).[42] Holy texts were cited to demonstrate the lawfulness of profitable returns on initial investments.[43]

The essay remained consistently apolitical, echoing the traditional Islamic political argument that religious and temporal authorities are interdependent and complementary. It also displayed a conservative social outlook. Va'ez declared that all members of a community needed one another to survive as a species; he recognized their diversity and pluralism requiring cooperation rather than competition, and the division of labor and distribution of reward according to productivity and abilities; he asserted emphatically there can be no equality, since equality is destructive.[44] Citing Naser al-Din Tusi, the fourteenth-century theologian-philosopher-scientist, Va'ez condemned the nomadic way of life and Sufi otherworldliness, declaring them parasitical since they were not labor productive, as sinful as indulgence in gambling and "other forbidden deeds." His tone was more intransigent when he criticized the "progressives" (speculative thinkers), who spent their time quoting philosophers and poets and debating whether Tusi was a Sunni or a Shia, oblivious of the "light of knowledge" that was then engulfing the world around them. "Enough with the sleep of ignorance. How much longer can we go on grazing others' pasture?"[45] He praised self-reliance, cooperation in the common endeavor to surmount obstacles to progress; what the Europeans had achieved in science and technology, he asserted, Iranians could achieve as well. Science and technology, he affirmed repeatedly, are the keys to wealth and success. Poverty is sinful if resulting from lack of ambition and will-power. There can be no good for he who does not love possessions.[46]

Va'ez's wrath was directed mainly against the religious leaders, the exponents of the shariat, who, he alleged, had obscured the true teachings of the Prophet, had interpreted the laws in a way that promoted their self-interest, had sown dissension and discord, and thus were to be blamed for weakening the nation, rendering it dependent on Europe.[47] He viewed the prevailing state of depen-

dence on Europe as the direct consequence of the nationwide "sleep of ignorance." In fact, Europe was looked upon as the model to emulate.

The Tehran–Azali Connection

The preachers' sermons and writings caused Aqa Najafi and other established olama of the city to renew their charges of heresy against them and to call for their expulsion. Zell al-Soltan withdrew his support, angered by their disrespectful portrayal of him in the *Ro'aya-ye Sadeqa.* Majd al-Islam was the first to leave Isfahan, arriving in 1899 in Tehran, where his former instructor and friend Nazem al-Islam was already established. Malek al-Motakallemin departed for Tehran, before undertaking trips to Shiraz, Rasht, Enzali, Mashhad, and Baku. Wherever he went, an initial welcome ended with his expulsion and takfir. His attempt to return to Isfahan was blocked by Aqa Najafi. Majd al-Islam took credit for saving him from further persecution by arranging for his safe passage to the capital and introducing him to some influential olama.[48] Though Majd al-Islam gave no details, most probably it was his friend Nazem al-Islam who proved to be of great assistance to Malek al-Motakallemin. Of all the respected mojtaheds of Tehran, only Mohammad Tabataba'i extended his protection to the Isfahani preacher, allowing him to preach at his own mosque. Jamal al-Din Va'ez arrived in the capital under circumstances similar to his fellow freedom seekers from Isfahan, and he soon joined a comparable but larger circle, where Yahya Daulatabadi figured prominently.

Yahya Daulatabadi was the son of Hadi Daulatabadi, the heir to Sobh-e Azal as leader of the Azali community. His religious background and the role of his father in the Azali hierarchy were common knowledge in Tehran's ruling and clerical circles. This often caused him trouble, forcing him to cultivate the friendship of influential political figures for protection. His main sponsors and supporters came from within the ranks of the modern educated young upper class men, with whom he shared views on education. Two such reformers who were to play a lasting role in the revolution, in drafting the constitution, and in legislating far-reaching secularizing reforms were Ehtesham al-Saltana and Mokhber al-Saltana.

On the surface, Daulatabadi's most important self-appointed mission was to found modern schools. His task was facilitated when, in 1897–1898 Amin al-Soltan was replaced by Amin al-Daula, the progressive, reform-minded official who had for years befriended other reformers. He had helped a schoolmaster from Tabriz, Mirza Hasan Roshdiyya, who had traveled extensively in the Transcaucasus and had been inspired by its modern school system to establish in the capital a new facility for teaching the modern disciplines. Both Roshdiyya and Daulatabadi worked to expand their schools, form a cultural society (anjoman-e maʿaref), found a national library, and generally promote learning. Despite the rising tension that inevitably prevailed among the leaders of the anjoman, despite the hostility of those olama who resented competition in a field they traditionally controlled, the schools survived quite well. The membership in the anjoman-e maʿaref came to include wealthy merchants like Amin al-Zarb,

father and son, an increasing number of members of the ruling elite, and men like Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez. The two preachers were often invited to lecture at Daulatabadi's schools and to be involved in the various innovative cultural endeavors sponsored by the anjoman.[49]

From Tabataba'i's mosque, Malek al-Motakallemin called for the adoption of the new sciences and the modernization of education. He discussed the rise and fall of nations and the role of the clerical and temporal leaders in promoting, or obstructing, progress, holding them entirely responsible for the grandeur or decline of their society. He recognized the importance of the monarchs in fostering the nation's progress, but he attributed to the religious leaders greater weight in influencing the masses, whose mind they controlled and who looked up to them for moral guidance. He pleaded with the olama in general to carry on their enormous responsibility with diligence, and to promote knowledge, lest they suffer the same fate as the Catholic clergy, who had gone down in history as corrupt and obscurantist opponents of progress. Here, Malek el-Motakallemin, like his fellow religious dissidents, praised the Protestant Reformation, which he generally viewed as providing the basis for the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution in western Europe. It was up to the olama, he argued, to arouse the nation from its sleep of ignorance and to open the gate of knowledge, and thus to protect the reputation of Islam. It was up to them to earn the respect and following of the future generations of Iranians.[50] In Daulatabadi's school, he addressed directly the students and told them "your destiny, and that of your nation and of your children, lies under the banner of science and nothing else. . . . Only through knowledge can you raise your nation to the level of the live nations of this world."[51]

Daulatabadi's ideas concerning schools were no different from those of Nazem al-Islam and his sponsors, Tabataba'i father and son. In fact they were parallel, yet the former's schools were secular, whereas the latter's was religious, at least outwardly. Just as rivalry set Daulatabadi and Roshdiyya apart, so did it cool relations between Daulatabadi and the Tabataba'is,[52] even though Daulatabadi and Nazem al-Islam remained in close contact, directly or through common friends within the Azali network. Malek al-Motakallemin continued to preach at Tabataba'i's mosque, as Jamal al-Din preached at the Imam Jom'a's. They all frequented Amin al-Daula's circle, teachers and preachers, religious dissidents and lay reformers. They also attended Najmabadi's private lectures, never failing to pay due respect to the olama of the town. They continued to meet in private, to exchange views and news and to coordinate their current moves. Sayyah and Shaikh al-Ra'is frequently joined them.

Hajj Mohammad Ali Mahallati, known as Sayyah (d. 1925), was born into a learned family of Mahallat. He studied in Najaf and Kerbala, where, according to his biographer, he befriended tollab from India and the Caucasus with whom he shared a common distaste for the backward conditions of Moslem countries, which they compared to the "progressive nations' of Europe. At the age of twenty-three or so, he began a journey which took him to the Caucasus, Russia, Europe, the United States, China, and Japan (carrying an American passport in the last two countries). In 1876 he ended his journey of eighteen years in India when he decided to return to his native land. His memoirs cover the period from

his return through the beginning of Ahmad shah's reign, after the collapse of Mohammad Ali shah's counterrevolutionary government in 1909.

Sayyah recounted the cultural shock that hit him hard when he arrived in Iran, realizing the appalling social conditions prevailing in his country and despairing over "the long sleep of ignorance" that continued to afflict his countrymen. To refrain from speaking up and telling the truth, and to practice taqiyya, he wrote, was more difficult than to resist drinking from readily supplied water when thirsty. He had gotten used to freedom while living in free nations, he added.[53] In his own words, Sayyah was a wandering darvish, with philosophical and mystical inclinations, interested in debating questions related to the nature of the soul, which he firmly believed to be as mortal as the body.[54] Echoing other intellectual dissidents, lay and clerical, he deplored the superstitious beliefs taught the masses as religion by high-ranking olama for their own selfish worldly interests, with the full support of despotic rulers. He was critical of the traditional centers of learning, of their method of teaching and of their curriculum; and he was convinced of the redeeming and rejuvenating power of the new sciences as developed in Europe, the United States, and other "progressive nations" he visited. He was equally contemptuous of the religious rituals still practiced by the faithful, including the Moharram and Safar ceremonies commemorating the events at Kerbala, declaring them to be mere forms of social and cultural entertainment devoid of any spiritual meaning for a nation where religion constituted the sole channel for self-expression,[55] a means to distract the masses' attention from reality.[56] Like his contemporary dissidents, Sayyah's wrath was directed mostly against the olama, though he did not spare the ruling elite and the political power structure. The rulers and the mollahs, he asserted, were two heavy stones crushing the nation, forcing the people to lie and deceive in order to survive.[57] Despite his cultural despair, he was optimistic in predicting "as anywhere else in the world, this tree [oppression] shall rot to the core."[58]

His network was the religious dissidents; he spoke highly of Aqa Khan Kermani and Ahmad Ruhi; he admired Asadabadi, who he had met in Egypt and in Europe and had introduced to Zell al-Soltan in Isfahan in 1886–1887; and he frequented Najmabadi's circle in Tehran. Like them, he expressed compassion for the persecuted Babis and was hostile to Naser al-Din shah. He collaborated with the group in composing, writing, and publishing articles and shabnamas ("night letters," or proclamation leaflets), and he worked for their distribution throughout the country. He was closely associated with Mirza Reza Kermani, despite the fact that, at least in his memoirs, he dismissed the latter as a deranged, disturbed, and untrustworthy extremist. In fact they were arrested together in 1890 and imprisoned in the same cell for twenty months. Like his fellow dissidents, Sayyah cultivated ties with high government and court officials, enjoying in different periods the patronage of Zell al-Soltan, Amin al-Soltan, Amin al-Daula, and Amin al-Zarb farther and son.

Abol Hasan Mirza Shaikh al-Ra'is (1848–1920), the Qajar prince, grandson of Fathali shah, was born in Tabriz of a Georgian mother. Though his elementary education was typical for his rank, he chose a clerical training. His intellectual inclination, however, leaned more toward philosophy and poetry rather than jurisprudence and the religious sciences proper.[59] Subsequently he went to Najaf

and Kerbala to study jurisprudence with the local mojtaheds, and then to Samara, where he joined the circle of Mirza Hasan Shirazi, from whom he received the license to practice ejtehad. In 1874 Naser al-Din shah gave him the title he is known by. He practiced his profession in Mashhad, where he also directed a recently founded hospital. He apparently attracted a large crowd to his mosque, where he preached on freedom of thought and the need to spread education to all classes.[60] In 1878–1879, the local governor, envious of Shaikh al-Ra'is, Safa'i tells us, accused him of propagating heretical thought[61] and banished him from Mashhad. The shah then intervened on his behalf and had his mosque restored to him. Royal patronage was not to last long, as Shaikh al-Ra'is continued to have troubles with the governor and his successor. Again, Safa'i tells us, envy, and the cleric's unconventional religious views, motivated the officials to harass him and declare him a heretic. In 1884 he went to Istanbul, where he stayed two years, associating with Iranian expatriates, lecturing in their Persian school, and calling for freedom and equality. He met with a few Ottoman high officials and was introduced to Soltan Abdol Hamid, who granted him a regular stipend.

Shaikh al-Ra'is then joined the Ottoman anjoman-e ettehad-e islami, a pan-Islamic organization, and became its spokesman among the Iranians. He wrote an essay on the subject, *Ettehad-e Islami,* and a few poems which he dedicated to the soltan, for which he was handsomely compensated. He worked with his Turkish fellow members for a Sunni–Shia, Ottoman–Iranian rapprochement. He went back to Iran in 1886, carrying with him another handsome gift in cash from the soltan. Soon, however, old animosities were rekindled, old charges renewed, forcing Shaikh al-Ra'is to travel abroad once more. This time he visited the Caucasus. He returned to Istanbul in 1892, finally meeting Asadabadi. According to Safa'i, the two spokesmen for pan-Islamic unity failed to get along, as Shaikh al-Ra'is refused to follow Asadabadi's political extremism or to allow himself to be exploited.[62] Shaikh al-Ra'is arrived in India in 1893, staying until 1896, when he returned to Iran to settle in Shiraz. In 1904 he briefly visited the capital; in 1905 he was in Mashhad, before returning again to Tehran to join the ranks of the constitutionalists. All this time he continued to receive payments from the Ottoman government through its consulate, where he was always a welcome guest.

All sources, without exception, confirm the fact that Shaikh al-Ra'is was consistently denounced as a Babi. Bahai sources insist that the Qajar cleric had secretly converted to their faith, even though he often denied it. Apparently Bahai leaders had persuaded him to go to the United States to proselytize and had agreed to pay his large debts; he, however, refused to go along, even though he took money from them. His connection with the Bahais was common knowledge in the capital, and some of his writings prove it. At the height of the controversy, he publicly denied his conversion, asserting that he had taken money from the Bahais in order to denounce them later and have the sum distributed for charity.[63] Regardless of the truth of the allegations, the fact remains that Shaikh al-Ra'is certainly did not belong to the circle of orthodox olama; when he died, the mojtahed of Mashhad refused to allow his burial in sacred land because of the shaikh's heresy.[64] His pan-Islamic views were amply rewarded by the Ottoman government, whose protection he enjoyed to the very end. However when the revolution broke out, his pan-

Islamicism rapidly dissolved into nationalism and constitutionalism. He belonged to the circle dominated by Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Yahya Daulatabadi, and lay radicals.

The Politics of the Religious Dissidents on the Eve of the Revolution

The religious dissidents continued to practice taqiyya and to seek patrons and protectors from among the clerical and ruling elite. Nazem al-Islam was, as previously stated, part of Mohammad Tabataba'i's circle. Majd al-Islam became associated with Ain al-Daula, the future minister who was then a powerful member of the new shah's entourage. Malek al-Motakallemin maintained his ties with wealthy Parsee merchants and their coreligionists in Tehran and simultaneously attracted the attention of Salar al-Daula, the Qajar prince who coveted the throne and financed groups willing to help him attain his goal, even outwardly espousing their cause. Jamal al-Din Va'ez gained the sponsorship of Hajj Abol Qasem, the Imam Jom'a of Tehran which he held until shortly before the outbreak of the revolution.

Only the religious dissidents and self-proclaimed social critics, most of them coming from the middle class or more modest background, could not possibly hope to achieve their goals. They clamored for social and cultural change; became increasingly intolerant of prevailing conditions, especially in the late 1890s and early 1900s, when the leading olama in the provincial towns intensified their persecution of the heretics and the religious minorities; and were themselves subject to takfir and harassment. Nonetheless, they opted to carry on the struggle by working from within the political and social system, fully exploiting the traditional patron–client bonds and mutual obligations to their advantage in penetrating that very system. They could then succeed in acquiring protection and establishing a network that crossed social boundaries and brought together groups and individuals, lay and clerical, high-ranking and low-ranking civil servants, members of the ruling classes and their dependents. Often ideological differences had to be set aside, ultimate goals postponed, principles sacrificed, for the sake of pragmatic necessities and short-term objectives.

It must also be noted that, just as they were able to penetrate political and clerical groups, their own circles and secret societies were infiltrated and manipulated from without by court and government officials busy intriguing against one another. With Mozaffar al-Din shah's accession to the throne, two broad factions emerged, one comprised of the late monarch's officials, who had acquired experience in amassing wealth and influence, and the other including the new shah's entourage, described as "hungry wolves with sharpened teeth." Both factions employed, at one time or another, members of the religious dissidents' group.

In 1898 the group suffered a setback when Amin al-Daula was removed from office. Their most ardent champion and fellow reformer, Amin al-Daula had shared their anticlericalism and helped them implement their cherished plans for education and propagation of the new thought through a relatively free press. But this group did not lack ingenuity or miss any opportunity crossing their path.

In 1901 a coalition of forces working against Amin al-Soltan, who had resumed his old post, began a campaign against the new Russian loan he was negotiating. Malek al-Motakallemin, Yahya Daulatabadi, and Hajj Sayyah, among others, figured prominently in a newly formed secret society, which also included members of the anti–Amin al-Soltan faction, led by a son-in-law of the shah, who kept the society informed on government moves and policies.[66] They increased their contributions to the Persian press published abroad, especially to the *Habl al-Matin* published in Calcutta by Jalal al-Din Mo'ayyed al-Islam, a fellow religious dissident. They circulated seditious pamphlets and newsletters in the capital and the provinces. They wrote to the olama in Najaf and Kerbala, where their representatives, especially Seyyed Mohammad Ali, the brother of the *Habl al-Matin*'s editor,[67] were working on the spot. The texts of the shabnamas reflected an Islamic orthodox tone, appealing to the mojtaheds' and the masses' religious sentiment, arousing their hostility to the shah and his minister.

The dissidents' aim in engineering Amin al-Soltan's fall was to help Amin al-Daula, their favorite official, return to power. The conspiracy, however, was to lead nowhere, as the British ambassador preferred to continue to work with Amin al-Soltan for the time being, and the Russian loan was eventually allowed to be signed. As stated in the first chapter, Hardinge discouraged radical opposition to the government; he manipulated the mojtaheds chiefly in order to keep the Iranian minister in line. He was not interested in a revolutionary movement of any kind.

The dissidents were aware of the situation, judging from their tactics and the pan-Islamic banner they carried, fooling both the government and the British officials.[68] According to Sayyah, the conspiracy to overthrow Amin al-Soltan was foiled as a result of Mostafa Ashtiani's betrayal. The low-ranking cleric, who enjoyed some social and religious status in the capital chiefly because of his father, the mojtahed Mirza Hasan Ashtiani, was responsible for writing and printing some of the seditious shabnamas. He revealed the names of the conspirators in return for a large sum.[69] Sayyah, who portrayed himself as a protégé of Amin al-Soltan but was a member of the so-called pan-Islamic conspiracy against him, played a dubious role in the treacherous revelations that led to the arrests of some forty individuals. He was given safe passage by the government, and he prudently left the capital until the dust settled.

The religious dissidents continued to intrigue against Amin al-Soltan, joining any group working for his downfall. Both Daulatabadi and Sayyah reportedly visited the British legation to sound it out regarding the opposition to the government, seeking potential British support and protection if needed. Apparently both were discouraged in their attempts, as the diplomat failed to recognize the depth of the dissidents' discontent and did not assess the validity of their claims and objectives. It must be noted here, however, that the British official's dismissal of their requests was somewhat legitimate as both Daulatabadi and Sayyah were far from candid in their interview, choosing to raise issues and interests they naively—or shrewdly, depending on the point of view—believed would attract their interlocutors' attention. They concealed their religious beliefs and expressed their concerns for the political situation in Iran, proclaiming their

fear of alleged Russian expansionist intentions and Amin al-Soltan's apparent agreement to Russian demands.[70] It was a tactic familiar to the British diplomat in Tehran, and therefore not too successful.

This failure to gain direct British support did not discourage the religious dissidents. It only reinforced their tendency to practice taqiyya and work from within the establishment. They rallied round Abdollah Behbahani, the mojtahed who, in February 1902, had obtained from British officials an expense account to enlist the clerical leaders' endorsement of his plan to discredit Amin al-Soltan in both Iran and Iraq. The plan was finally realized on September 15, 1903, when the British diplomats, in common accord with their Russian counterparts, decided at last to let Amin al-Soltan go.[71] The opposition had secured a fatwa signed by the mojtaheds of Najaf and Kerbala, declaring Amin al-Soltan a heretic. Dated 21 Jamadi II, 1321 (September 14, 1903), too late to be credited for the resignation, its authenticity was doubted by all concerned. It nevertheless was allowed to circulate throughout the country to lend legitimacy to the minister's fall from power.[72]

Ain al-Daula, the Qajar prince and close adviser to Mozaffer al-Din shah, and one of the chief engineers of Amin al-Soltan's fall from power, was appointed sadr-e aʿzam. A major reshuffling in the existing factions followed, as expected. The religious dissidents themselves formed new anjomans, though larger in membership and much more focused in programs than ever before. On May 28, 1904, Malek al-Motakallemin, Va'ez, Shaikh al-Ra'is, Yahya Daulatabadi, Solaiman Maikada, Mirza Reza Musavat, Majd al-Islam, Sayyah, Bahr al-Olum Kermani, Ardeshir (a Zoroastrian merchant), Jahangir Khan (an Azali Babi journalist), two Qajar brothers, Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, a Babi by the name of Khayyat, who had been subjected to harassment and extortion at the hands of Aqa Najafi's hired gangs in Isfahan, and others, totaling forty, met secretly to organize their society. A committee was then voted for, including Malek al-Motakallemin, Va'ez, Daulatabadi, Shaikh al-Ra'is, Maikada, Musavat, and Mirza Mohsen Sadr. The members unanimously decided to overcome their numerical and political disadvantages by recruiting members from among the powerful ruling elite, lay and clerical, as well as the olama in Iraq, expatriates and newspaper editors abroad, and members of the Qajar royal family. They also agreed to recruit the opponents of the current government of Ain al-Daula, including friends and supporters of Amin al-Soltan, with whom they shared a common enemy.[73] Their goal was to replace tyrannical rule with the rule of law and justice. They proposed intensifying their activities in disseminating the new learning, enlightening people of all classes, having European works on the history of revolutions translated into Persian, and more important, avoiding the accusation of heresy by observing conformity with the shariat.[74]

Nazem al-Islam Kermani organized his own anjoman a few months later. In February 1905, together with Mohammad Sadeq Tabataba'i and others, he set up a secret society, anjoman-e makhfi, with the initial task of "enlightening" its members and encouraging them to spread the word and promote their cause. In his inaugural speech Nazem al-Islam declared Iran was currently on the list of "uncivilized, savage" nations of the world, lacking the necessary modern institutions and knowledge deemed vital for progress: schools, factories, roads, a free

press, national government, an army, even clean baths. He proclaimed Mohammad Tabataba'i, the patron of the society, fully in favor of the new learning, which he did not view as heretical or contrary to Islamic principles but, to the contrary, as a source of strength for religion.[75] Recalling past unsuccessful attempts at reforms which were blocked by the court and the olama, Nazem al-Islam informed his fellow members that the society's objectives would be strictly limited to demanding the application of the Koran. "Aqa Tabataba'i is with us," he told them, "and others will also be with us, once they know our goal is to ensure the application of the Koran."[76]

Nazem al-Islam and his listeners were aware of the fact that the reforms they were calling for either were traditionally considered matters of orf jurisdiction or constituted a radical departure from Islamic rulings. They read aloud a passage from *Safarnama-ye Ibrahim Beg,* a social critique of Iran's conditions written in the form of a travel book by Zain al-Abedin Maragha'i, a Russian Azerbaijani merchant. When it was first published in Cairo, it was banned in Iran by both government and religious authorities. Passages read that night were most virulent in their attacks on the ruling elite. Members of the society vowed to lie to any mollah who might discover them reading the "devious" book and to protest their innocence by claiming they were reading it in order to refute it.[77] At subsequent meetings the members continued to read from the same book and from others, as well as newspapers published abroad and smuggled into Iran, especially *Habl al-Matin.*[78]

Recruitment for the society was also discussed, for the members wished to broaden the social and ideological compositon of their society. Conservative high-ranking olama such as Shaikh Fazlollah Nuri were to be approached diplomatically, on their own terms, and promised leadership;[79] other circles were to be infiltrated through acquaintances, alliances forged based on common short-term goals.[80] Behbahani and his entourage were perceived as important potential allies, if rightly guided away from personal motives to broader objectives that could still be of interest to them.[81] If he failed to fulfill his promises, or should he deviate from the prescribed course, the anjoman members agreed to "drop" him and seek another mojtahed for support.[82] Efforts to reach tribal leaders, such as the Qashqa'i Khan, were contemplated, even though no one had any illusion as to their greed for power. Some noted that through them they could reach the poor tribesmen and make them understand the tyrannical rule of shahs, ministers, mollahs, khans, thus awakening them to their own right to rise against oppression, call for justice, and promote knowledge.[83] One member even suggested the possibility of following the Babis' well-known practice of seeking potential converts from among victims of mollahs. Victims of government officials, they argued, should be easily attracted to their cause, and it was important to take personal motives into consideration when recruiting. "In our task of awakening the people, we must not be exclusive."[84]

The members were cautious in expressing their views even among themselves during their secret meetings, fearing their ranks was infiltrated by government agents, and they refrained from exposing fully their objectives.[85] Fear of takfir compelled them to enforce the practice of taqiyya and adopt Islamic rhetoric, constantly referring to the holy texts to prove the validity of their views and

objectives. The third Imam Hosain was recalled as the founder of the first secret society dedicated to a holy cause.[86]

The members repeatedly asserted that their anjoman was not contrary to Islam, but there were periodical lapses in their self-imposed vigilance. For instance, one of the members, a preacher by the name of Zol-Riyasatin, embarrassed them with his frank anti-Qajar statements and his unorthodox sermons in praise of the controversial seventeenth-century philosophers and speculative theologians Mir Damad, Mollah Sadra, and Ahmad Ahsa'i, whose schools of theology inspired Babi thought. The society unanimously decided to forbid Zol-Riyasatin from preaching for one year.[87] As we shall presently see, the sentence was not to be served; as the movement gathered momentum the preacher proved to be one of the most outstanding orators, taking a leading role in instructing the masses on the merits of constitutionalism from an improvised mosque in the British legation.

At their meetings the members of the secret society would be careful in identifying the qanun they were calling for as orfi, dealing with matters pertaining to government affairs, to be written by the oqala and daneshmandan, the possessors of reason and knowledge two lay terms used in contrast to the traditional clerical term olama, the learned in religious sciences. Sometimes the debates would lead to heated disputes, as some more prudent members cautioned against the use of the term mashrutiyyat (constitutionalism), which could cause them troubles, and suggested limiting their vocabulary to safer wordings. "Let us cling to knowledge, and application of the Islamic law." Others preferred more daring outspokenness, expressing their readiness to die for the cause. Inevitably, Nazem al-Islam would add his own brand of moderation, ending the dispute by declaring: "*mashrutiyyat* and *mashru'iyyat,* application of the Islamic law and justice, or knowledge and civilization, the result is the same, freedom."[88] The choice of the terms used, distinguishing mashrutiyyat from mashru'iyyat, clearly indicated the society's awareness of the differences inherent in the two concepts. However, at that early stage when there still was no officially accepted separation of the religious from the profane in various fields of knowledge, and when religious dissidents continued to wear the turban and the religious garb, both the intentions and the outward appearance of the clerical secularists remained veiled.[89] One of the most articulate members of the society, Shaikh Mohammad Shirazi, known as the "philosopher" and described as a patriot learned in the "rational and political" sciences, continued his religious functions and had his office in the Sepahsalar mosque school, where the anjoman often held its meetings.[90]

The anjoman's stated regulations were astonishingly self-revealing. The anjoman's objectives were to arouse the nation's consciousness and to call for reforms. Individuals affiliated with any of the four recognized religions (Islam, Christianity, Judaism, and Zoroastrianism) were eligible for membership, provided they were Iranian by birth. The anjoman's sole leader was to be the expected Twelfth Imam, which all religions, it asserted, believed in as the coming Messiah. All members were obligated to pay due respect to their own religious leaders and to keep them informed on their worldly responsibilities, to remind them they were answerable to God, to make them aware of the people's needs and problems. The task of guarding the fatherland was not exclusive to the

Moslem olama; it fell to all learned individuals, be they Moslem or non-Moslem, experts in jurisprudence or any other science, again provided they believed in Iran as their fatherland. In this common belief, this sharing of a common objective, all would cooperate with the Moslem olama. At the end of each meeting, rauzas (narratives commemorating the Imams, especially the battle of Kerbala) would be recited to recall past religious leaders' sufferings and sacrifices for the sake of freedom.[91]

Eager as they were to acquire religious respectability, the religious dissidents were forced to adopt a correct religious tone and rhetoric, blending religion and political issues, in a manner reminiscent of past religious extremist groups that had periodically attempted to seize power in Shia Iran but were condemned as heretical by the established olama, who favored the political status quo. In contrast, neither the lay secularists nor the elite-turned-reformers of this period emphasized the religous validity of their views, even though they, too, had realized the advantage of having a mojtahed's alliance.

4

The Transcaucasian Connection

With the signing of the treaties of Golistan (1812) and Turkomanchai (1828), which ended two disastrous wars with Russia, Iran gave up all claims to political rule in the Caucasus. The Turkic-speaking province of Azerbaijan was permanently divided in two, the south remaining as part of the Iranian kingdom and the north, with an estimated population of half a million Moslems, falling under Russian dominance. The Shia in Russian Azerbaijan held a clear majority, but Sunni influence was strong, and Russian authorities were able to use one sect against the other to break sporadic insurrections. At first, though, the khanate system of administration was kept intact, with a Russian commander replacing the local Moslem khan as governor. The religious courts continued to function as they had before Russian annexation, and Persian was maintained as the official administrative language.[1]

However, by the middle of the nineteenth century, the khanate system was supplanted by a Russian civil administration. Native Moslem officials were dismissed and replaced by Russians. Land confiscated from local landowners was given to Russian settlers. These harsh imperialist measures led to renewed insurrections, forcing the central government to reconsider its relations with the local elite. In 1845, a viceroy was appointed for the Caucasus; he reported directly to the tsar and had full military and civil responsibilities in the entire region. The viceroy, Mikhail S. Vorontsov, adopted the policy of coopting the Moslem elite, restoring to them their land and privileges, and raising their status "to a Muslim upper estate through which the government could exert influence on the inhabitants in accordance with its objectives."[2] He consolidated this relationship by allowing the Moslem gentry access to civil service careers and admitting their children to Russian schools. Thus a new class of Russian-educated, Moslem professionals came into being.

The policy of accommodation ended with Vorontsov's retirement in 1865. Administrative reorganization reduced drastically the number of natives employed in the bureaucracy, and Russian officials held all the top positions. The office of viceroy, which had conferred upon the Caucasus a special status in the empire, was abolished and replaced with the post of governor-general/commander-in-chief of the Russian forces in the area. The absolute power of the central government was thus restored. By 1892, non-Christian membership in the Duma, the local elected assembly, was reduced to one-third. Moreover, whereas the Municipal Law of 1870 gave each Duma within Russia a large measure of self-government for local affairs, the law was not implemented as

fully or as quickly in Transcaucasia. In fact, a uniform Russian court system and judicial procedures were enforced.

The Moslem religious institutions in the Caucasus were organized by and subject to the Russian state. There were two separate administrative bodies, s Sunni headed by mofti, and a Shia headed by a shaikh al-Islam. Both administrations were located in Tiflis; both had jurisdiction over their respective judges and councils in Tiflis, Baku, Erevan, and Elisavetpol (Gandzha). Russian regulations were applied to the training, selection, and appointment of all clerical posts, including the administration of justice and instruction in the religious schools. The judges' professional functions were reduced to recording births, deaths, marriages, and divorces. Each man of religion, upon appointment, had to pledge loyalty to the tsar and compliance to the laws of the government, as well as promising to fulfill his duty in inducing his fellow Moslems to abide by the Russian authorities and show "steadfast loyalty and devotion to the Sovereign Emperor."[3]

Elsewhere in Moslem central Asia subjected to Russian rule, the imperial policy of forced conversion into Christianity, rather than creating the desired positive effects of religious assimilation, left a profound negative impact on Russo-Moslem relations. It aroused the hostility of the Moslem social elite against its Russian rulers and provoked their own missionary activity to preserve the supremacy of Islam in the region. The converts never proved to be "firm Christians," as they continued to practice their original religion in secret, and, with the first relaxation of the repressive policy, they demanded permission to "return to Islam." Great was the number of "defectors."[4]

The central Asian Moslem misssionary zeal was above all characterized by a spirit of profound self-criticism, striving for religious renewal. In its early formation, the Jadidist (Renewal) movement was influenced greatly by the modernist ideas of a Tartar cleric, Shehabeddin Margani (1818–1889), who first attempted to "purify" Islam from the ill-effects of fanaticism and obscurantism that it had allegedly acquired as a result of conservative, "unenlightened" theologians' influence. He called for an end to the practice of taqlid, claiming all individuals had the right to interpret religion, and insisted on the need to allow the teaching of modern science and the Russian language in Moslem schools.[5]

The task of reforming the madrasa system of education and of incorporating the new learning into the Islamic curriculum was first undertaken by a Tartar from the Crimea, Ismail Beg Gaspraly (Gasprinski, 1851–1914). Admitting readily that he was influenced by the contemporary pan-Slavist movement,[6] Ismail Beg viewed Islam, reformed and newly interpreted, as providing a strong basis for the union of all Russian Moslems. The new schools that he established and the newspaper *Tarjoman,* which he founded in 1883, helped in educating the new leadership that came to dominate the social and cultural life of the Moslem communities. The *Tarjoman,* although written in a formal language closer to Ottoman Turkish than to any of the Turkic dialects spoken in Russian Moslem lands—and thus incomprehensible to the vast majority—circulated widely in the various parts of central Asia, serving as a model for other local papers that were to be published there.

Russian colonialism caused the initial impetus and conditioned the reli-

gionational awakening and cultural renaissance of Russia's Moslem subjects. In their important study of the Russian Moslem nationalist movements, the French historians Alexandre Bennigsen and Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay argued that the reformist movement of the Jadidists came about as a result of the Moslem intelligentsia's close contact with Russian culture and that the Ottoman and Arab reformist influence was first felt only in the early 1900s, remaining "secondary" throughout.[7] Indeed, Western and Soviet scholars agree that the Jadidist leaders were liberal innovators aiming at modernizing their religion and society through educational and cultural reforms. National independence was not part of their agenda in the 1880s and 1890s; political activism was never adopted as a tactical means to attain their objectives. National consciousness emerged as a viable force in the nascent political life of the urban Moslem bourgeoisie only with the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1905. Whereas high-ranking members of the religious hierarchy tended to cooperate with their Russian rulers, a great number of the Moslem olama were profoundly affected by the Jadidist movement and came to side with the intelligentsia in their opposition to the conservative religious leadership. By 1905, open-minded middle and lower ranking olama reportedly dominated the religious institutions through their numbers and the forcefulness of their reformist ideals. Subsequently, liberal and radical parties were to find eager recruits from within their ranks. In 1904, for instance, students at the Mohammadiyya madrasa in Kazan formed a radical Jadidist wing within the movement, politicizing the religiocultural reform movement and turning it into a nationalist, anti-Russian, socialist-oriented activist trend.[8]

At the turn of the century, Russian Azerbaijan was described as a "feudal land," with Baku, the capital, forming a proletarian "oasis surrounded by a peasant population."[9] Baku was the oil center of the Russian empire and the headquarter of major international companies, business firms, and banks. Among its multiethnic, multireligious population, the Russians, Armenians, and Moslems constituted the largest groups, with the latter holding a plurality of 40 to 50 percent. Socioeconomic tensions further fueled deep-rooted ethnic conflicts. Although Moslem workers filled the majority of the lowest paid jobs in the oil fields and industries, the Moslem bourgeoisie was held in contempt by Russians, Armenians, and foreign capitalists who monopolized the bulk of the oil industry and its related businesses. Moslems owned only 18.9 percent of arable land, and in the Baku Duma non-Christian representation was restricted to one-third of the membership. Although the Duma was ineffectual, since Russian authorities never allowed local self-government to develop, the Moslems' low representation underscored their inferior status in the Baku community. In the Duma of 1902–1905, however, the Moslem bourgeoisie was to occupy nearly half of the seats.[10] By then Baku had emerged as an important center of Turkic central Asian cultural renaissance and political activism, the nationality issue playing an increasingly dominant role in shaping the diverse ideological platforms of the Moslem political parties. The city, with its handful of Moslem millionaires, its small but highly visible and articulate group of Russian-educated intellectuals and professionals, and its vast pool of semiskilled and unskilled laborers, proved to be a fertile ground for mass mobilization and political agita-

tion. The Moslem population's deeply felt resentment of the unfair treatment and discrimination they received at the hands of Russian colonial tsarist regime was to be duly exploited not only by the Moslem leaders themselves, but also by Russian opposition parties, be they moderate liberals like the Kadets or more radically revolutionary like the Russian Social Democratic Workers' party. It was no accident that the emergence of the "nationality question" as a fundamental political problem coincided with the intensification of Russian revolutionary activities in the area shortly before and during the first Russian Revolution of 1905.

The Cultural Origins of the National Liberation Movement in Russian Azerbaijan

Soviet historians tend to distinguish the "bourgeois nationalist" trend, which allegedly utilized the national liberation movement in Azerbaijan for "bourgeois ends," from the "revolutionary-democratic" wing, which struggled against Russian colonialism from the start.[11] Some Western scholars, on the other hand, emphasize the so-called pan-Islamic, pan-Turkic, anti-Russian character of the movement led by the liberal bourgeoisie at the time of the first Russian revolution.[12] In fact, the Jadidist movement in Azerbaijan at the end of the nineteenth century, like its counterpart elsewhere in the Moslem borderlands of the Russian Empire, was essentially an apolitical, reformist, sociocultural movement led by the Russian-educated intelligentsia. Long before they began to organize their own political parties, members of the Moslem bourgeoisie had undertaken a far-reaching modernization program through the sponsoring of literary and educational projects devoted to the spread of the new learning. From among the Moslem tycoons of Baku, Zain al-Abedin Taqiev proved to be the most generous and most consistent philantropist. Though Soviet accounts until recently dismissed him as a capitalist exploiting the masses and the national liberation movement for his own class interests, he was, according to the ample evidence provided by these same sources, at the very center of the Baku Moslem cultural renaissance.[13] He financed many newspapers published in both Russian and Turkic languages, schools, libraries, cultural clubs, and even a theater for Moslem performers staging the work of Moslem playwrights as well as Russian plays in translation. Many of the leading intellectuals and professionals of Baku had studied in Russian universities on Taqiev scholarships; others pursued their literary endeavors with subsidies from him and other wealthy entrepreneurs.

In 1880, Taqiev founded a Russian-language newspaper, *Kaspi,* edited and written by Moslems for Moslems. For a long time *Kaspi* remained a major vehicle for both liberals and socialists who began their political careers under the auspices of wealthy bourgeois nationalists. It is significant that the paper carried articles written by men such as Ahmad Beg Aqaev, the radical Islamic modernist turned pan-Turkist; Ali Mardan Topchibashev, the moderate liberal democrat Kadet; and Nariman Narimanov, the Social Democrat. After the 1905–1907 events they were to part company, each to follow a different ideological path, their differences exacerbated by the October Revolution of 1917. But in the

early 1900s, all three aspired to a common goal: to awaken the Moslems, to educate and "enlighten" them, and, by the same token, to undermine at the grassroots level the influence of conservative olama, whom they held responsible for the prevailing religious fanaticism and superstition and for the abject ignorance of the Moslem masses.

Colonial rule affected the intellectual life of northern Azerbaijanis, impelling it in a direction their Iranian brethren were not to follow for another generation. Russian imperialism deprived its Moslem subjects of autonomy, yet it inevitably precipitated and, ironically, even facilitated a national awakening and advance into the modern age. At the time when Iranian intellectuals still practiced taqiyya and freedom of thought was continually repressed by a socially and intellectually conservative religious establishment dominated by law-oriented mojtaheds, their northern colleagues, as subjects of non-Moslem power, enjoyed freedom of expression in cultural and religious matters.

One of the best representatives of the new genre of cultural and social criticism was the essayist and playwright Fathali Akhundov (Akhundzada, 1812–1878).[14] Born into a Shia family from Iranian Azerbaijan, Akhundov grew up in the Caucasus. He gave up his studies in Islamic philosophy and mysticism and traveled to Tiflis, where he learned Russian and eventually acquired an important position as translator of Oriental languages in the service of the viceroy. From his comfortable and secure post in the Russian civil service, Akhundov felt immune from possible clerical persecution and censorship. Among his numerous writings, *Sa Maktub* (Three Epistles), his most virulent antireligious polemic, inspired a great number of religious dissidents and freethinkers both in the Caucasus and in Iran, where it circulated clandestinely. Pronounced by a contemporary Soviet historian "the most outstanding work of materialist philosophy in the East,"[15] the essay condemns all religions, including Islam, as "meaningless myths." Together with his other writings, especially plays in which he provocatively satirized the old sociocultural order, *Sa Maktub* provided a younger generation of Moslem Transcaucasian intellectuals with a literary model to emulate.

Nariman Narimanov (1870–1925), the novelist-playwright-journalist-actor-physician-revolutionary activist-politician, began his multifaceted professional life as a social reformer. Born in Tiflis into a Shia Azerbaijani family, he was educated from the age of twelve in a Russian school. The ethnic and national diversity of the student body, which included Russians, Christian Georgians and Armenians, and Sunni and Shia Azerbaijanis, prepared him for his future political and literary commitment to the cause of ethnic and religious tolerance. He was attracted to Russian literature, especially Pushkin and Gogol, but his literary mentor was the late Akhundov. Like the latter, he believed it critical that the Moslems reform their society and culture and adopt Western learning. In fact, in his senior year at school, he wrote a paper on the significance of Peter the Great's modernization programs.[16]

While still in high school, Narimanov began writing his first satirical play, *Ignorance,* which was to be staged in Baku at Taqiev's theater in January 1895. Upon graduation in 1891, Norimanov moved to Baku, where he obtained a teaching job at a private school. He continued writing his plays, novels, and short stories, and he contributed articles to *Kaspi.* He also translated Russian

works into Azeri Turkish; his translation of Gogol's *Inspector General* was subsequently staged at Taqiev's theater by Azerbaijani actors, with Narimanov in the title role. Narimanov considered the theater as the best "school for adults."[17] The years 1894–1900 proved to be the most artistically creative period of his life, when he committed his talented pen to the enlightenment of his fellow Moslems. In 1894, together with A. Djaparidze, the Christian Georgian who was to lead the Social Democratic Workers party in the Caucasus, and other equally socially engaged activists, Narimanov founded a public library. It offered to its readers current newspapers in Russian, Georgian, Armenian, Persian, Arabic, and Turkic languages. The library also organized meetings, lectures, and debates, and it even sponsored amateur plays. The majority of its members were Moslems, but it also included a large number of Russians, Armenians, and some Jews. By January 1897, the *Kaspi* reported membership in the library had reached the figure of 25,849.[18] Apparently many mollahs secretly frequented the library, taking journals and newspapers home to read. By 1898, local government authorities forced it to close.

Narimanov's Soviet biographer insists that he was by that time an advocate of "atheist and materialist philosophy."[19] He may, indeed, have had atheist tendencies; he was, after all, a devout follower of Akhundov. However, in this early phase of his career, he still treaded cautiously. Unlike Akhundov, who was secure in the Russian viceroy's employment, Narimanov financially depended on Moslem bourgeois sponsorship for his social and cultural endeavors. Frank anticlericalism, but not anti-Islamic sentiment, was allowed to be freely expressed in Baku at the turn of the century. Thus, like other members of the Moslem intelligentsia, he gave his fierce anticlericalism free reign and turned an ardent advocate of modernization, calling for a new social order. Most of the heroes in his creative writing of this period are symbolic victims of ignorance, religious superstition and fanaticism, ethnic violence, and clerical abuse of power. In his novella *Bahador and Sonya,* the love story of a Moslem man and an Armenian woman, the ethnic violence that determines their tragic fate is attributed solely to religious fanaticism. "The people blindly believe the mollahs, and only them," says the hero. "The Moslems do everything the mollahs ask them to do. But this is ruining the nation, and even our religion itself. A Moslem philosopher once said, 'If the Prophet Mohammad now looks at his own followers, he would not recognize the Faith which he had once revealed.' And this philosopher is right."[20] Elsewhere, Narimanov wrote, "Ignorance turns a man into a brutal beast";[21] and he expressed his conviction "that those who consider themselves the spiritual masters of the Moslems are guilty. . . . They stupify the people with foolish traditions."[22] Like Akhundov, Narimanov believed that all religious leaders were responsible for widespread ignorance, and that Moslems should follow the European example and turn to science instead.

In August 1902, awarded a Taqiev scholarship, Narimanov enrolled in the medical school of a newly founded Russian university in Odessa. His initiation to political activism began there, as he rapidly became involved in student movements and discovered the works of Marx and other socialist thinkers. By January 1905, he was a major participant in the general student strike staged in sympathy for the riots in St. Petersburg and which had led to several deaths.

Ahmad Aqaev (Agaoglu, 1865–1938), who had studied in St. Petersburg, was equally influenced by contemporary Russian literature. Described as an "excitable and impulsive" youth,[23] he was reportedly attracted to the revolutionary ideals then current in Russia. However, it was in Paris, where he had gone to study in his late teens, that his cultural identity as a Moslem took definite form, shaping his ideology for the next two decades. In the French capital he mixed socially with Iranian and Ottoman expatriates, both of whose political causes he freely espoused. His friendship with some of the leaders of the Young Turk movement, which began in this period, was to prove instrumental in his ultimate decision to move to Turkey in 1909 and join their revolution. While still in Paris, though, he was more closely associated with the Iranian dissidents, lay and religious. He became an enthusiastic champion of Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and Malkom Khan, and he eagerly adopted their Islamic reformist ideas. Moslem circles in Paris were still vibrant with Jamal al-Din's famous exchanges with Ernest Renan, the French philosopher who, in his lectures at the Sorbonne and later article in the *Journal des Débats,* had proclaimed all religions, but especially Islam, incompatible with science.[24] Islam, Renan concluded, is the "heaviest chain that humanity has ever borne."[25] In his famous response Jamal al-Din had risen in defense of religion, and of Islam in particular, as a civilizing force necessary for the masses incapable of comprehending rational thought. Acknowledging the fact that Christian Europe had by then intellectually progressed more than the Moslem East, he expressed his hope that the "Mohammadan society will succeed some day in breaking its bonds and marching resolutely in the path of civilization after the manner of Western society."[26]

Aqaev devoutly followed that argument, publishing his own series of articles in the Parisian journal *La Nouvelle Revue* in 1891–1893.[27] During the greater part of this period Jamal al-Din was in London, working with Malkom Khan at arousing English public opinion against the Qajar government and against the tobacco concession granted to a British firm. In an interesting article discussing the Iranian government and the Persian state of mind, in which he accused the European press, and especially *The Times of London,* of distorting the image of Iran, Iranians, and Moslems in general, Aqaev portrayed the Iranian nation as abused by both its temporal and religious leaders and in a constant state of cultural and political turmoil, on the verge of inevitable civil war. The tobacco concession, he wrote, served only as a pretext to stage another of the series of popular revolts that had begun to break out with the Babi uprisings in the middle of the century. In his highly controversial and inaccurate account of the Babi movement, Aqaev denied the fact that the Babis were waging war against Islam and the state, and he described the Bab as a "man of heart and spirit," aware of the problems facing his fatherland, who aimed at purifying Islam and reforming the government. He insisted that the movement turned revolutionary only when the shah "unwisely" refused to listen to the Bab's calls for the establishment of a constitutional monarchy and for social, judicial, and fiscal reforms. The Bab, Aqaev went on, was merely voicing the popular demands for reforms and expressing the general national malaise; his task is now taken up by Jamal al-Din, the leader of all the Shia, and by Malkom Khan.

Aqaev warned the European powers against the potential force of a "gigantic

Moslem movement," should they fail to work hard in bringing together the two worlds, Christian and Moslem, through the spread of selective aspects of the Western civilization. European governments, he stated, should persuade Moslem national officials and monarchs to promulgate and implement needed reforms. In an earlier article, Aqaev had denounced as venal and hypocritical the Shia olama who abused their profession to promote their own selfish, worldly interests. "The status of the olama is not an end in itself," he explained, "but a means to exploit and dominate."[28] He did, however, admit that there were exceptional men of religion, and he named Mirza Hasan Shirazi, the mojtahed of Samara, to whom the fatwa banning the consumption of tobacco was attributed, as a perfect example of worthy religious leaders who are "progressive and liberals." Such olama, he contended, could interpret the Koran according to the new exigencies of time, and thus help in bringing about national regeneration.[29] But Aqaev was careful in stressing his view that Islam recognizes neither ecclesiastical power nor clerical hierarchical authority. God alone is absolute, he wrote, and all his creatures are equal before his command; each Moslem is his own mollah, each house his mosque.[30] His denigration of the Shia olama strongly implied that organized, institutionalized religion was an aberration.

In 1895 Aqaev was back in Baku, contributing regularly to the *Kaspi* articles in which he followed up radical reformist views of religion and Islamic culture. In articles entitled "Pan-Islamism: Its Character and Direction," "Islam and Progress," "Mohammadanism and Its Future" and "The Situation of the Moslem Peoples," he strongly argued that Islam constituted the most vital factor in the life of the Moslem masses.[31] Moslem social development and renewal could be accomplished only through religious renewal. He condemned "reactionary Islam" as taught by conservative olama, and he called for a rational, free, and progressive interpretation of the Koran and the shariat. He insisted that although the Moslems' salvation could be attained only through religion, such a salvation depended on intensive contacts with European civilization. Profoundly anticlerical, he firmly believed that the lay intelligentsia alone was capable of undertaking the sacred task of renewing Islam.

The paper *Kaspi* continued to be the major organ of the Moslem intelligentsia of Baku until 1905, even though it was published in the Russian language. It enjoyed the steady financial support of Taqiev, its original publisher and owner, and was edited by the moderate liberal Ali Mardan Topchibashev (1869–1934). Born in Baku into an aristocratic family claiming descent from a noble Moslem ruling family of Georgia, Topchibashev had studied in a Russian school before enrolling in the lawschool at the University of St. Petersburg. He practiced law for a few years before giving it up to join the small circle of Moslem modern-educated professionals concerned with similar sociocultural issues of the day. Topchibashev was to dominate Baku politics throughout the first decade of the twentieth century and was to remain closely associated with the wealthy entrepreneurs, steering away from the radical wing that was to rise during the 1905–1907 Russian Revolution. His identification with the capitalists' interests and political aspirations alienated some of his earlier fellow reformers, who were to follow a more radical course. As we shall see, and contrary to Soviet accounts, the break between the two wings of the national liberation movement was not sudden, for

each ideological faction needed the other to reach all segments of society, and both basically shared identical social and cultural goals. The political means to attain their goals would eventually set them apart.

The First Russian Revolution and the Azerbaijan Moslem Liberation Movement

The bourgeois-liberal revolution of 1905, which forced Tsar Nicholas II to promulgate his October Manifesto promising Russia a constitution, marked the emergence of the national liberation movement in Azerbaijan as a viable political force. Although the constitution, finally implemented in 1906, disappointed all who had hoped for political freedom in Russia and the Duma proved to be a docile instrument in the hands of conservative progovernment landowners, the new measures did provide the necessary legal means for the opposition to express and propagate its views. Censorship and the ban on trade unions were nominally relaxed. Russia was to enjoy a "semiconstitutional" regime from 1906 to 1917.[32]

The Moslem intelligentsia of Azerbaijan, strongly backed by the wealthy bourgeoisie, seized the opportunity to demand equal political and economic rights for their coreligionists. In a recent study the Soviet historian G. B. Saidzada describes the bourgeoisie's attitude toward the tsarist regime as "complex and contradictory."[33] On the one hand, the bourgeoisie strongly resented the colonial policy restricting the Moslems' economic activities and severely limiting local political autonomy. Baku could boast of four Moslem tycoons of Taqiev's stature, a fairly sizable number of merchants held the monopoly over trade with Iran and the Middle East, and the shipping magnates were exclusively Moslems. And yet the Moslem bourgeoisie played a relatively insignificant role in the local oil industry and international finance. Taqiev, for example, was the exception, sitting on the board of directors of a British firm in which he owned some shares. Similarly, twenty-three of the forty-eight seats in the local Duma of 1902–1905 were occupied by the Moslem bourgeoisie, including Taqiev, Topchibashev, and Aqaev, but the Duma was hardly an active participant in local political life. Nor were the Moslems represented in the union of the oil industrialists. On the other hand, the same wealthy entrepreneurial Moslem class, according to Saidzada, basically supported Russian colonial rule, fearing as it did labor unrest, ethnic conflicts, and the ideological extremism of the radical Russian socialist parties active in Baku. It was this ambivalence that was to characterize the role of the tycoons—especially Taqiev—in the national liberation movement and was to determine the liberals' policy. More importantly, this attitude was to act as a restraining force on the more radically oriented Moslem political leaders.

By January 1905, the *Kaspi* began to publish articles demanding greater autonomy and equal rights for the Moslem subjects of the Russian empire. Throughout the winter and early spring of that year, Topchibashev and Aqaev continually pressed their demands in the editorial pages, calling upon the tsar to grant the Moslems what he was granting the Russians: the establishment of local elective district councils, judicial reforms, guaranteed freedom of conscience,

press, opinion, and assembly, equal opportunity for employment in the civil service, and the right to teach in Azeri, all within the legal framework of the Russian constitution.[34]

In 1905, a new Azeri-language weekly newspaper, *Hayat,* was established by Taqiev, who again hired Topchibashev as editor. It became the official organ of moderate liberals, Islamic reformists, and modernizers. Its first issue proclaimed the *Hayat* to be representing the aspirations of the Moslem Turkic nationals, working in unison for the common good and progress of all Turks, here and elsewhere, and for Islam. "There is no salvation for us outside Islam," it emphatically asserted; nor is there any necessity to struggle against the present regime.[35] Despite this proclamation, Topchibashev was neither pan-Islamist nor pan-Turkist; he was a Moslem modernizer turned loyalist to the Russian constitutional monarchy, advocating a political platform identical to the Russian Kadets'. It was Topchibashev, in fact, who was to direct the All-Moslems Congress in that direction.

In August 1905, a group of Russian Moslem leaders led by Gasprinski requested permission from the Imperial government to hold an All-Moslem Congress. Permission was denied; nonetheless, some hundred wealthy and prominent Moslems from all over the empire met on a ship anchored in a river in Nijni-Novgorod. Despite the fact that high-ranking religious leaders, including the chief mufti, opposed the meeting, several reform-minded middle and lower ranking olama attended it. The congress called for the union of all Moslem subjects of the empire and requested from the tsar political, civil, and religious rights equal to those granted Russian subjects, without, however, expressing any desire for political independence. It favored democracy, constitutional monarchy, and proportional representation of all nationalities in the Duma. It was equality with the Russian subjects that the congress insisted upon; the attainment of equality lay behind the convening of the congress, and the hope of gaining united support from participating Moslem delegates fueled the congress. The congress met a second time in St. Petersburg in January 1906; it was then decided to form a political party, Ittefaq al-Moslemin, or Moslem Union. Once more Topchibashev, the only Azerbaijani representative, and Gasprinski emphasized the social and cultural nature of their demands and program. Topchibashev, who had close contacts with the Baku local chapter of the Russian constitutional monarchist Kadet party, forged an alliance between the latter and the Ittefaq. At the third congress, held in August 1906, the Ittefaq formally endorsed a platform identical to the Kadet's.[36]

At the third congress, and subsequently in committee meetings of the party leadership, Topchibashev reportedly avoided explicit pan-Turkist or pan-Islamist formulations.[37] His and his allies' objectives were to implement far-reaching social and educational reforms in the Moslem communities. The secularization of the Moslem school system headed their list of priorities. A prominent member of the congress, a Volga Tatar named Abdol-Rashid Ibragimov, who was a close follower of Jamal al-Din Asadabadi, had clearly revealed the party's goals when he proclaimed: "We, the Moslems of Russia, being loyal to the Russian government and fearing the spread of ideas of pan-Islamism, socialism, and anarchism—ideologies disruptive to the life of the people and repugnant to the doctrine of Islam—have decided to combat these ideological trends in a legal way. We will serve the tsar

and his throne just as faithfully as did our fathers and forefathers." He stressed the fact that the aim of the union was to "free the maktabs and madrasas from the hands of the mullahs and transfer these schools into the hands of the people"[38] and thus undercut the influence of the conservative olama. The blunt anticlericalism provoked both Topchibashev's and Gasprinski's anger, and Ibragimov was compelled to soften the blow in the subsequent meeting by speaking of the plight of the olama's position as educators and guardians of the faith.

Modernists and secularists as they were, neither of the leaders of the Moslem Union was interested in breaking so radically his ties with the religious classes.[39] In their petition to the tsar, freedom of worship and the olama's right to hold privileges equal to the Russian clergy's figured prominently. Furthermore, the bourgeois liberals who favored the union's platform were indeed eager to distance themselves from the small but by now highly vocal radical Moslem groups who were impatient with tactics of moderation vis-à-vis the olama.

The liberal Moslems' hope to achieve equality with Russian subjects was nonetheless doomed to failure. Their alliance with the Russian Kadets did ensure their victory in the election to the first Duma, where they won twenty-five seats.[40] However, the central government neutralized this victory as it prevented the elected deputies from effective action, dissolved the Duma altogether, and eventually changed the election regulations by decreasing the number of non-Christian representatives.

The Hemmatists

At the turn of the century, Baku was one of the most important industrial city of the Russian Empire. A sizable, predominantly Christian, working class, composed essentially of skilled and semiskilled oil laborers, was led by powerfully organized unions and trained to stage widespread strikes, forcing the management to concede better working conditions. In 1903, and again in 1904, successful strikes ended with the signing of the first labor contract in Russia. Moslem workers, the least skilled and most neglected by both the labor unions and their employers, nonetheless formed too important a segment of the labor force to be ignored for long by party leaders and radical activists, be they Moslems or non-Moslems. From among the various liberal activist groups that the Moslem intelligentsia formed at that time, the Hemmat group proved to be the most radical and most effective in mobilizing the Moslem workers.

Small Moslem socialist circles came into being in Azerbaijan as early as 1903, and some sixty Moslem socialists reportedly joined the Russian Social Democratic Workers party (RSDWP). In mid-1904, the Bolshevik faction took control of the party's Baku Committee and began to turn its attention to the potentially viable Moslem labor force. The Hemmat group was created as a separate, though affiliated, organization of the RSDWP, with the expressed purpose of training and mobilizing the Moslem workers for the party. According to one of its founders, Soltan Majid Efendiev, it was allowed a separate existence because of "particular conditions" needed for party work among the Moslems.[41] Such an officially recognized autonomy was contrary to the party's rules, which insisted

that the basis of cells and branches be territorial, not ethnic or religious. However, there was a widespread belief in the Baku Committee that Azerbaijan could not be reached through more conventional means of agitation.

"The separate existence" of the Hemmat group, which also on occasion referred to itself as the Moslem Social Democratic group, was a matter "not of principle but of tactics."[42] Its leadership included Armenian and Georgian members of the RSDWP. Stepan Shaumian, an Armenian, and P. A. Dzjaparidze, a Georgian—Lenin's closest associates in the Caucasus—were in charge of directing the Hemmatists, and some Hemmat representatives regularly attended the Baku Committee meetings. Though Efendiev categorically denies that the Hemmat group sought independent action, he admits that there were some "bourgeois nationalists" who had called for the "democratization of the party."[43] Indeed, the nationality issue was to split the ranks of the Hemmatists in 1906–1907, as some opted for loosening their ties with the Russian-dominated, Russian-controlled RSDWP and for forming a national Social Democratic party similar to the Bund, the Jewish Social Democratic party, or to the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, known as the Dashnaktsutiun. The Dashnaks favored a federalist solution to the nationality problem and opposed the RSDWP's internationalist program appealing to the working classes alone.

It is important to note here that the Hemmatists who participated in one way or another in the Iranian Constitutional Revolution, Nariman Narimanov, Soltan Majid Efendiev, and Mashadi Azizbekov, remained loyal RSDWP members until their deaths. Mohammad Amin Rasulzada, who began his political career as a Hemmatist and member of the RSDWP, played an important though brief role in Iranian politics during the period of the second majles (1908–1910). Before founding his own nationalist separatist Musavat party, he was a firm Social Democrat throughout the period under consideration in the present study. Rasulzada (1884–1954) was born into a family of Shia middle ranking olama, whereas Efendiev (1887–1938) was born into a wealthy landowning family of Azerbaijan; both were educated in Russian schools. Rasulzada opted for a profession in journalism, whereas Efendiev studied medicine in the University of Kazan. Both were original founders of the Hemmat group. They were joined by Azizbekov, a young man born into a working-class family in Baku, who had studied in Russian schools in his native town and in Tiflis before traveling to St. Petersburg to study electrical engineering. In the Russian capital, Azizbekov was one of the very few Moslem students admitted to an institute of higher learning. He rapidly displayed leadership and organizational skills. A superb orator, he proved to be one of the most important speakers at party rallies and street demonstrations; his apartment in Baku became the headquarter of the activists, where weapons and revolutionary pamphlets were secretly stored for distribution among the street agitators.

Azizbekov revealed a great talent for acting, and he periodically performed at the Taqiev theater. The stage was increasingly used as a vehicle for the dissemination of social and political ideas and a medium for the awakening of public consciousness among a largely illiterate population. Azizbekov shared this view with Narimanov, who returned to Baku in the fall of 1905 and almost immediately joined the Hemmat group. Both men also shared an experience in radical

student activities at Russian university campuses in St. Petersburg and Odessa, respectively. They brought to the Hemmat group much-needed organizational skills and leadership qualities. Consequently, Hemmat grew in numbers rather rapidly and expanded its activities outside Baku, to other towns with large populations of Moslem workers.

In October 1905, the Hemmatists began to publish their own newspaper in the Azeri language; they called it *Hemmat,* and they attached to it a motto in Arabic: "Joint efforts of men will move mountains." As a Soviet historian candidly admits, the paper "was not noted for its social-democratic consistency,"[44] and the articles were basically written from a non-Marxist point of view. It underscored its specific Moslem Azerbaijani identity, though it instilled in its readers a sense of class consciousness, calling upon the "democratic intelligentsia" (as opposed to the "bourgeois intelligentsia") to work together with the working class. More important, it denounced the tsar's Russian colonial policy in Azerbaijan.[45] The bulk of its articles, however, were imbued with the spirit of the Enlightenment, expressing their concerns with the new sciences, the necessity to reform the educational system, and the need to emancipate women—all reflecting a strong condemnation of the conservative clerical establishment. In that sense, the Hemmatists of this period could by all means be labeled "liberal bourgeois," "reformist-Jadidists," indistinguishable from their counterparts in the rest of the Moslem world, though they benefited from the greater freedom of expression that Baku enjoyed in 1905–1907. In fact, the Hemmatists did not break ties with the more moderate intelligentsia or with the bourgeois-owned press and social clubs. Many of them were active in both radical and moderate circles. Narimanov and Efendiev continued to write for bourgeois papers, articles dealing with subjects agreeable to their patrons. At this early stage in the formation of Azerbaijan's national culture, the objectives of the moderates and the radicals were almost identical: to "liberate" their society from the influence of the conservative olama, to educate the nation, to promote the growth of trade and industry, and to encourage the formation of an independent Azerbaijani capitalist class that would acquire the economic power needed to combat Russian and European economic competition.

In his two-volume post-Stalin study of the spread of Marxism-Leninism in Russian Azerbaijan, the Soviet historian V. Samedov argued that the Hemmatists, whose paper *Hemmat* was suspended in February 1905, were compelled by force of circumstance to use bourgeois networks for their own ends. They did not "collaborate" with the bourgeois nationalists; they only sought to "infiltrate" their clubs and newspapers for the purpose of spreading revolutionary propaganda.[46] Nonetheless, in his final assessment of the literary and political contributions of the Azerbaijani intelligentsia, Samedov did acknowledge the fact that, even though many of them were neither Social Democrats nor Marxists, having failed to understand the universal historic role of the proletariat in the struggle for socialism, "they had a feeling for the revolutionary movement," and some held "revolutionary-democratic" positions. The ideas of the Enlightenment which they upheld, he further conceded, though already anachronistic by the time of the 1905 Russian Revolution, did not lose their importance, given the relative cultural backwardness of the Azerbaijani population.[47]

The ideological composition of the Azerbaijani press in 1905–1907 was indeed fluid, and Marxism was diluted with eighteenth-century humanist ideals. In his weekly column published in *Hayat,* which the bourgeois-liberal Topchibashev edited, Narimanov discussed Marxism at great length. He described the goals of the Social Democrats, explaining their struggle to achieve equality for all people and their call for representative government. He informed the workers of their right to own the fruits of their labor, reminding them that, without that labor, "capitalism is dead." He also warned against the tsar's imperialist design in sowing division among the various nations of the empire.[48] Narimanov fiercely denounced the Russian colonial policy that aimed at "eradicating completely the national languages of the subjected people," replacing them with the compulsory study of Russian.[49] He praised the "freedom fighters" engaged in the "decisive struggle" for national liberation against the powerful and destructive tsarist autocratic regime; but he insisted that the revolutionary movement must be broadly based to include all workers of all nationalities. He stressed the importance of unified action transcending national particularities, noting that the tsar's government would not voluntarily grant people their rights. The people have in themselves the power to act and seize by force what the state denies them.[50]

One of the most crucial issues that Narimanov and fellow Hemmatists were hard-pressed to deal with was the bloody ethnic conflict that erupted in February and August 1905, resulting in the death of thousands of Armenians and Moslems. While some members of the Moslem Union, including Aqaev, organized armed militias to defend the Moslem population and properties against Armenian attack, the Social Democrats intensified their campaigns for workers' solidarity in confronting their common enemy, the tsarist regime. They accused the state of deliberately provoking ethnic clashes in order to divide their ranks and undercut the democratic-revolutionary national liberation movement. The Hemmatists and Armenian Social Democrats founded a biweekly, bilingual Azeri-Armenian paper called *Devat/Koch* (The Call) to counteract ethnic provocations of the state and the bourgeois Armenian and Moslem nationalists. Nineteen issues appeared between May and August 1906, when publication was outlawed by the police.

Efendiev and Azizbekov, among other Moslem Social Democrats, contributed regularly to the paper, which, from its first issue, unequivocally stated one primary goal: to ensure the victory of the oppressed proletariat in its struggle against its oppressors. Its self-avowed mission was to instruct the masses on how to attain their political and economic rights; its intention was to serve the interests of the working class alone, regardless of nationality or religion. In its subsequent issues, the journal published a series of articles in which it denounced the Russian state and its colonial policies and the ruling classes who exploited ethnic conflicts to cut off their workers from the Russian workers' revolutionary movement, and who, in the name of nationalism, sought to separate the Caucasus from Russia and its culture in order to break their political ties. Nationalism, it stated, is the ideology of the exploiters; nationalist interests mean capitalists' interests. It propagated the idea of friendship and brotherhood of all workers of different nationalities, and it urged them all to rally round the Russian revolutionary proletariat. Finally, it pleaded with the Azerbaijani intelligentsia to join their

forces and lead the people onto the "road of freedom," away from "tsarism and capitalism." In a particularly inflammatory essay, Efendiev promised that, with the overthrow of capitalism, the existing social order condoning poverty and injustice would be destroyed. Socialism would not allow the hard-working members of society to go hungry while the leisure class feasted. The change of the political system, he informed his readers, must be accomplished through a revolution; the government must fall into the hands of the people.[51]

Such open denunciations of the ruling classes and of the bourgeois nationalists did not prevent the Hemmatists from continuing to publish in bourgeois papers, including the *Hayat,* which they attacked in *Devat/Koch.* When both *Hayat* and *Devat/Koch* were closed late in the summer of 1906, they turned to two other papers, which, according to Soviet historians, were also owned by members of the bourgeoisie. *Tekamol* (Evolution) began to appear toward the end of 1906, edited by Mohammad Amin Rasulzada; *Ershad* (Guidance) started publication earlier in the same year, edited by Ahmad Aqaev, the radical Islamic reformist who ceased to collaborate with Topchibashev following a heated argument over editorial policies at *Hayat.* Both papers were financed by younger wealthy members of the bourgeoisie with left-of-center political ideas.[52] Both papers rapidly proved to be major organs voicing Hemmatists' views. Both denounced bourgeois nationalism, promoted interfaith brotherhood and cooperation, rejected the Imperial Manifesto of October 1905 as empty promises, and advocated the workers' right to strike, not only to demand better working conditions but also to undermine the power base of the political structure.[53] In the second issue of *Tekamol,* Efendiev asserted that only massive general strikes can "strike a severe blow to autocracy which, sooner or later, shall be destroyed."[54] The nationality problem, he argued, can be solved only through the workers' victory; the workers, therefore, must rally round the RSDWP and join its forces to achieve social and national liberation.[55] In *Ershad,* Efendiev wrote in the same vein about the plight of the peasants, proclaiming their right to own the land they tilled. "Land must be taken by force from them [the landowners] and given to the peasants. There is no other solution."[56]

The Hemmatists were as concerned with the nationality question as were the bourgeois liberals, and they dedicated themselves to defining, analyzing, and offering solutions to what they termed one of the most important and most significant issues of their time.[57] Here, too, they fused into one ideology nationalist and Marxist thought in an attempt to appeal to as broad a constituency as possible and, more importantly, to win the support of the wealthy Moslem bourgeoisie. They adopted the Russian Marxists' line of argument that a capitalist bourgeoisie fulfills a crucial historic role by destroying the old feudal order and creating a working class in its thriving industrial factories, preparing the ground for the inevitable class struggle for power. In a series of interesting essays on the origins and consequences of revolution, colonialism, and the European power struggle, Efendiev commented at great length on the vital part played by the bourgeoisie in shaping the political and economic destiny of a nation.[58] The Industrial Revolution, he wrote, created a new industrial and mercantile class at odds with the traditional, land-based feudal aristocracy. Together with the French masses, the new class formed a so-called third estate,

powerful enough to lead the deadly struggle against the monarchy, the feudal landlords, and all other conservative forces that obstructed the development of new modes of production. He emphasized the "progressive role" of the capitalists, who enjoyed the support of the masses, in destroying the old French monarchy and its socioeconomic power structure. Currently, he went on, the French bourgeoisie and the capitalist classes of the developed industrial nations are engaged in fierce competition to establish their respective colonial rule in Asia and Africa and to force out of the international market the bourgeoisie of the backward, colonized nations.

Efendiev, while condemning European imperialism and noting the evil consequences of capitalism, sought to show how native bourgeoisies subjected to colonial rule are themselves victims of European capitalists' greed. He deplored the absence of conditions necessary for a successful revolution in the Russian Empire—thriving industry, powerful bourgeoisie, and organized proletariat. Echoeing Russian Marxists' faith in historical determinism, he expressed his conviction that, despite its failure, the Russian Revolution of December 1905 would nonetheless result in the strengthening of capitalist development, which, in turn, would inevitably generate the growth of an industrial proletariat. "Time moves forward to progress and evolution. . . . It is impossible to stop progress and evolution," wrote Efendiev.[59] "History moves inexorably," wrote Narimanov.[60] The Hemmatists were also careful in dissociating the European working classes from the colonial policies of their governments. "Not the Europeans, but the capitalists, rather the European capitalists, are the culprits of this calamity. This is the fruit of the bloody and treacherous deeds and designs of their governments."[61] Efendiev insisted that the RSDWP was leading the most decisive struggle against colonialism, and that the nationality problem could be resolved through a united action of all workers against imperialist powers.

The Hemmatists followed closely the Bolshevik-dominated RSDWP Baku Committee line, mobilizing the masses of illiterate, unskilled, underpaid Moslem workers, organizing strikes, and staging street demonstrations—all the while sabotaging liberal bourgeois appeal to Moslem unity. They printed leaflets in Azeri which they distributed freely to Azerbaijani workers, calling on them to seek guidance and advice from the Social Democrats and asking them to establish a trusting relationship with all other workers organized under the aegis of the "powerful Social Democratic party."

> The Moslem people are not deceived. The organized self-aware proletariat, trained by the Social Democrats, considers the struggle against any kind of inequality, any kind of injustice, and the defense of all the oppressed people, as its chief goals. Moslems, know that only the organized working class in town and in the village will give freedom to all Russia and to all its inhabitants. Go to the meetings where Social Democrats speak. Then you will find out what you should do, and with whom you should go for the attainment of freedom and happiness. The Social Democrats are waiting for you, Moslem citizens.[62]

With the outbreak of ethnic violence in February 1905, the Hemmatists warned the Moslem workers against the Tsarist regime's effort to "fuel" Moslem–Armenian hostilities in order to prevent the formation of a united workers'

revolutionary front. "Moslems, like all other people, unite, close your ranks, fight the government, throw off its tyranny. Death to autocracy; greetings to the Republic. Greetings to the brotherhood of all people."[63]

The Hemmatists also organized strikes at the Moslem-owned factories. In June 1906, the biggest labor event took place at Taqiev's textile factory, where reportedly sixteen hundred workers participated, forcing the factory to close down for a month. A committee of striking workers was formed, demanding better working conditions, including an eight-hour workday, a salary increase, better labor–management relations, a new bath to be built near the factory. The event attracted the attention of most parties and factory workers all over Azerbaijan. *Devat/Koch* gave ample coverage to this event, which symbolized the rise of the Moslem proletariat against their own Moslem employers, against a "father-benefactor" figure such as Taqiev. It noted the fallacy of national unity, observing that the fundamental interests of all workers, regardless of their nationality, are identical. "Those who consider all Moslems as equal are mistaken. . . . No. The type of Taqiev is one, Moslem workers' is another. The Mantashevs are one kind, the Armenian workers are another."[64]

Throughout 1906 and 1907, general strikes periodically forced the closing of factories but also compelled the management to deal with some of the workers' demands. Soviet historians report that Topchibashev, the moderate bourgeois liberal closely identified with capitalists' interests, became involved in mediating negotiations between the workers and their employers, recognizing the legitimate grievances and demands of the employees from their employers, and organizing legal unions.[65] At a meeting to discuss the formation of a teachers' union, which was attended by Taqiev and other Moslem philanthropists as well as party leaders of all persuasions, Narimanov openly clashed with his benefactor. Taqiev bitterly denounced the latter's role in staging the strike at his textile factory and refused to give in to the Hemmatist's demands for greater autonomy for the teachers' union.[66]

Moslem unions and the Moslem labor movement fared no better than their Russian counterparts. By 1907, major arrests of strike leaders and participants, arrests of party leaders, and a general recession in the oil industry combined to bring labor unrest to a halt. Moreover, as Samedov admitted, the bourgeois wing of the national liberation movement was powerful and well organized enough to stifle the vigorous but relatively small circle of the "progressive, revolutionary democrats." Moslem entrepreneurs who had consistently financed the press and clubs used by the Hemmatists, frightened by the potential violence of the strikes, became more selective in their philanthropy. Taqiev was essentially interested in cultural and social autonomy, in Moslems' political and economic equality with Russians; according to the Soviet sources, he was not interested in political independence. Both the Moslem Union and the Moslem Kadet party platforms corroborate this view, as does the portrayal by the governor of Baku. "During the turbulent years of the Russian Revolution, Taqiev boldly condemned the destructive designs of the extremist parties, and the government was at that time indebted to his restraining influence. Then as now, Taqiev should be considered as a man who is not only devoted to Russia, but also carries these sentiments amongst the Moslems who take his opinion into serious account."[67]

Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay remarked on the "unstable character" of the Hemmatists, the "unresolvable contradictions" of this first Moslem socialist party. It never directly attacked Islam, they noted, and it never broke completely with the nationalist camp.[68] These observations, correct as they may be, fail to take into account the sociocultural climate prevailing in the Moslem Caucasus at that time. A more accurate assessment would confirm the view that, in the last analysis, the Hemmatists, like the Social Democrats in Iran and their fellow Shia dissidents, were inclined to resort to the time-honored practice of taqiyya to ensure their survival and allow them to carry on the struggle from within the very system they wished to eradicate. Here, the Russian Social Democrats' views on the nationality issue eventually convinced some of its leaders to endorse a similar tactic.

The original Russian Marxist group had overlooked the nationality problem when it drew up its program in the 1880s, merely calling for the establishment of "full equality for all citizens, regardless of religion or national origin."[69] The First Congress of the RSDWP of 1898 also ignored this problem. According to Richard Pipes, the party for the first time faced the national question in 1901, when the Bund demanded that the Jews be recognized as a nation. The party leaders categorically refused to accede to such "nationalistic, un-Marxian, and completely impractical"[70] requests. Lenin, however, gradually came to realize the importance of the issue as a means to the party's revolutionary ends. He began to conceive of the possibility, even desirability, of an alliance between the socialists and the minority nationalists on a conditional short-term basis. He considered this the "support of an ally against a given enemy, and the Social Democrats provide this support in order to speed the fall of the common enemy, but they expect nothing for themselves from these temporary allies and concede nothing to them."[71] Lenin, as Pipes adequately explained, was prepared to have Social Democracy "utilize such forces, whether they expressed dissatisfaction on the part of other classes, or of religious groups, or of national minorities," forces which he deemed "suitable for exploitation in the struggle for power."[72]

Not all Social Democratic factions agreed with Lenin; many prominent ideologues, such as Leon Trotsky and Georgi Plekhanov, strongly objected to conceding to the nationalists' demands. However, Lenin, through his close collaboration with Shaumian and Djaparidze, the Armenian and Georgian members of the Baku Committee of the RSDWP and of the Hemmat group, influenced the Hemmatists.

The workers of Marx, Engels, Trotsky and Kautsky had by that time been translated into the Azeri language, and thousands of copies of each had been distributed in the Caucasus. Narimanov, the chief translator for the RSDWP, translated into Azeri a doctored version of the party's program, which he published in June 1906 in the bourgeois-owned paper *Hayat.* He candidly stated that the attainment of the party's "lofty goals" of complete religious freedom and equality of all religions was not yet possible, given the people's ignorance and prevailing social repression. "Our people," he wrote, "do not differentiate what is good for them from what is bad. Therefore, it is necessary to proclaim these goals gradually."[73]

Working from within the Moslem bourgeois system ensured the Hemmatists'

survival and access to the bourgeois facilities and networks which they utilized to spread their message and educate the masses. For tactical reasons, the Hemmatists aimed at weakening and eventually eliminating the influence of the religious institutions and the olama in society, rather than eradicating Islam. Within the Russian imperial context, Islam gave the Moslems their "national" identity, just as Judaism gave the Jews their distinct identity. The Hemmatists, like the Bundists (the Jewish Social Democratic party), avoided antireligious slogans. Although the Hemmatists, and other "progressive-democratic" intellectuals, bitterly attacked their rivals' choice of Ottoman Turkish, instead of Azeri, as the national language, they were nonetheless keenly aware of the fact that Islamic culture was the common denominator holding together Moslem Azerbaijani society. In their speeches and their writings, they addressed themselves to the "Moslems" and not to "Azerbaijanis," following the contemporary practice of distinguishing them from other non-Moslem inhabitants of Azerbaijan. Islam conveyed a national-ethnic, and not just religious, distinction. Azerbaijani national identity in this period was not yet shaped; it was still in the process of self-definition.

The Hemmatists, fighting the tsarist regime from the very beginning, had no illusions about the possibility of changing the religious status quo accepted by the high-ranking olama, who owed their privileges and positions to the tsar. The Moslem Kadets, however, demanded autonomy for their religious institutions and the right for the Moslem community to appoint its own religious leaders. In fact, as already mentioned, this demand constituted an essential component of the Moslem Union platform drafted by Topchibashev, among others. Yet Topchibashev was not planning to establish an independent Moslem religious institution controlled by the olama. On the contrary, he and other so-called pan-Islamists who participated in the Moslem congresses wished to bring to an end the Russian policy of subjugating the religious institutions to imperial power. Topchibashev reportedly wished to eliminate the influence of conservative, traditional olama, whom the Russian authorities had appointed and who blocked all attempts at reforms. Writing in 1909 about the Moslem nationality question in the empire, a Russian liberal observed that members of the Moslem intelligentsia, understandably, were compelled to pay attention to the conditions of the religious institutions. Moreover, in their struggle for cultural development, they had to resort to "sociopolitical obscurantism" in addition to religious obscurantism, for they believed that cultural development required, first and foremost, change at the level of the religious leadership. They insisted that the mofti and the shaikh al-Islam had to be elected by popular vote, and that radical religious reforms had to be instituted. However, Russian repression and reactionary olama's opposition forced the intelligentsia to abandon this tactic. They began to seek a more outright secular approach to the problems of social and cultural reforms. "Can we count on the clergy? Hardly."[74] Thus, the bourgeois liberals, no less than the Hemmatists, came to view the high-ranking olama as unreliable civil servants in the pay of the Russian imperial government.

Lower ranking mollahs, on the other hand, like their counterparts in Iran, joined the various social and political groups led by the intelligentsia, well disposed as they were to the ideas of reform and the new learning, and, above all, alienated as they were from their own religious leaders.[75] Poor and not well

educated, having no access to higher religious education in reputable schools, realizing the scarcity of good career opportunities within the religious institutions subjected to Russian rule and regulations, some of these mollahs eagerly joined the ranks of the radical parties active in Baku and elsewhere in the Caucasus.

Here, one must note that neither of the political groups active in the 1905–1907 events was calling for political independence. Both the Moslem Kadets and the Hemmatists, to name the two most important groups in Azerbaijan, depended on, and followed closely, Russian political parties' platforms and ideological support. The Russian Constitutional, or Kadet, party advocated an extensive program that would grant all Russian citizens, regardless of their religion and nationality, equality before the law, freedom of worship, and the right to free cultural self-determination. By cultural self-determination they mean the right to establish free educational and religious institutions for the purpose of protecting and developing the language, literature, and culture of every people in the empire. The Kadets, however, strongly objected to the idea of federalism, let alone political independence, arguing that the conditions prevailing in the empire made it impracticable. The socialists, on the other hand, were divided among themselves over the nationality issue. The Socialist Revolutionary party adopted a generally more liberal attitude toward the minorities and supported a federalist program, even though many Russian members remained ambivalent in their willingness to accept the national minorities' demands. The Social Democrats, be they Mensheviks or Bolsheviks, were internationalists and thus adamantly opposed to either federalism or the unconditional right to self-determination. In that sense, their attitude was essentially no different from the Kadets'.

In 1903, at their Second Congress, the Social Democrats included in their program the minorities' demands for regional self-rule, full equality for all citizens, the right to establish schools that taught in the native language, and the adoption of native languages on an equal basis with the state language in all local social and government institutions. The Social Democrats' adoption of the right of all nations to self-determination, according to Richard Pipes, "put on record the opposition of the Russian Marxists to all forms of discrimination or oppression of one nation by another. It was not a programmatic statement, but rather a declaration, and was understood as such at the time."[76] As Marxists, they favored a strong centralized state and opposed nationalism on the ground that it was incompatible with their socialist goals.

Topchibashev and his group of liberal bourgeois, to which Taqiev and other wealthy Moslem entrepreneurs belonged, adopted the Kadets' platform and formed an alliance with this Russian constitutional party favoring legal means for attaining its goals. The Hemmatists affiliated themselves with a revolutionary party, the RSDWP, believing that only with the overthrow of the tsarist regime and the triumph of socialism could the colonized nations achieve national autonomy. They were no more inclined then the Moslem Kadets, at least at this early stage, to demand complete political independence. Neither party, therefore, can be viewed as nationalistic in the usual meaning of the term. Their respective leadership, their rank and file, even their respective programs, which reflected the Russian party's each adopted—none aimed at territorial independence. They were not separatists. Bearing in mind this fundamental characteristic of the nationality problem in

Azerbaijan as conceived by two of its viable political groups in the early 1900s, one fails to see irreconcilable differences, or even contradictions, between the "bourgeois" and the "progressive-democratic" wings of the movement. Hence their ability to continue to work together on matters concerning sociocultural reforms. What was to continue setting them apart was the difference in their tactics and approach to political and economic issues, which, again at this early stage, remained secondary as priority was given to the more urgent task of sociocultural reforms.

The Azerbaijani press continued to thrive with the publication of a highly popular magazine, *Mollah Nasreddin,* to which a number of Moslem writers and artists, imbued with the spirit of the Enlightenment and the ideals of the French Revolution, regularly contributed articles, cartoons, poems, and short stories.[77] It was founded in April 1906 by Jalil Mamad Kulizada (1869–1932), a Moslem Azerbaijani who lived in Tiflis and was a devout disciple of Akhundov and an admirer of contemporary Russian novelists, especially Gogol. He began his career as a translator in a local Azeri paper owned by bourgeois liberals, *Sharq-e Rus*; he continued there until it was closed in January 1905. With the financial backing of a wealthy Moslem merchant, he bought the printing press of the defunct paper and began the publication of *Hairat,* printing not much more than commerical announcements, texts of telegrams and official dispatches, and some short stories. Kulizada also used the press to illegally print revolutionary leaflets written by the Social Democrats. According to Samedov, Kulizada never belonged to the RSDWP or to the Hemmatist group, despite his occasional collaboration with them. However, as Samedov admits, Kulizada and his circle upheld "democratic," "revolutionary," "progressive" views. Like the Hemmatists, they were antitsarists, anticlerical, and republicans.

Mollah Nasreddin, a magazine of cartoons, perfected the literary satire; it was devoted to the task of destroying the old order and replacing it with a dynamic, enlightened society where people govern themselves and the reign of social justice and equality is supreme. The people have to struggle to attain that end, beginning by waging war against religion. Religion and the olama were held responsible for the prevailing ignorance, superstition, and fanaticism that kept the Moslems culturally and socially backward, rendering them easy prey to political despots and colonial rulers. The paper concentrated its attacks on Moslem clerics, accusing them of "sucking the blood of the wretched Moslem people."[78] Mirza Ali Akbar Taherzada Sabir (1862–1911), another well-known Azerbaijani poet, published his best works in *Mollah Nasreddin.* Fiercely anticlerical, he addressed himself to the olama in one poem whose tone inflamed clerical hostility to the paper to new heights. In the poem, entitled "I do not believe you," he stated, "You need religion in order to rob the enchained people," and he declared religion to be "as frightening as the glitter of a bandit's knife."[79]

The magazine was finally proclaimed heretical by the Azerbaijani olama, who had obtained a fatwa from Najaf banning its sale and purchase by Moslems. Kulizada wrote in his memoirs that his residence in a Christian quarter of Tiflis ensured the independence of the magazine, since the Moslem authorities had no jurisdiction there. Otherwise, he added, he could not have carried on his struggle

against men of religion; they would have stoned him to death.[80] Thus, *Mollah Nasreddin* survived clerical censorship and became highly successful; through its use of cartoons it was accessible to a wide public within Transcaucasia and beyond the Caspian shores, in Iran itself. It amused, it informed, it aroused interest, and it inspired open-minded Iranians. Many of the articles, poems, and political messages were also written in Persian to reach non–Azeri-speaking readers.

In 1907, both *Ershad* and *Takamol* were forced to close. The Hemmatists were, once more, deprived of legal means to propagate their ideas and programs. Their bleak political prospects, however, did not put an end to their activism, as Iranian Azerbaijan and all of Iran were increasingly attracting the Hemmatists' commitment and support. They, together with the Baku Committee of the RSDWP and Lenin himself, vested their hope in the Iranian Revolution, which they closely monitored, and which came to symbolize the rise of the oppressed East against its Oriental despot from within and European imperialism from without.

Russian Azerbaijan and Iran

Bennigsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay argued that the Russian Azerbaijani intellectuals turned pan-Turkic partly in reaction to the conservative sociocultural influence of the Shia religious establishment, which closely identified with Iran and enforced the predominance of the Persian language and culture. The leaders of the nascent Moslem national Azerbaijani movement preferred to emphasize their linguistic links with Ottoman Turkey and other Sunni Turkic peoples of central Asia over and against the religious bond that tied them to Shia Iran. Thus, strong hostile currents engulfed the conservative social groups and Shia olama, partisans of Iran, on the one hand, and the liberal, nationalist, anticlerical intelligentsia, on the other. The liberals' anticlericalism, the French authors claimed, underscored their opposition to Shi'ism, that is, to Iranian influence.[81] Some Western scholars also defined Russian Azerbaijani cultural nationalism as anti-Iranian and pro-Turkic, expressing its spokesmen's resentment and rejection of Iranian dominance of their social and intellectual life.[82]

Russian Azerbaijani intellectuals were, indeed, anticlerical and highly critical of Shia rituals and beliefs. In the works of Fathali Akhundov and Nariman Narimanov, to name only two of the most famous literary figures of the time, Shia men of religion were the central targets of their most vicious polemics and satires. Ahmad Aqaev, long a defender of the "real" Islam, became quite adamant in his denunciation of the Shia establishment, be it in Iran or Transcaucasia. However, none of these intellectuals identified Iran or Iranian culture solely with Shi'ism or Shia olama. Moreover, anticlericalism was a characteristic that almost all Moslem modernist thinkers shared. Some, like Aqaev, were also carrying on the long Shia tradition of opposition to institutionalized religion dominated by the mojtaheds and other high-ranking members of the establishment. It was a tradition that Jamal al-Din Asadabadi and fellow Iranian religious dissidents had updated and brought into the circle of lay modernizers. Asadabadi

was well known in Russian Moslem communities, having traveled throughout the Russian Empire from 1887 to 1889.

Culturally, Russian Azerbaijanis were not different from Iranian Azerbaijanis. They spoke the same Azeri dialect, and the elite were educated in the Persian language. Socioeconomic ties were maintained, and the flow of travelers across the frontier kept increasing in the second half of the nineteenth century. A more fertile, liberal, intellectual climate and employment opportunities in the Baku oil fields attracted both the educated and the mercantile classes, as well as unskilled laborers from Iranian Azerbaijan. At the turn of the century, Iranian Azerbaijani migrant workers made up 15 and 12 percent of the labor force in Baku and Elisavetpol (Gandzha). Between 1891 and 1904, the Russian consulate in Tabriz issued 312,000 entry visas; in the 1905–1907 period alone 20,000 to 25,000 emigrated to Baku.[83] The bulk of the Russian trade with Iran was in the hands of wealthy merchants and shipowners from Baku. Leading precursors of Iranian secular nationalism, such as Akhundov and Abdol Rahim Talebov (1834–1911), were Russian subjects. Both wrote their best known works in Persian and addressed themselves to issues related to Iran and Iranians living in the motherland. Haj Zain al-Abedin Taqiev, the Baku millionaire, headed the list of wealthy patrons of important Iranian travelers, intellectuals, politicians, and journalists. He also sponsored the free distribution of Baku periodicals and newspapers, which he financed, for the dissemination of new ideas throughout the Moslem world.

Although most Russian and Western sources viewed Moslem Transcaucasians as backward in comparison with the Christian Armenians, Georgians, and Russians living in the area, Tabriz looked up to Moslem Baku as more enlightened and progressive than itself or Tehran. Its social and political activists sought in Baku inspiration and models to emulate for their own modernization programs. Some turned as anticlerical and fiercely secularist as Baku activists; many turned antireligious, like Akhundov and his followers. The magazine *Mollah Nasreddin* found avid readers who dutifully subscribed to it, while more ambitious admirers attempted to publish similar magazines in Tabriz and elsewhere in Iran. Iranian Azerbaijanis, encouraged by their northern brethren, would unabashedly call for the adoption of the new learning and the curtailing of religious influence in society. Semisecret literary societies were formed to propagate their views and recruit missionaries for the new cause, receiving direct help from Baku. It was from within this small group of "enlightened" Tabrizis that the radical political activists were to emerge. Here, too, Baku would be a vital source of inspiration and emulation.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century Tabriz saw the emergence of a new generation of young Iranians devoted to the task of reforming their society from below. Most of them came from a middle- or lower middle-class background; a great number of them professionally belonged to the religious institutions, wearing the traditional turban and clerical garb. Trained in the madrasa and maktab system, they were, nonetheless, attracted to the European ideas of the Enlightenment they discovered through the local foreign missionary schools, or through their extensive travels to Istanbul, Baku, Tiflis, and Russian cities. They were also acquainted with the ideas of Malkom Khan, Jamal al-Din Asadabadi, and

other Iranian dissidents living in exile, whose works and periodicals they collected and distributed clandestinely in Iran. Though they were interested in the Ottomans' experiments with reform, and were duly impressed by some of the Young Ottomans' (the Young Turks' predecessors) Islamic reformist views, especially Namik Kemal's, the Tabrizis felt greater social and cultural affinities with fellow Shia intellectuals living in the Caucasus. Akhundov, Talebov, Maragha'i, and other Azerbaijanis who wrote in Persian and devoted their pens to specifically Iranian issues, naturally proved to be more inspiring than the Young Ottomans. The Baku political parties and groups, the Baku press, and Baku intellectual circles offered more attractive models for emulation, be they socialists or bourgeois liberals.

Many of the Tabrizis met with leading Transcaucasian intellectual and political figures. Hasan Roshdiyya, the young mollah highly interested in the new learning, who had studied in Beirut at the French university, had traveled extensively in the Russian Moslem borderlands before founding his own Moslem reformed school in Erevan, teaching foreign languages and modern sciences. During his four-year stay in the Caucasus he had established a lasting friendship with Talebov. He had also enjoyed the generous financial support of Taqiev.[84] Upon his return to Tabriz, he founded a school like that in Erevan, thus establishing a precedent for open-minded educators throughout the country. The Roshdiyya school system acquired greater fame when its founder, invited by the reformist minister Amin al-Daula, opened several such schools in the capital.

Hasan Taqizada was another young mollah who had several times visited friends and relatives in Russian Azerbaijan. "Repelled" by the local madrasa traditional education in "blind imitation,"[85] in 1895 he founded a literary circle of some twenty young, like-minded Tabrizis. They established a school to teach the new learning, a periodical called *Gangina-ye fonun* for the dissemination of modern concepts and knowledge, and a library-bookstore. The school was soon closed by the olama's order; the paper lasted barely one year; but the library survived and rapidly came to serve as the headquarter of the political activists on the eve of the revolution.[86] By that time, several secret societies had been formed; despite apparent ideological differences, they were simultaneously engaged in promoting their cause, which shared secularist, antimojtahed, constitutionalist, modernist goals.

Taqizada's circle was cofounded by three Russian-educated young men, Hosain Adalat and the Tarbiyyat brothers, Mirza Mohammad Ali and Mirza Ali Mohammad. It included mollahs, such as Hassan Sharifzada, Mohammad Salmasi, Mirza Ghaffar Zonuzi, Mirza Ibrahim Aqa; merchants, such as Karbala'i Ali—called "Monsieur"—Rasul Sadeqyani, Hajj Mirza Aqa Farshi; and other lay professionals.[87] Some Persian sources refer to this secret society by its code name "Aleyhom" and describe its early activities as primarily directed at denouncing superstitious beliefs and rituals which, allegedly, the credulous, illiterate masses took for religion. It was thus in close contact with another secret society almost entirely composed of lower ranking mollahs and tollab, appropriately called anjoman-e islami, the Islamic society.[88]

The Islamic society of Tabriz was modeled after its namesake in Isfahan which Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez had founded. It followed

their pattern of preaching sermons that blended religious rhetoric with commercial advertisement and political propaganda. In fact, both Isfahan preachers had spent some time in Tabriz at the turn of the century and had recruited the services of local preachers for the promotion of the textile industry owned by the sherkat-e islami of Isfahan. Taqizada's longlasting friendship and political cooperation with Jamal al-Din Va'ez began at this time.[89] Together with the three most prominent preachers involved in this commercial promotion at Tabriz mosques, Shaikh Selim, Mirza Hosain Va'ez, and Mirza Javad Nateq, they were interested in pushing for greater causes than marketing Isfahan manufactured goods. Reportedly they exploited the occasion to open up the discussion to broader political issues, and to disseminate their own views on the new learning, freedom, patriotism, and the need to abolish the practice of superstitious rituals.

Shaikh Selim, Hosain Va'ez, and Javad Nateq[90] shared a profound distaste for the traditional learning and the conservative sociopolitical outlook of the high-ranking members of the religious institutions. Shaikh Selim and Hosain Va'ez were born into poor rural families, whereas Nateq grew up in Tabriz, the son of a middle-ranking mollah and a protégé of Taqizada, who was five years his senior. All three, however, led a life of financial hardship that compelled them to seek assistance and patronage from the local notables. Thus they practiced taqiyya, lending their services to the lay and clerical grandees in town, performing traditional religious rituals and recitals, while secretly joining forces with other dissidents.

Hosain Va'ez reportedly began his political activism at the age of twenty-five after a trip to Baku and the Caucasus in general, returning with a "new soul" after seeing this "totally new world."[91] Javad Nateq, upon joining the Aleyhom group, similarly discovered a "new world" so dramatically different from the "dry ambiance" of the olama's milieu he was accustomed to.[92] It was essentially the world of journalism, of social criticism, of political activism and commitment; a world where the pen and the spoken word wielded power. For the first time in their life, they heard of concepts such as constitutionalism, republicanism, sovereignty of the people.

Toward the end of 1904 and the beginning of 1905, Ali "Monsieur" formed a more politically active, more revolutionary secret society referred to in Persian annals as markaz-e ghaibi, or Secret Center. It included many members of the Aleyhom group and of the Islamic society.[93] Ali "Monsieur" had spent several years in Istanbul before traveling extensively in the Caucasus. He knew French and was well versed in the history of the French Revolution. He was to become the most radically secularist revolutionist of Tabriz, gearing the local Constitutional movement onto a course running parallel to the Transcaucasian Hemmatists'. Several other members of the Secret Center, such as Mohammad Shabstari known as Abol Ziya, Ali Davaforush, Rasul Sadeqyani, the Tarbiyyat brothers, and Taqizada himself, to name but a few of the better known figures, shared this radical, secularist view. By the eve of the revolution, Shaikh Selim, Hosain Va'ez, and Javad Nateq, who were to emerge as the three most articulate preachers of the Constitutional movement in Tabriz, began to collaborate closely with the Secret Center. It was this latter organization, comprising members of both Aleyhom and the Islamic society, that formed the first secret cell of Iranian Social Democrats in Tabriz.

The origins and the social and ideological composition of the Social Democratic branch in the Tabriz need investigation. According to most Persian sources, the Social Democratic organization (ejtema'iyyun-amiyyun) was secretly founded in Tabriz on the eve of the revolution or shortly after, depending on the source, by members of the markaz-e ghaibi.[94] In a recent study on the subject, the Soviet historian Nariman A. Hasanov insists that both secret societies were in fact one and the same, the markaz-e ghaibi, among whose members he includes the preachers Shaikh Selim, Mirza Javad Nateq, and Mirza Hosain Va'ez, acting as the central committee of the Social Democrats. Echoing most Persian and Russian sources, he stresses the fact that the Iranian Social Democratic organization was originally founded in Baku by the Hemmatists, and that it recruited its members from among the vast pool of migrant Iranian workers, receiving support from a small circle of Tabriz radicals.[95] Another Soviet historian, Hasan M. Hasanov, had earlier refuted some Persian accounts that the Social Democratic party was first established in Iran, in 1903 or 1904, by the Transcaucasian radical activist Haidar Amu oghli, arguing that it was officially set up by Nariman Narimanov no earlier than December 1905, and that it worked very closely with the Hemmat group under the direct supervision of the Bolshevik-dominated Baku Committee of the RSDWP.[96]

Nonetheless, as both Hasanovs and other Russian historians have convincingly demonstrated, the Baku Committee of the RSDWP beginning in 1903 and the Hemmat group from its founding in 1904 had vigorously undertaken the political education of the Moslem workers, a large percentage of whom consisted of Iranian expatriates. The Bolshevik faction, especially, was highly successful in mobilizing them and in staging massive strikes even at Moslem-owned factories.[97] Moreover, although Narimanov was indeed one of the most important Hemmatists directing the Iranian Social Democrats, be they in Baku or in Iran, he had joined the Hemmat group a year after it was founded by Rasulzada, Efendiev, and Azizbekov, among others. Similarly, Moslem socialist circles, albeit small and numerically insignificant, had already been formed as early as 1903, as noted previously. It may, therefore, very well be that a few Transcaucasian individuals had sought to establish some secret radical cells in Iran prior to the formation of the official Iranian Social Democratic group in Baku by Narimanov, or even independently from the Hemmatists.

Here, one must stress the fact that the Moslem Transcaucasian activists had found channels for the propagation of their ideas other than the secret societies of Tabriz. Mashhad and Tehran proved to be equally ripe for the formation of underground networks. A great number of Moslem Azerbaijanis who fled Baku and its vicinity after the bloody religioethnic conflicts had found refuge in Mashhad. Among these refugees were many radicals who began to mobilize members of the lower classes and the tollab. Others had settled in Tehran, where the political and intellectual climate was more receptive to their views.

Haidar Khan Amu oghli Tariverdiev (1880–1921)[98] was the most prominent Transcaucasian radical playing a secret role in the events leading to the eruption of the Constitutional movement and the subsequent struggles against the conservative elements in the government and the majles. Born in Iranian Azerbaijan, he had moved to the Caucasus with his extended family in the early 1880s. He

completed his school education in Erevan, where he reportedly was introduced to the works of Marx and other socialists, before enrolling in the university of Tiflis at the department of electrical engineering. In Tiflis he joined a group of Moslem, Armenian, and Georgian socialists. It was while working in Baku in 1902 at a Taqiev factory that he met Mozzafar al-Din shah, who was on his way back from Europe. The shah offered him a position in Mashhad at a power plant installed by the German firm Otto Deuz.

Haidar Khan arrived in Mashhad in 1903. He had by then espoused socialist views and was dedicated to the cause of armed struggle, overt or covert, for the establishment of a democratic republic. During his eleven-month stay in Khorasan, he wrote in his autobiographical sketch, he strove to organize a secret cell for the promotion of the cause, but with no success. He then moved to Tehran to work for a Russian construction firm before joining the more prestigious company of Amin al-Zarb, the wealthy merchant who was having a power plant installed in the capital. Sometime in 1905 Haidar Khan returned to Baku, then went to Europe to continue his studies in engineering. However, it seems likely that he spent his time in Europe, where he met Lenin, pursuing revolutionary, rather than academic, interests. He returned to Iran in time to participate in the early phase of the revolution. He reportedly established contacts with some of the olama in the capital, and he had a large following from among the tollab.

There is no doubt that Haidar Khan had penetrated religious circles through Malek al-Motakallemin. As we shall see, he was to figure prominently in the various anjomans the latter controlled after the first majles was established. It is also known that in Tehran Haidar Khan encountered several individual activists, such as Mohammad Reza Musavat, Solaiman Khan Maikada, and Ali Akbar Dehkhoda, not to mention Hasan Taqizada and Hajj Mirza Ibrahim Aqa, the deputies from Tabriz, who shared his radical views and were to clash with the more moderate fellow constitutionalists. On the other hand, Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Hasan Roshdiyya, Shaikh al-Ra'is, and their like, were to prove highly receptive to Haidar Khan's tactics and slogans and would turn political radicals as well. It seems likely that Nazem al-Islam himself, when he came to pronounce his radical statements on the revolution, the plight of the poor, and the need to check the abuse of power and privileges of the nobility, was influenced by the Transcaucasian activists. He did print several shabnamas written by the Baku Social Democrats, and he praised the willingness of fellow Moslems from the Caucasus to join the armed struggle against the reactionary shah. Moreover, Nazem al-Islam's own mentor, the mojtahed Mohammad Tabataba'i, was to fall under the extremists' influence, as we shall see.

E. Bor-Ramenski, the Russian scholar who first discovered the Iranian Social Democratic program in the Baku archives, noted that the mojahedin (that is, the armed Moslem fighters trained in the Caucasus) were fighting for "bourgeois-democratic" reforms. Their social background, he explained, was "extremely mixed," ranging from retailers, moneychangers, and small landowners to low-ranking mollahs and unskilled laborers. Not all of them were actual members of the Social Democratic party; in fact, a great number of them were unaffiliated volunteers.[99] This disparate though generally petit bourgeois social composition of the Moslem Social Democrats' constituency in part accounts for the multiplic-

ity of small radical organizations spreading out in Transcaucasia, where Iranian expatriates proliferated, and in Iran.

The importance of the Iranian Azerbaijani migrant workers and expatriates as potential political agitators was not lost upon any of these groups. In two separate issues of November and December 1905, Jalil Mamad Kulizada, the non-Marxist "revolutionary-democrat" who often collaborated with the Hemmatists, published two inflammatory articles addressed to the poor Iranian laborer. In "The Deprived Ones," he lamented the miserable conditions of the wretched worker forced to desert his home and family in search of employment he could not find in his own country. "He runs away, leaving behind wife and children; he runs away because his wife and children are starving. He rushes to us, so that he could earn a living and feed his family."[100] In the second article, "Farewell Speech," Kulizada incited the Iranian workers returning to their homeland to strive to awaken their compatriots' social consciousness:

> Do not forget, you poor Iranian workers, when you go back to your fatherland, to gather round you the people who are as hungry as you and as oppressed as yourselves, the working people. . . . Convey to your fellow workers and peasants greetings from their Russian comrades. Should they desire to follow the steps of their comrades, should they wish to cast off the yoke imposed upon them by the Persian despots, khans, landowners, mollahs, employers, princes and others, should they want to gain their human rights and to breath freely, then their own Russian comrades would present them, as a token, their own banner with its inscribed holy slogan. . . . Let the abused, deprived Iranian workers read that slogan: Proletariats of all nations, unite.[101]

Narimanov admitted that, as the creator of the Iranian Social Democratic organization and the architect of its ideological strategy, he had to take into serious consideration the Moslems' particular social conditions. When he translated the Russian RSDWP progam into Azeri, and when he came to prepare the Persian version, Narimanov confessed, he had to be cautious to avoid offending the religious feelings of the population:

> The question of religion is so important in the Moslems' life that, in 1906, I had to omit from the program those clauses pertaining to the separation of church and state, and to the separation of schools from church. This was the time when, as the leader of the Iranian Social Democratic party, I had to send agitators to Iran with the program of our party. . . . I may have committed a crime, but, nonetheless, we threw off the throne the most foolish hangman of the world, Mohammad Ali shah.[102]

In both the Azeri and Persian 1906 versions,[103] the following demands were made: the right of the peasants to own land they till; an eight-hour workday for all laborers; guaranteed government social security for all women, children, and old men; low-cost housing for the poor; free schools for orphaned children; progressive taxation; government subsidies of sugar, tea, kerosene, and other essential commodities through the decrease of customs import duties levied on them. Explaining that "this freedom-seeking faction" aims at liberating the wretched nation from the clutches of its "bloodsuckers," that is, the government officials, the program demanded the right for the nation to run its affairs; free-

dom of opinion, so that the people can exchange views with the government and eliminate anything that is detrimental to the nation's interests; freedom of the press; and the merchants' and industrialists' right to negotiate with the government on behalf of all and not just a couple of individuals. The clause regarding religion is even more prudently worded. Freedom of religion is requested "in accordance with the law of the holy shariat, that no one should be forced to renounce his religion or adopt another, whatever faith or creed one may profess. . . . The government should not have the right to force the conversion of anyone into any other faith, so that the followers of all religions may establish among themselves brotherly relations." Here, a note is added to the Persian version, stating that this last clause does not really concern Iran as, contrary to Imperial Russia, in Iran neither the government nor its subjects infringe upon "the followers of other religions."[104]

Narimanov's ideological prudence reflected his and his fellow Hemmatists' tactics which allowed them to tread cautiously in the Russian Azerbaijani social and political scene and to continue to work from within the Moslem moderate bourgeois national movement. It was no accident that the Azeri version of the RSDWP program appeared in *Hayat,* the Baku bourgeois paper. The Iranian Social Democrats were to adopt a no less cautious ideological stand, likewise seeking to attract to their cause a socially broader based constituency. As a Soviet historian remarked, the participation of Moslem preachers in the Social Democrats' meeting, the use of formulas glorifying Allah, the very religious premises where they gathered, the omission of freedom of religion from their program, clearly indicate the Iranians' need for broad mass appeal and their readiness to consider the mood of the masses when devising their practical revolutionary work.[105]

The Iranian Social Democrats, like the Hemmatists, were neither ideologically pure nor doctrinaire. They were, first and foremost, men of action. As we shall see, when in 1907 the Hemmatists and their Iranian counterparts came to revise their program and prepare a more detailed list of regulations for the mojahedin, such "sectarianism" predominated, reflecting what Bor-Ramenski termed the "underdevelopment of Iranian politics."[106]

Undoubtedly, the Baku Social Democrats and the Hemmatists played a pivotal role in organizing and supporting the Tabriz Social Democrats, as we shall see. However, the ideological origins and the modus operandi of the markaz-e ghaibi lay not only in the Russian Social Democratic Workers party but also in the Shia tradition of intellectual dissent and in the European liberal tradition of the Enlightenment. All secret societies active in Tabriz before the revolution shared identical nationalist, modernist, anti–clerical establishment, politically oppositionist views. None could as yet be defined as Social Democratic, even though some of their members were to turn toward this direction. In that sense, they were similar to the Hemmatists.

The secret societies, like their counterparts in Tehran, devised ways and means to disseminate their views, to arouse the people's social and national consciousness, and to establish a new sociocultural order. They criticized the backward conditions of Iranian society, which they contrasted to "civilized nations" of Europe. They printed newsletters, secret leaflets, and pamphlets. They

contributed to the Persian newspapers published abroad, and they helped in distributing those that were officially banned in the country. The Baku Azeri press found eager readers in Tabriz.

Tabriz activists, again like their counterparts in Tehran, wrapped their innovative thought in religious cloaks in an attempt to attract the olama to their cause. They were able to find in the person of the mojtahed Mirza Ali Theqat al-Islam a valuable ally and staunch supporter. Theqat al-Islam was by natural inclination an advocate of the new learning; he was therefore, amenable to the progressive ideas of the secret societies, much in the same way Mohammad Tabataba'i was drawn into the activities of Tehran's secret societies. Theqat al-Islam was the leader of the Shaikhi school of Shia thought in Tabriz, which, like its counterpart in Kerman, suffered merciless persecution at the hands of the orthodox religious leaders. However, unlike the Kermani leader, who, being led by a member of the Qajar ruling family, had declared himself against the Constitutional movement, Theqat al-Islam was to become one of the three most active Iranian mojtaheds in support of the Iranian Constitution and was to lose his life as a consequence. The relationship of Theqat al-Islam with the Tabriz radicals, following the promulgation of the Constitution, was to be identical to Mohammad Tabataba'i's with the Tehran radicals.

The secret societies' tactics recalled those employed in the capital. Religious ceremonies and assemblies were exploited to propagate the cause. Rivalry between the high-ranking olama in town was fanned and manipulated, especially between Mirza Hasan, the powerful mojtahed, and the local Imam Jom'a, between these two and Theqat al-Islam, betweeen the Shaikhis and their opponents. Discontented officials and dismissed civil servants were sought and recruited. A network of collaborators within the government bureacracy was cultivated to keep the societies well informed on current policies, events, incidents, and even scandals which its leaders could use to their advantage.[107]

5

Political Agitation and the Mobilization of Religion

The Mobilization of the Ayatollahs

All Iranian sources agree that the olama's involvement in the Constitutional movement began no differently from clerical participation in other political cabals, siding with or against the sadr-e aʿzam of the day. In 1903 Amin al-Soltan, who was then the bête noire of the liberals, fell from power as a result of the concerted effort of the olama of Tehran (Behbahani, the Imam Jomʿa, Mohammad Tabataba'i, Fazlollah Nuri, Ali Akbar Tafrashi), the court and government officials, the secret societies, and lay dissidents. As soon as Ain al-Daula assumed the premiership, new coalitions were forged, involving major shifts in alignments. Nuri, closely associated with the new sadr-e aʿzam, emerged as the most powerful cleric in the capital, acquiring and distributing favors, expanding his influence in both government and religious circles. The Imam Jomʿa and Abu Taleb Zanjani were his allies in the capital. His rival, Behbahani, joined a cabal plotting against Ain al-Daula, engineered and financed by Amin al-Soltan and his associates. In contrast to Ain al-Daula, who tightened the strings of the state treasury, Amin al-Soltan maintained his reputation as a generous provider for his supporters and allies.

In late September and early October 1903, Amin al-Soltan's agents pursued the time-honored policy of sowing division among the olama. They instigated a fight between the tollab of the madrasa-ya Sadr and the Mohammadiyya over the right to administer the latter's endowment. The Mohammadiyya, located in the bazaar, was then under the trusteeship of Ali Akbar Tafrashi, a senior and respected mojtahed, an ally of Behbahani; the Sadr was run by the Imam Jomʿa. Government and court officials took the side of one or the other group. The tollab of the Sadr, upon the Imam Jomʿa's instructions, raided the nearby madrasa Asefiyya, which was administered by a member of Behbahani's newtork, and had it evacuated and brought under their master's control, whereupon the Mohammadiyya tollab, led by Moʿtamed al-Islam Rashti, Behbahani's protégé, came to rescue the Asefiyya tollab. The battle ended with heavy casualties and victory for the Moʿtamed al-Islam group. Consequently, the Imam Jomʿa accused Behbahani of complicity and incited his tollab to attack him. When Behbahani was assaulted, Tafrashi publicly demanded from the government punitive action against the Imam Jomʿa's tollab.[1] Ain al-Daula, who at first ignored the incident

because of his dislike for the Behbahani–Amin al-Soltan faction, was pressed to punish the Imam Jomʿa's students. The display of force aroused popular sentiment against the government and in sympathy for the olama, whose prestige thus increased considerably. Under these new circumstances, Behbahani, the initially injured party who had asked for government intervention, called for the release of his assailants.

Whereas Kasravi refers to this incident as evidence of government hostility to the olama in general, Malekzada claims the revolutionaries, working underground, were responsible for fanning dissension in order to have the olama turn against the state.[2] Subsequent events confirm the latter's assertions. The secret societies relentlessly sought ways to entice the olama to unite in a common cause against the government, while Amin al-Soltan's faction deepened its association with the Tehran religious leaders, offering them rewards for their opposition to Ain al-Daula.

A photograph of Joseph Naus was just the pretext all interested groups needed.[3] The Belgian expert hired by the government to reform the tax system of the country was seen wearing clerical garb at a costume party. In the annals of the revolution, the controversial Belgian tax official symbolizes European encroachment in domestic affairs and corrupt Iranian officialdom selling out the nation's interests to the foreigners. A number of the important merchants in Tehran, Tabriz, Isfahan, and other major cities, were resentful of the new tax reforms and customs levies, and dissatisfaction with the promotion of Armenian Christians to managerial positions in the Customs and Postal Administration was widespread. However, the Belgian official was in fact attacked by government and court officials frustrated in their efforts to amass fortunes and special privileges. In Tehran Saʿd al-Daula, the minister of commerce, headed the list, which also included the partisans of Amin al-Soltan. In Tabriz the crown prince was reportedly unhappy with the sum offered by Priem, the Belgian financial expert in Azerbaijan, and enticed the local mojtaheds to denounce the Belgian officials on religious grounds. In March 1905, during the Moharram holy week that commemorates the Kerbala events, a time when the religious passion of the faithful supposedly reaches a paroxysm, the procession was transformed into a political demonstration skillfully directed by the preachers. The tollab brandished copies of the photograph of Naus, demanding vengeance. Behbahani was persuaded to deliver a sermon condemning the Belgian officials and calling for their dismissal. The incident, and the passions it aroused, eventually subsided. Bribes and vague promises, the unwillingness of Nuri and the Imam Jomʿa—and their followers among the olama—to join the protest, and the British envoy's refusal to support it helped in restoring calm. The anti–Ain al-Daula factions continued to encourage the merchants to agitate against Naus. In April some leading merchants and shopkeepers took bast (sanctuary) in the Shahabdolazim shrine, demanding the dismissal of the Belgian official. Once more vague promises put an end to the agitation.[4] A united clerical front was not to emerge until new incidents were exploited to convince the ayatollahs of the capital to close ranks against Ain al-Daula's government.

At the end of November 1905, underground activists appropriated the issue of the sale of land to Russian concerns. The land in question, site of an old

cemetry and a dilapidated mosque, was classified as waqf wasteland and left under Ashtiani family jurisdiction. The Ashtianis reportedly drew some profits by selling lots to individuals to build housing for the poor. The Russian Bank, however, bought the entire parcel for the construction of their branch, obtaining Nuri's legal services for the purchase. During construction some human skulls and bones were unearthed and carelessly discarded. Nuri's opponents and the Ashtiani brothers seized the occasion to decry the blasphemous deed and the humiliation of Moslems by the infidels with the complicity of an impious government. The Ashtiani brothers then paid a crowd of forty men and twenty women three tomans each to stage street riots. In the ensuing violence, the new building was destroyed. The incident is generally viewed as significant evidence of increased tension between the olama and the state and as one of the preliminary stages of the revolution. Nazem al-Islam vividly described the effectiveness of mobilized religious and nationalist sentiment for a revolutionary cause. Such a "divine force," he wrote, could defeat an army and overthrow a monarchy. He concluded his account of the incident with a dramatic statement: "The storm of revolution was blowing hard."[5]

The story of the 1905 Shaikhi–Balasari war in Kerman,[6] which Nazem al-Islam recounted in detail and which was examined by subsequent historians, throws more sobering light on the strange mix of religion and politics and its effect on historical events in Iran. The province of Kerman, like all other provinces, was ruled by a Qajar prince, who, though appointed by the reigning monarch, depended on the local elite to retain his post and ensure public goodwill. Again as in other provinces, the governor of Kerman had to contend with individual's intrigues and factionalism, which normally began as soon as a nominee was officially announced in the capital. One such faction was headed by the most powerful and wealthy local family, the Ibrahimis, descendants of Ibrahim Khan Zahir al-Daula, the Qajar prince who had governed the province for decades. The entire Ibrahimi clan and their large entourage, retinue and clients, adhered to the controversial Shaikhi school of Shia theology. The school became prominent in Kerman when Ibrahim Khan's eldest son, Mohammad Karim Khan (d. 1871), a theologian by profession, assumed its leadership. Hostility to the Ibrahimis often acquired religious coloring, as other notables in town, lay and clerical, competed for prominence in local affairs. Periodically the Ibrahimis were denounced as heretics by orthodox olama (referred to as Balasaris) allied to rival families.

When in 1904 a new governor, Rokn al-Daula, was appointed, the Ibrahimis reached agreement with him. They would retain their traditional control of Kerman administration without his intervening, in return for a substantial share of tax revenues to be deposited in the state treasury left under his discretion. As Nazem al-Islam put it, the local government was thus turned into a "company" run exclusively by the Ibrahimi family. This aroused the hostility of a rival clan, that of the Vakil al--Daula, who found in the person of Shaikh Shamshiri Barini an expedient ally. Barini was a young mollah reknowned for his virulent sermons addressed against the Hindus, the Zoroastrians, userers, or heretics, depending on the occasion his services were solicited. Currently the Shaikhis occupied polemical center stage as he renewed the charges of heresy against them. Rap-

idly he became popular among the masses, who took delight in hearing his bold attacks on members of the powerful Qajar ruling class. When government officials had him expelled from town, the individuals who wished to profit from the situation, Nazem al-Islam explained, incited the masses to stage a street demonstration, thus forcing the government to allow Barini to return, whereupon Barini resumed his denunciation of the Shaikhis. Nazem al-Islam wrote that the opponents of the Ibrahimis viewed Barini's pronouncement as "descended from heaven," adding that their grudge was not religiously motivated but personal.

In spring 1905 Hajj Mirza Mohammad Reza, a Kermani mojtahed, returned to his native province after a long absence, having received specific instructions from Najaf and Kerbala to put an end to the religious strife. The "conspirators" sought his religious condemnation of the Shaikhis but received no response. A minor clerical figure then publicly pronounced the Shaikhis najes (impure, or religiously unlawful). This pronouncement was attributed to Mirza Mohammad Reza; it encouraged members of the Vakili clan and their supporters to seek bast in his house, to express their opposition to the "rule of the heretics over Moslems." They failed to gain the religious support of Aqa Baqer, the highly respected local senior mojtahed who, realizing Barini's "corrupt" and "destructive" ends, forbade his kin and followers to associate with him. Nevertheless, they gained the all-important political support of Shahab al-Mamalek, an aide to the governor Rokn al-Daula. Mass demonstrations against the Shaikhis were organized; telegrams were sent to Tehran requesting the governor's dismissal for the sake of protecting religion. The Ibrahimis finally lost control, and the leader of the Shaiki school of theology was forced to retire to the family's country estate, where he soon died. The "apparent defeat" of the Shaikhis left their richly endowed mosque and madrasa open to attack. Hajj Mohammad Reza seized it and put it under his cousin's trusteeship. The Ibrahimi's guards, in defense of the property, assaulted the newcomers. A fierce fight ensued, which led the masses, "unarmed and unskilled, as always a tool in the hands of their leaders," to flee in the direction of the Shaikhi leader's home. There the guards, again in self-defense, opened fire on the crowd. A few died, and some forty were wounded. Nazem al-Islam asserted that most of the dead were children and adolescents, who had no other aim but to flee the scene of riots. Tehran was informed, and Rokn al-Daula was dismissed. The Shaikhi–Balasari dispute came to an end; "it had nothing to do with religion, it was all about rulers."[7]

With the appointment of a new governor in fall 1905, the Kerman political scene witnessed the inevitable transfer of allegiance and formation of new alignments that normally accompany changes in the administration. Rokn al-Daula, the dismissed governor, forged a new cabal, this time with the full support of the mojtahed Mirza Mohammad Reza, aimed at making it impossible for the new appointee to govern.[8] Excited crowds were encouraged to create public disturbances, raiding shops and homes of Jewish wine sellers, in order to embarrass the new governor, Zafar al-Saltana. The governor then was forced to warn the mojtahed, who defiantly left town. Riots broke out in the streets, and an angry mob, accusing the governor of forcing their religious leader into exile, brought him back to town. The incident snowballed as the subversive elements obstructed any attempt to reconciliation, fanning dissension, informing Zafar al-

Saltana of Rokn al-Daula's conspiracy and advising him to use force to restore calm. Armed soldiers were sent to disperse the crowd, instructed to shoot if necessary. Two men reportedly died in the melee before curfew was imposed. When Mohammad Reza came out of his house to challenge the soldiers' treatment of a group of women who had defied the order to disperse, he was arrested and publicly given the bastinado. As Nazem al-Islam wrote, none of the mojtahed's allies came to his rescue, not even the Vakilis, who could have intervened on his behalf with the governor and thus put an end to the hostilities. He was escorted out of the city.

Both Majd al-Islam and Nazem al-Islam claimed that no one in Tehran knew of the Kerman events and that they were instrumental in drawing the attention first of Tabataba'i then of Behbahani to the issue.[9] The fact that most standard histories relied on Nazem al-Islam's account, and that there exists no independent source to corroborate the events, confirms the impression that the Kermani–Azali network was chiefly responsible for instigating the riots, which they then manipulated for their own ends.

The religious strife that so divided Kerman society at the turn of the century had a more complex origin than the Shaikhi–Balasari dispute.[10] The Azali oposition to the Shaikhis was based on both doctrinal and political considerations. Mohammad Karim Khan, the powerful Ibrahimi leader of the Kerman Shaikhi school, had waged merciless campaigns against Ali Mohammad the Bab, publicly denouncing him and his successors as heretical. The Azalis, outwardly professing orthodoxy, were able to sustain their hostility toward the Shaikhis, and vindicate the Bab, by espousing the Balasari cause. Led by Shaikn Mehdi Bahr al-Olum, they fomented trouble in a city already torn by religious controversy.[11] Bahr al-Olum was the son of Mollah Mohammad Ja'far, an early Babi convert, and brother of Shaikh Ahmad Ruhi, the Azali revolutionary who was executed with Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani in Tabriz in 1896. He allegedly was responsible for spreading rumors, playing on the credulity of the simple-minded masses to arouse their religious sentiment and bigotry, and causing public disorder.

Such disturbances eventually forced some of the high-ranking olama of the town to take a strong public stand against the authorities, thus precipitating an olama–state confrontation. Fierce olama rivalry, and equally intense political intrigues, provided ample opportunities for the dissidents in the capital to carry on their activities. On December 3, 1905, the mayor of Tehran, Ala'al-Daula, warned some leading merchants against increasing sugar price. Following a verbal confrontation he ordered his servants to bastinado a couple of them in public. All sources corroborate the fact that after the beating, the tojjar were invited to have lunch with the mayor and then signed a note promising to lower the sugar price.[12] Hasan Roshdiyya, in a meeting of their secret society that very evening, told its members he had been in a position to prevent the bastinado from taking place but had decided against it, "since our goal is to start the revolution. Hence, instead of opposing [the authorities'] action, I instigated it."[13] The following day, the bazaar closed in protest. Sa'd al-Daula, the minister of commerce and an opponent of Ain al-Daula, fully supported the merchants and encouraged them to demand the dismissal of both Ain al-Daul and Ala'al-Daul. The merchants then solicited some olama's backing.[14]

Meanwhile the Imam Jom'a, secretly conspiring with the sadr-e a'azam against the Behbahani–Amin al-Soltan faction, "trapped" the olama by inviting them all to attend a Friday prayer service at the masjed-e shah mosque. Jamal al-Din Va'ez was persuaded to give a sermon. Preaching on the subject of justice, he referred to the mojtaheds as the Hidden Imam's representatives, praising their unity of purpose and their determination to put an end to the injustice reigning in the nation. In a thinly veiled threat, he then advised the shah to cooperate with the olama and pay heed to their petitions. At this point the Imam Jom'a stood up and virulently denounced Va'ez as a Babi and enemy of the shah, commanding his servants to beat him. The frightened crowd dispersed rapidly, and the olama left the mosque in equal haste. Va'ez found asylum in Mohammad Tabataba'i's house, then went into hiding until shortly before the end of the "lesser migration."[15] According to Nazem al-Islam, the masjed-e shah incident was another instance of the long and bitter feud that chronically divided the olama ranks. This time it marked a victory for the Imam Jom'a–Nuri faction. The Behbahani–Tabataba'i camp had to regroup, and it had to solve the immediate dilemma over whether to cooperate with the merchants. Tabataba'i reportedly explained that the choice was difficult. They were under the moral obligation to support the bazaar and its leaders against the government's action; yet their own support could be interpreted as an indication of their collaboration with the merchants in keeping the prices high, and thus could be exploited to arouse public opinion against them. The decision to leave town and seek bast in the Shahabdolazim shrine offered a solution acceptable to all interested parties. It also fulfilled the wishes of Amin al-Soltan's agents, who increased their contact with Behbahani and Tabataba'i, offering financial support for their continued hostility to Ain al-Daula.[16] Similarly, it served the purpose of the anjomans, who had long conspired to engineer an olama–state confrontation.

Though all sources unanimously agree the decision to leave town was Tabataba'i's and Behbahani's, they nevertheless provide information to demonstrate the vital role played by the anjomans in helping the two mojtaheds reach that "historic" decision. Nazem al-Islam describes his role in bringing together anti–Ain al-Daula individuals to press Tabataba'i into action, and the latter's agreement to execute their plan "ahead of time."[17] Malekzada insisted the freedom seekers who had gathered in Malek al-Motakallemin's house that same day were instrumental in seizing this golden opportunity to achieve their objectives after years of secret preparations.[18] A pro-Nuri source alleges that both Behbahani and Tabataba'i, and their followers, deliberately refrained from asking Nuri to join them, wishing to see him "put to shame" in an anticipated victory over Ain al-Daula.[19] "The events of masjed-e shah and the decision to go to Shahabdolazim gave the freedom seekers hope that the bullet had hit its target, and war between the two classes was certain and unavoidable."[20]

The Lesser Migration

These events are considered the prelude to the revolution. It must be noted, though, that there was no clear-cut state–olama dispute. Each side included

within its ranks members of the olama and government circles. Moreover, the emigrants' (those who went to the shrine) demands still reflected personal grudges and interests. The Ashtiani brothers this time saw their mosques given away to the Imam Jomʿa and Mollah Mohammad Amoli; Sadr al-Olama and Behbahani likewise were dispossessed of their own as the Imam Jomʿa and Hajj Mirza Abu Taleb Zanjani were declared the new trustees.[21] On the other hand, court and government officials, be they in or out of office—Salar al-Daula, Rokn al-Daula, Amin al-Soltan, Saʿd al-Daula, and others—had sided with the "emigrants." Surprisingly, the merchants played the least visible role in this phase of the revolution. Nazem al-Islam reported they feared for their properties. The Bonekdar brothers, Hajj Mohammad Taqi and Hajj Hasan, acknowledged in all sources as the "financiers" of the bast,[22] were merely middlemen, receiving funds and instructions from contributors who preferred to operate behind the scenes. They took complete charge of administering the cash flow, providing meals, water pipes, cigarettes, tea, and other "daily livelihood needs." Food was abundant, and money was liberally distributed among the olama.[23]

From among the eight olama who went to the shrine Behbahani, Tabataba'i, Sadr al-Olama, the Ashtiani brothers, Mohammad Reza Qomi, Mohammad Reza Sadeq, and Jamal al-Din Afja'i, Behbahani and Tabataba'i emerged as the decision makers. According to all sources, it was the successful alliance of these two rival religious leaders that gave coherence to the movement and conferred legitimacy on the political demands of the heretofore underground opposition. The creation and maintenance of the "united front" was not without its risks.

Here the *Tarikh-e Bidari* gives the fullest account of the difficulties encountered by the anjoman-e makhfi in forging and consolidating the clerical alliance. Portraying Tabataba'i as a genuine reformer, motivated by nationalist and religious considerations, and Behbahani as self-serving and corruptible, Nazem al-Islam noted the abiding fear his society felt that Behbahani might defect to turn lukewarm, which could have disastrous consequences on its designs, since it counted heavily on Behbahani's committed hostility to Ain al-Daula.[24] The society spared no effort in instructing followers on the "right course," insisting on the need to overcome "personal" and "particular" interests and to call for justice and for "the application of the Islamic law." Above all, mistrustful of Behbahani's possible ulterior motive (restoring Amin al-Soltan to power), they warned against the mojtahed's notorious venality. They threatened him with public exposure should he "not fulfill his promises" and warned him that they would replace him with another leader.[25] Thus, Nazem al-Islam revealed how dissident and lower ranking clerics like himself and fellow members of the anjoman had assumed the task of guiding the mojtaheds, and how they realized the urgent need to have Tabataba'i and Behbahani join forces against the other two high-ranking olama of Tehran, Nuri and the Imam Jomʿa. They devised strategy and tactics for recruitment of well-known preachers and olama to their cause. Aware of their own helplessness and lack of a power base, they fully realized their dependence on the olama's alliance to achieve their goals. They wished to reenact the olama–court officials coalition, sponsored by the "patriots and knowledgeable individuals," that had engineered Amin al-Soltan's fall from power in 1903.[26] Thus, despite their incessant talk of "noble ends" and lofty liberal ideals, they saw

themselves compelled by circumstance to accept gratefully the generous financial support and tactical assistance of individuals such as Amin al-Soltan, Salar al-Daula, and other members of the despised ruling elite, whose interests were diametrically opposed to theirs.

As the news of the bast spread rapidly through the capital, the instigators-turned-supporters of the emigrant olama incited the tollab of the mosques under the Imam Jomʿa's jurisdiction to leave town, too. Reportedly at that time Shaikh Mehdi Nuri, Fazlollah's son, defected to his father's enemy camp, bringing with him fifty of his own students. The reception was cool, as the religious leaders and their aides were alert to possible infiltration of their ranks by government spies, rival clerics' informants, and agents provocateurs sent to sow division among their ranks. Indeed the probability of infiltration was high, as the olama were notorious for their divisiveness and corruptibility. Moreover, the Ain al-Daula faction, to a large extent, successfully accomplished its ends in that early phase, referred to as the "lesser migration" in the annals of the revolution, by simultaneously exerting a lot of pressure, cajoling, baiting, bribing, and even setting traps.

Nazem al-Islam reported that Ain al-Daula offered 20,000 tomans to Tabataba'i in return for his defection from Behbahani's group. When this was turned down, he sent carriages and a force of some two hundred armed soldiers commanded by Amir Bahador to bring back the olama to negotiate with the court. The olama, highly suspicious, refused, and the government envoy threatened to use force. Following an exchange of harsh words between Afja'i and Bahador, the soldiers surrounded the leading mojtaheds. Morteza Ashtiani fainted in the melee. Behbahani and Tabataba'i rallied the tollab and their supporters and staged a public demonstration in the local bazaar, the government officials retreated. Ain al-Daula, realizing the gravity of the situation, agreed to negotiate with the bastis.

Ahmad Tabataba'i, a brother of Mohammad Tabataba'i, was appointed by the bastis to represent them in the negotiations. But widespread mistrust undermined the possibility of an agreement, as the emigrants began to suspect their own representative of caving in to the minister. Ahmad Tabataba'i had allegedly agreed to collaborate with Ain al-Daula in exchange for payment of a large sum in cash and the promise of monthly stipends for him and his two sons.[27] In return, the demand for the minister's dismissal was removed from the list. Ahmad Tabataba'i then succeeded in convincing most emigrant olama to return to town, although Mostafa Ashtiani, Abol Qasem Tabataba'i (Mohammad Tabataba'i's elder son), Eʿtemad al-Islam (Behbahani's son-in-law), and a couple others, needed more convincing. However, the olama, increasingly suspicious of the deal, at the last minute rejected it and reiterated their demand for the dismissal of Ain al-Daula.[28]

The secret societies themselves were no less guilty of planting spies in the Shahabdolazim group. Malekzada claimed they were able to warn the bastis of possible treacherous overtures. Dabir Hozur, the future Qavam al-Saltana, who held a post as Ain al-Daula's secretary, kept the secret societies informed of government moves and decisions, as did many low-ranking civil servants and court employees.[29] Malekzada further added that his father's anjoman worked

hard to prevent a reconciliation between the olama and the government officials. The members drew up Machiavellian designs aimed at further sharpening olama–state differences and mutual distrust. Shaikh al-Ra'is made the most of his court connections to plant misinformation on the bastis; other members were sent to Nuri and the Imam Jom'a, and to the bastis, warning one group against the other, deepening the rift that divided the ranks of the religious establishment. The "freedom seekers" used deceitful means to wage "psychological warfare" and obstruct any potential rapprochement between the government and the bastis, the emigrant olama and those who chose to remain behind.[30] Both Malek al-Motakallemin and Yahya Daulatabadi (through his brother Mirza Ali Mohammad) reportedly influenced the bastis' decisions and action and were finally instrumental in having them draw a list of demands that included the call for the establishment of a house of justice.[31]

Daulatabadi sought the Ottoman ambassador's good offices to present the shah with the list. Malek al-Motakallemin was the main mediator between the anjomans and the emigrant olama, traveling from Tehran to Shahabdolazim and back, collecting cash contributions from interested parties and distributing them among the bastis in return for their adding to the list the demand for a house of justice. The list included the following: removal of the transportation official who had harassed the olama on the Tehran-Qom road; return of the mojtahed Mohammad Reza to Kerman; return of the Maravi mosque to its trustee Morteza Ashtiani; dismissal of Naus; dismissal of Ala' al-Daula from governorship of Tehran; repeal of the special postage tax; and establishment of a house of justice. Malekzada insisted the olama's original demands were "superfluous" and claimed that the demands for the dismissal of Naus and Ala'al-Daula, for the return of Mohammad Reza, and for the house of justice were the freedom seekers' own contribution to the list.[32]

The olama's return was not achieved without incident. The bastis who had initially been reluctant to accept the deal spent the night of January 10, 1906, under Ain al-Daula's roof. News spread that they were kept against their will. Riots broke out, placards threatening the government were posted on the walls, and the bazaar was closed. Crowds of women attempted to stop the shah's carriage in broad daylight in a crowded thoroughfare, crying out for justice and warning the shah of serious consequences to the government's disrespectful treatment of the olama.[33] It must be noted that none of the demands posed any direct threat to Ain al-Daula personally, and the demand for his dismissal had been dropped. According to Malekzada the shah could easily afford to accept all the demands without loss of prestige, and he had already indicated his willingness for conciliation.[34]

The display of public disorder when agreement was reached, just a day before the olama's triumphant return, is reminiscent of other such street riots instigated by subversive elements who wished to radicalize the issues at a time when reconciliation was imminent and the short-term dispute involving government and religious officials was about to end. For instance, in 1892 Mirza Hasan Ashtiani was made to appear a victim of the oppressive government, and the recently reached accord was concealed, in order to heighten tension in the capital and foment public disorder, thus increasing the pressure on the religious

leader to push for more demands. Nazem al-Islam wrote that "some tollab" in Shahabdolazim, following the public announcement of the agreement reached with the government and just before the olama's return, called for the Ottoman ambassador to guarantee the agreement and ensure its execution. The olama refused, expressing their trust in the government and the shah's promises. The tollab were then silenced, as rumors were spread that the Babis were conspiring to break the entente.[35] Mohammad Reza Musavat is mentioned as one of those who made this demand, and who had warned Tabataba'i and Behbahani against falling into Ain al-Daula's "trap." Malekzada confirms that Musavat was "unhappy with the turn of events" and wished to "implant suspicion in the heart" of the bastis, in order to prevent their return before the final "completion of the goals."[36] Malek al-Motakallemin was sent to Shahabdolazim to deliver 500 tomans in cash donated by Salar al-Daula for the bastis' extra day's expenses. Tabataba'i then, according to Daulatabadi, demanded a separate royal decree proclaiming the equitable application of the Islamic law.[37] Malekzada confirms this story, adding that Malek al-Motakallemin's talk of parliamentarism and constitutionalism was too alien to his audience in Shahabdolazim, and the "leaders of the movement" felt compelled by force of circumstance to give up their goal for the time being and ask for a house of justice instead.[38]

Thus all sources, with the exception of Kasravi, corroborate the role of the freedom seekers in pushing the olama into action, using devious means to obstruct untimely reconciliation with the government and forcing the olama to adopt a more intransigent attitude. The royal decree on the equitable application of the Islamic law did indeed appear separately from the decree that granted the demands of the original list, thus giving weight to Daulatabadi's and Malekzada's claims.

In the last analysis, a shadowy war was raging between the political opposition and the secret anjomans, on the one hand, and the government, on the other. The olama, both those who went to Shahabdolazim and those who stayed in Tehran, were engaged in their own power struggle. Ain al-Daula assumed he was fighting just another cabal instigated by rival politicians, and he attempted to deal with it accordingly, keeping the shah in the dark as to the gravity of the situation. The bastis had among themselves, and among the government and court officials who secretly supported their cause, a majority of actors who likewise believed they were engaged in such a cabal. But they all unwittingly ended up supporting a movement they were not even aware of at this early stage. All parties involved, practically without exception, were weaving their respective webs of deception, manipulating one another for their own ends, which may or may not have coincided.

Interlude

On January 12, 1906, the bastis came back to town, with the high-ranking olama driven in the royal carriages sent for the occasion. The angry mob of the previous day turned into a jubilant crowd hailing their heroes. On that day, wrote Nazem al-Islam, the slogan "long live the Iranian nation" was heard for the first time,

replacing the traditional hailing of Islam and the king of Islam.[39] Yet, paradoxically, this triumphant return and the concessions gained from the shah and his minister, according to all sources, marked the beginning of a new state–olama relationship.

Both Nuri and the Imam Jom'a, facing their rivals' success and the resulting increase in their prestige and fame, subdued their intense hostility and established, outwardly at least, an entente cordiale that was to last until the first majles was convened. All the high-ranking olama in Tehran joined a newly founded clerical association, the anjoman-e hauza-ye islami, which met regularly to discuss issues of the day. The olama thus acquired collectively, through that anjoman, a voice in the current political debate. This role, which, prior to the lesser migration, had been assumed by individual olama active in political factions, was officially accorded graciously, if not in good faith. However, the olama, though honored and consulted with deference by the court and government officials, did not obtain an increase in power beyond that which they had traditionally wielded. The honors bestowed on them by the court in no way conferred on them institutional authority in political matters. Moreover, in concrete terms the bastis' concessions were less than modest gains for almost all parties involved.

Ain al-Daula was still sadre-e a'zam, and there was no promise made, or demanded, for his dismissal. Ala' al-Daula was indeed removed from office, but his replacement marked no change. In fact, the new mayor, as Nazem al-Islam would lament, proved to be even worse than his predecessor; the latter eventually joined the ranks of the constitutionalists while the former "double-crossed" them.[40] The dismissal of Naus remained a serious issue through the subsequent phases of the revolution. The house of justice the shah had agreed to set up was defined vaguely, and its composition and relations to existing state and religious courts were not mentioned, beyond the abstract obligation to implement the Islamic law fairly. Furthermore, and of greater consequence to state–olama relations, the language and tone of the official letters exchanged by the shah and the bastis during the negotiations, and the decree signed by both parties, reflect traditional sovereign–subject relations whereby the monarch admonishes and the olama promise to pray for and praise the king of Islam.[41]

Ain al-Daula and court officials lost no time in planning a campaign to win the olama's friendship and cooperation. They lavishly entertained them in public and in private and courteously visited them in their homes. The meager resources of the state treasury were not spared as the olama received expensive gifts in cash and kind. Secret or semisecret meetings were held with individual olama, deals were made, and pledges were offered to promote mutual interests.[42] But nothing remained secret for too long in a rumor-filled capital in times of crisis. The near success of the olama–Ain al-Daula entente cordiale was suspiciously watched by all the groups alarmed at what they stood to lose from it: the anti–Ain al-Daula factions such as Amin al-Soltan's, Salar al-Daula's, and Sa'd al-Daula's, as well as the dissidents, who, more than ever, needed the olama as cover for their revolutionary activities. They therefore intensified their subversive tactics, eroding the basis of the entente, rekindling the atmosphere already charged with hostility and mutual distrust. The renewed struggle this time in-

volved court and government officials, on the one hand, and faction leaders and the anjomans, on the other. At stake was the power to influence and manipulate the olama.[43] As on previous occasions when disparate groups rallied for a common short-term goal, individuals' motives were entangled, and clear-cut national and ideological considerations were blurred in the intricate strategies devised by the various actors.

In April 1906, British diplomat Grant Duff informed London that "the clergy do not seem likely to renew their agitation against [Ain al-Daula] just at present." He reported on the activities of the preachers and popular leaders who continued to attack the government and demand reforms, noting especially Shaikh al-Ra'is, a cleric "reputed to be a member of the Bahai sect but who openly professed the tenets of Islam," whose blunt criticism caused trouble with the authorities.[44] In his analysis of the events of 1906, the British chargé d'affaires who replaced Grant Duff noted in more marked fashion the dissension between the popular leaders and the mojtaheds, who "began to feel that a new element, dangerous to their authority, was coming to the fore." He explained how the government was successful in controlling the "leaders of the reform movement" after their return from Shahabdolazim, and how "the sympathies of the great mojtaheds were not heartily with the popular movement." Here, however, Shaikh al-Ra'is was mentioned as a member of the high-ranking establishment olama who did continue to denounce the tyrannies of the government. Rather than realizing the preacher's fundamental religious differences with the mojtaheds, the diplomat emphasized Shaikh al-Ra'is's political differences. "The preacher in question," he wrote to London, "was the advocate of a union of all Mussulmans. . . . The movement was not only popular, but religious, and it threatened the very existence of the Kajar dynasty."[45] The religious dissidents were no longer hoisting the pan-Islamic banner, but the British diplomats were oblivious to this fact.

The religious dissidents were intensifying their underground activities and expanding their networks within the religious institutions. Malek al-Motakallemin and Nazem al-Islam reportedly mobilized some two thousand of the tollab enrolled in the leading madrasas of Tehran.[46] They formed an anjoman separate from the hauza-ye islami, with the purpose of "distinguishing the tollab willing to serve their fatherland from those serving individuals," be they politicians like Salar al-Daula and Amin al-Soltan or a high-ranking cleric.[47] The new anjoman-e ettehadiyya-ye tollab, put under the direct control of Malek al-Motakallemin, became a highly successful religious association, providing a channel for the nonreligious ideas and views of its directors as well as a means to penetrate religious circles and disseminate revolutionary propaganda.[48] More importantly the ettehadiyya was instrumental in exerting pressure on Tabataba'i, Behbahani, and other religious leaders, to resist government overtures for conciliation and appeasement and to resume their demands for the fulfillment of the royal promises. It was then that the call for a house of justice, now termed majles, was forcefully heard. Through this anjoman and others similarly controlled by the underground opposition, broadsheets were published and widely circulated in town, informing and inciting the public to rise in defense of their rights and "break their chains of bondage."[49]

In one such shabnama, the tollab and craftsmen—"the wretched people"—addressed the religious leaders, begging them—their "masters"—to pay attention to their "humble servants' needs." It eulogized the mojtaheds as the "guides to the path of the shariat," the commanders of the nation who hold their country's fate in their own hands, empowered as they were to lead in either direction, good or evil, victory or defeat. It reminded them the people were awaiting their signal to rise in defense of the nation and of religion against its "oppressors" and "corrupt traitors." It hailed the great service they rendered with their lesser migration, having thus dramatically refuted the "misguided" individuals; contention that national decline was caused by the olama, who had obstructed the path of progress and the equitable execution of the law. These "wretched people" pointed to their own role in following the olama's lead, in carrying their commands to a successful end. Finally, it warned them against the "wolves in disguise" who sowed division among them, loudly complaining of unfulfilled promises, of increased oppression, and of higher rates of inflation. It ended with a veiled threat: the ayatollahs' existence and self-protection depended on the existence of the "wretched people": as long as they remained strong and capable, the olama could live in tranquillity; should the subjects be disabled, the masters would be the first to fall victims to the oppressors' evil design.[50]

Another shabnama adopted a more menacing tone, as the shah was attacked for not fulfilling his promises and the olama, with the exception of Tabataba'i, collectively condemned for their alleged selfishness and greed, and for their apparent interests in the "superfluous" aspects of religion to the detriment of its principles. The "people" were incited to raise the banner of protest, to clamor for justice without waiting for the olama's order to do so; they were asked to assume responsibility for their own life and acts.[51] Mohammad Reza Musavat went so far as to blame openly the olama who participated in the bast for not having accepted their followers' advice, holding them accountable for the shah's failure to honor his decree. He also directly took the shah to task for losing the trust of his subjects and allowing national chaos and decline.[52]

While the religious dissidents were covertly working at undermining the government–olama entente, some of their most prominent leaders continued cultivating ties with government and court officials. Thus, following a forced two-month absence, Jamal al-Din Va'ez returned to the capital, agreeing to subdue the tone of his sermons—and taking a sum of 1,000 tomans offered by Ain al-Daula. He also earned large fees for performing religious rituals at royal households.[53] Similarly, Yahya Daulatabadi and Malek al-Motakallemin attempted to negotiate with Ain al-Daula and members of his cabinet, together with Mohammad Tabataba'i. Daulatabadi reported Ehtesham al-Saltana, a reform-minded government official, had contacted him and Malek al-Motakallemin in May 1906, in order to persuade them to endorse his strategic views. According to Daulatabadi, Ehtesham al-Saltana aspired to something "greater than a house of justice" and believed that nothing short of thorough political reform would achieve the desired goals, a majles and a constitution. He was convinced that success could be attained only through the leadership of "well-informed individuals" (that is, in constitutionalist code words, those educated in modern schools and well versed in European institutions and concepts), never through the leadership of "four uninformed

turbaned individuals." He called for the formation of a united front of all reformers and a thorough examination of the clerical ranks in order to distinguish the "true freedom seekers" from the false, and thus avoid potentially harmful clerical intervention in politics. Arguing that their goals could be accomplished only by working from within the system together with the court and government, he persuaded first Daulatabadi and Malek al-Motakallemin, then Tabataba'i, whom he met through the other two to negotiate with the sadr-e a'zam, who, he assured them all, was willing to fulfill their wishes. In a top-secret meeting, Tabataba'i allegedly told Ain al-Daula he would fight to the very end for the establishment of a majles and the promulgation of a constitution, even though he considered such an institution detrimental to the olama's interests, since it would replace them as the people's guarantors and defenders of their rights, and would thus curtail their own social and political influence. Ain al-Daula reportedly promised his support. But in a subsequent cabinet meeting attended by Ehtesham al-Saltana, Amir Bahador, the court minister, rose against the ideas of a majles and accused Ehtesham al-Saltana of giving in to the "bribe-taking akhunds." In self-defense Ehtesham al-Saltana insisted his goal was to see a strong central government established to resist the "self-serving akhunds." The negotiations failed, and Ehtesham al-Saltana was exiled from the capital.[54]

Widespread Unrest

In addition to increased pressure from the underground opposition, Ain al-Daula's betrayal provoked a chain of action and reaction that eventually led to the "greater migration." It should be emphasized, though, that not all events that precipitated the olama's second exodus from the capital followed a logical sequence; they were not necessarily ideologically consistent or socially determined. A series of unrelated instances of unrest in Tehran and the provinces, with diverse causes and involving different social groups, was adroitly exploited by the opposition and the subversive elements. The cumulative effects of these events proved to be of greater consequence than each one taken in isolation.

In Mashhad the governor, Asef al-Daula, was reputedly cruel and corrupt, hoarding wheat and allowing inflated prices for bread and meat. In the first week of April 1905, a bread riot, instigated by two mollahs from the Caucasus who had mobilized the tollab of local madrasas, turned into a mass demonstration involving the hungry and the poor. The crowd, described in *Tarikh-e Bidari* as composed of children and the "simple-minded," the usual unhappy people who join a demonstration held anywhere at any time at any place, along with some shopkeepers from the bazaar, marched to the olama's homes to enlist the support of "those who did not work with the government and were aware of the masses' plight."[55] A threatening message was then sent to the governor. When no response was received, the crowd attacked the house of Mo'aven al-Tojjar, the local merchant held responsible for high prices. When the latter had his guards fire at them, the crowd fled in the direction of the Russian bank, where the Cossacks shot their guns to disperse them. They sought refuge in the shrine of the eighth Imam, but they were pursued there, too. A few bullets hit the cupola.

The Russian consulate gave asylum to the two mollahs, declaring them under Russian government protection since they were Russian subjects. Asef al-Daula was compelled by the situation to restore order in town, promise a fresh supply of meat and bread, and disperse the crowd. However, as Nazem al-Islam wrote, the news reported in Tehran was selective, alleging the governor had ordered the destruction of the shrine. He explained, "to a certain extent" this impious act heightened tension as Tabataba'i tearfully informed the public from his minbar, and shabnamas spread the "story."[56] Thus, when news of the bread riot reached Tehran a month later, it was given "a different coloring" to increase popular resentment against the government.[57]

In Kerman the dubious case of Mohammad Reza, the local mojtahed, was revived and further dramatized by the interested parties. Nazem al-Islam reported the mojtahed was still residing outside Kerman city, contrary to the specific demand for his return in the list signed by the shah. The follow-up story is as confusing as the initial story had been. In June 1906 the new governor, Hosain Mirza Farman-Farma, allegedly wrote to the sadr-e a'zam that the mojtahed's presence in Kerman city was not in their best interests, and he asked permission to send the mojtahed to Mashhad. When Ain al-Daula granted the permission, Faman-Farma instructed Bahr al-Olum and Shaikh Yahya (the mojtahed's uncle) to extend to Mohammad Reza the governor's official invitation to return to his native city—while privately advising him to travel to Mashhad instead. The dubious mission was successfully undertaken, wrote Nazem al-Islam; the public and private commands were simultaneously executed. Mohammad Reza left for Khorasan, where he was welcomed and treated with honor by the olama, notables, and government officials. Meanwhile, in Tehran Mohammad Tabataba'i was fed a doctored version of the story, as the conspirators, feeling the urgent need to rekindle the olama's hostility to the state, informed him that the Kerman mojtahed was treated with indignity and prevented from returning to his native town. The desired result was obtained; Tabataba'i felt once more personally offended by both Ain al-Daula and Farman-Farma, who had promised him full cooperation in solving the Mohammad Reza affair.[58]

Two conclusions may be derived from this obviously overblown case of alleged state–olama hostility. One, the event was unrelated to the current situation in Tehran, where the majles was the issue, eclipsing all other demands that figured in the original list; two, it constitutes another clear instance of the Azali network's covert activities. Nazem al-Islam mentioned Bahr al-Olum and Shaikh Yahya as the governor's emissaries in charge of the dubious mission with Mohammad Reza. Both belonged to the Azali network, which had thus manipulated seemingly unrelated events in the remote province of Kerman, capitalizing on the lack of adequate communication, to fan dissension among the Tehran olama and the government.

In Shiraz, the governor, Malek Mansur Mirza Sho'a' al-Saltana, had appropriated land and had arbitrarily levied heavy taxes. He thus aroused the hostility of both the landowners and the merchants of Shiraz. This hostility was fully exploited by the leading family of Shiraz, the Qavam, who traditionally competed with the governor in local politics and administrative affairs. Some local olama

supported the anti-governor cause. In November and December 1905, they had incited the crowd to seek bast in the Shah Cheragh shrine. A riot broke out when the governor sent forces to disperse them and a number of individuals were shot in the melee. On December 27, a cable was dispatched from "the people of Shiraz" to all the foreign envoys, requesting their mediation with the shah, who they believed was kept misinformed of the situation by Ain al-Daula, a relative and supporter of the governor.[59] Until June 1906, when the shah finally appointed Ala' al-Daula, the dismissed mayor of Tehran, as the new governor of Fars, unrest was widespread in the provincial capital. Three hundred people sought bast in the British legation, demanding a royal promise to attend to their grievances. The British chargé d'affairs in Tehran met with Moshir al-Daula, the minister of foreign affairs, to discuss the issue, expressing his concern that the local population felt the need to seek foreign help against its own government.[60]

British officials viewed the disturbances in Shiraz with considerable concern. Troubles in the southwest region of Iran often led to acts of lawlessness detrimental to their commercial interests. Caravans transporting imported goods were raided and plundered and the normal flow of trade seriously disrupted. This concern, in addition to British determination to support Mohammad Ali Mirza as crown prince, motivated the current envoy in Tehran to visit the latter and ask him to intervene with the shah for the dismissal of Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana, and to cable London suggesting an official demand for the recall of the hated governor.[61]

The olama of Shiraz, on the other hand, cabled Tabataba'i to bring their problems to the shah's attention and demand court action against Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana.[62] A letter was addressed to the crown prince Mohammad Ali Mirza in Tabriz, allegedly written by a highly respected religious leader of Shiraz, Hajj Ibrahim. The letter reminded the prince of the long historical tradition prevailing in Iran of close cooperation between the king and the men of religion. It referred to the olama's function as counselors to the government and to the government practice of appointing local officials in compliance with the people's wishes. In that sense, it asserted, "Iran is an Islamic Republic," envied by France and the United States.[63] The content of this letter was soon divulged in Tehran, wrote Nazem al-Islam, and it "gave strength" to the freedom seekers since, in those days, such pronouncements constituted a novelty with the olama.[64] The letter sent to the foreign envoys expressed the merchants' grievances against the governor, reflecting their commercial concern with overtaxation. It neither demanded government reforms nor revealed support or sympathy for the events occurring in the capital at that time. The popular uprisings in Shiraz in 1905–1906, instigated by the merchants, accidentally coincided with the movement in Tehran.[65]

The decision to appeal directly to the crown prince proved to be strategically expedient. It was common knowledge, then, that Ain al-Daula was plotting to have Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana declared crown prince instead of Mohammad Ali Mirza.[66] The latter proved to be the most powerful ally of all anti–Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana, anti–Ain al-Daula factions. The fact that both the Russian and British governments were in favor of Mohammad Ali Mirza as heir to the Qajar throne, and that they eventually backed him against the sadr-e aʿzam's wishes, further enhanced the crown prince's political influence in ruling circles.

In Tehran, Tabataba'i, angry with Ain al-Daula's clever move against the

proposed, and promised, majles, wrote him a fiery letter in which he reiterated his willingness to fight for the cause to the end—even till death, should it be necessary. It is in this letter that one of the very rare references to foreign domination was made by a mojtahed in support of the constitution. Tabataba'i argued the majles would be the best means to ward off Russian, British, and Ottoman encroachment in domestic affairs. He contended that the majles could be established through the united effort of the government, the olama, and the nation, and not by force through Russian, English, or Ottoman intervention. Here, then, rather than accusing Ain al-Daula of collaborating with the foreign powers, Tabataba'i in effect was warning him against their eventual intervention to establish a majles, which the opposition was clamoring for. We want this majles to be established by our own king and minister, he wrote, and not by the British, Russians, and Ottomans, and he expressed his strong conviction that such an institution constituted the only remedy for national ills.[67] As Kasravi rightly noted, it was in this letter that the term majles was used by a cleric for the first time.[68]

Ain al-Daula seized upon the occasion provided by Tabataba'i's letter to frighten the shah and raise the specter of imminent olama revolt against him. The shah mobilized the royal forces to patrol the streets. Rumors of a pending holy war spread rapidly through the city, as usual in times of political crisis, adding tension to the already charged climate. But, again as often the case, nothing happened to precipitate the storm.

6

Revolution in the Making

By the end of the year A.H. 1323/February 1906, all groups involved in the political disturbances in the capital, covertly or overtly, had set aside their ideological or personal differences to concentrate on one issue, the establishment of a house of justice, by now commonly referred to as a majles. Although at this stage the term meant different things to different individuals, it served as a rallying point for all parties interested in bringing about the fall of Ain al-Daula from power, either as an end in itself or as a means to attain broader goals.

Among the leading olama of the capital, Behbahani wished to regain prominence in ruling circles, which he could achieve with the return of Amin al-Soltan to the premiership. Similarly, a spectacular victory for the movement he outwardly championed from the very beginning could help him eclipse the shining star of his rival, Fazlollah Nuri, who then reigned supreme at the court and in government offices. Nuri himself, despite his envied position as the current sadr-e a'zam's closest clerical associate—and, consequently, the most influential mojtahed in the country—had begun to reconsider carefully his next move in the intricate and endless game of political chess. Minor incidents were already setting him against the minister; reportedly, he was expressing in private his disenchantment with the tyrannical abuse of power and the corruption prevailing among government and court officials.[1] Moreover, Nuri was politically astute enough to realize that the mood for change was widespread, and that his well-known exclusive association with Ain al-Daula might prove a liability in the event of the latter's dismissal from office. A second exodus on the part of Behbahani, Tabataba'i, and their followers might bear more tangible results than the first.

Tabataba'i, on the other hand, was increasingly influenced by the secret societies of which he was a member. The radical origins of his speeches and sermons grew more evident. He worked closely with the religious dissidents, coordinating his actions and political pronouncements with their program. His mosque attracted large crowds, eager to listen to his social and religious messages and transform them into popular slogans for mass public demonstrations. His house was the rendezvous of the activist tollab, religious dissidents as well as lay opposition leaders. His sons, Abol Qasem and Mohammad Sadeq, assumed prominent roles in the movement, often acting as his contacts with other groups. However, despite his popularity and the sincerity of his motives, the secret societies knew very well that Tabataba'i did not have the disposition and interpersonal communication skills necessary for effective leadership. He was perceived

as open-minded, in favor of freedom and justice, incorruptible; credulous, even naive, easily influenced by various viewpoints, endorsing the one or the other, and thus often contradicting himself; and above all "very temperamental, to the degree of insanity."[2] He lacked the organizational talent Behbahani often displayed and cleverly used to promote the causes with which he chose to identify. Behbahani, by the force of his personality and his ability to maneuver with great ease the labyrinth of Tehran politics, was to emerge as the natural leader of the constitutionalist olama.

Despite their differences in temperament and principles, Behbahani and Tabataba'i, throughout the period of détente between the court and the olama who participated in the lesser migration, cooperated closely. Often this proved precarious in the face of Ain al-Daula's plots to drive a wedge between them. As tension began to mount in the spring of 1906 and pressure was continually exerted on the olama to renew their concerted effort against Ain al-Daula and demand the establishment of the majles, the two mojtaheds acknowledged the need to form an unassailable united olama front. They decided to attempt a reconciliation with Nuri. The three met privately in the latter's home, where Behbahani and Tabataba'i explained the purpose of their political movement and solicited the full support of their powerful colleague. Nuri granted it and promised to break his ties with Ain al-Daula.[3] Thus reassured of their rival's intentions, Behbahani and Tabataba'i were ready to escalate their campaign against the minister.

The movement had finally emerged as an effective unified opposition against Ain al-Daula, involving disparate groups, lay and clerical, with diverse interests, all rallying round the banner of constitutionalism and representative government. "In these days," wrote Nazem al-Islam, expressing his misgivings over the new political alignments, "people who used to make a living out of tyranny" have turned constitutionalist. He feared individual secret motives might entail the creation anew of tyranny, of yet another despotic regime. Nonetheless, he was confident that the oqala would closely watch all groups, including the olama, and keep them under tight control. Indeed, Nazem al-Islam and fellow dissidents fully realized the potential advantages the support of the "powerful individuals" would bring to their cause, backing their effort to strengthen the mojtaheds' will, reaching different layers of society, urban and rural, and awakening the masses.[4] Support was solicited from tribal leaders, Moslem merchants, wealthy Zoroastrians, political opponents of Ain al-Daula. According to the *Tarikh-e Bidari-ye Iraniyan,* the Russians and British also offered cash to the dissidents. The "patriots" desire government reforms, the author wrote; some political factions wish the dismissal of Ain al-Daula and the reappointment of Amin al-Soltan; what do the Russians and British want?[5] That question was to rankle through the revolutionary period and beyond.

The Olama Front

At a general meeting of the olama's anjoman, the olama unanimously concluded that the ailing Mozaffar al-Din shah was deliberately kept misinformed of the

gravity of the political situation in the capital by his chief minister; further, they resolved to urgently request a royal audience through secret channels to the monarch. Subsequently, Behbahani and three other olama met with the shah. They came out of the palace convinced that the monarch was indeed in favor of establishing a majles, and that Ain al-Daula was the sole obstacle to its establishment. They decided to adopt the language and tactics of moderation, expressing their loyalist attitude toward the shah and concentrating their attacks on the minister.[6]

Ain al-Daula attempted once more to cultivate division within the ranks of the opposition. He wrote to the olama, warning them against the radical subversive element in their midst, which, he alleged, was using them to destroy the state and religion and to establish a majles that would allow them absolute freedom of action. The move bore no fruit, as the olama and lay opposition groups closed ranks, forming new associations for better coordination of their movements. One such association included Behbahani, Tabataba'i, Sadr al-Olama, Morteza Ashtiani, Jamal al-Din Afja'i, religious dissidents such Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and lay dissidents like Mohammad Reza Musavat.[7] Nazem al-Islam's secret society was reorganized by Sadeq Tabataba'i and came to include new members from among the ranks of government officials.[8]

The groups met daily to discuss current events, develop their strategy, and send letters directly to the shah through trusted court officials. Petitions of that period display the opposition's desire to appeal to the shah, to clear their movement of any charge of radicalism, and to attempt to undermine the sadr-e a'zam's position by drawing the monarch's attention to his minister's abuse of power.

Tabataba'i wrote to the shah, complaining that the petitions of "those who pray" for him (that is, the olama) were intercepted, and that a lack of direct communication prevented them from defending themselves against any charge raised covertly against them. He swore by the Prophet and all the Imams that the olama "loved his majesty" and prayed for his good health, that their own peace and tranquillity depended on his rule. He deplored the fact that the shah was "prevented" from seeing the wretched reality of the nation's conditions, that he was not informed of the oppressive nature of his government and the injustices committed by corrupt officials. As evidence of widespread misery due to misgovernment, he brought to the monarch's attention the case of fathers giving their daughters to abusive tax collectors in lieu of taxes they could not pay and the fact that tens of thousands were fleeing across the border into Russia. Then he insisted that a majles would solve all problems; it would enact the necessary laws to lift oppression and restore calm and confidence and even improve the distribution of food. Finally, he emphatically proclaimed that the establishment of a majles would save the nation from British, Russian, or Ottoman conquest. "A monarchy without a majles is meaningless and perishable," he declared.[9] This petition was also censored by Ain al-Daula and his supporters in court. The shah's reply merely admonished the mojtahed to pray for his good health, advise and silence the "wrongdoers," and restore order.

The posters, on the other hand, increased in circulation, covering the walls of all buildings, mosques, madrasas, and olama's homes. Intensifying the radical

tone, one poster demanded individual rights for the poor and warned against any government attempts to bribe the mojtaheds. Another shabnama, addressed to the olama, called on them to take strong and immediate action to exert pressure on the shah to establish the majles. It assured them that the shah, "a loving father to his wretched subjects," was willing to comply with their demands, even though he was led to believe by his corrupt entourage that a few "anarchists" sought to destroy the monarchy. It spoke of the "destitute classes," the "servant classes," now awakened to their individual rights and no longer tolerating oppression, no longer willing to bow and bend, no longer seeing any difference between dying by a bullet or by starvation, yet confident that Moslem soldiers would not shoot at fellow Moslems.[10]

The *Tarikh-e Bidari* describes the popular activities during the weeks preceding the second migration. Street disturbances and mass demonstrations were organized with feverish intensity, their leaders cloaking their action in religion, arguing that jehad consists of self-defense and struggle to obtain individual's rights.[11] Rumors were widespread that Tabataba'i's republican goals were disguised as constitutionalism and holy law while armed men gathered at his house, preparing for war.[12] Fear of popular uprising was increasing, forcing Ain al-Daula to order the Cossacks to patrol the city and to establish curfews. Strict orders were given to arrest anyone seen after curfew hours, thus making it difficult for people to meet in the evening or distribute papers in the dark. Tension in the capital was so high that Ain al-Daula was reportedly packed and ready to escape, should the situation deteriorate.[13]

Tabataba'i attempted to restore calm. In his sermons he strongly denied that religious leaders were calling for jehad, and he stressed peaceful means to attain their demands. "The shah is a Moslem" he told the crowd assembled at his feet, "we do not contemplate jehad against a Moslem king." He asked them to remain patient, to allow the olama time to negotiate with the monarch. He reassured them of the olama's incorruptibility, swore by the Koran they took no bribes, and promised they would continue to raise their voice until freedom was obtained and a house of justice established. Radical elements reportedly attempted to dispute his preaching, with shouts that "we no longer have the strength to bear tyranny."[14] Often he found himself forced to reassure the public of his own nonrevolutionary intentions. Arguing that the concepts of justice and equality of all before the law were fundamental principles of Islam, Tabataba'i insisted that some people had wrongly accused him of calling for a constitution or a republic. "I swear by God and the Koran . . . if we call for justice, we mean the establishment of a majles. . . . We have not said we do not want the king; we have not said we are enemies of the king. . . . We have consistently expressed our satisfaction with this king."[15] Once again he deplored the shah's sickness, which kept him isolated and out of touch, a pawn in the hands of corrupt officials who misinformed him of the intentions of the proponents of a majles. He told his audience: "The source of tyranny is one individual [the sadr-e a'zam of the time]. Your duty is to eliminate tyranny." However, his view of the monarchy ran counter to the traditional quiescent attitude toward temporal authority. A king is an individual appointed by the nation, he asserted, to levy taxes, to recruit soldiers, and to prevent people from oppressing one another. Should the king fail

to fulfill his responsibilities, it is the nation's right to choose another "protector." "A king is an individual like any one of us."[16]

In this sermon Tabataba'i in effect displayed a new sense of urgency, a readiness for action. His rhetoric reflected the archetypal Shia format, invoking the name of the Hidden Imam. "Today our true and great king is the Imam of the Age, may God speed his return, and we are his servants." He expressed his willingness to die "in the path of justice," and he projected an exalted self-view as a martyr. "Should they kill me, my name shall last till the Day of Judgement . . . my blood shall water (the tree of) justice." The sermon, however, ended with a concrete demand: "We want justice, we want a majles in which the shah and the beggar are equal before the law. We do not mean a constitution and a republic, we mean majles, an Islamic [mashruʿa] house of justice."[17] He explained that the Iranians were not educated enough, and thus were not worthy of constitutionalism and republicanism. It must be noted here that neither in this sermon nor in any other did Tabataba'i adopt an antiforeign tone. To the contrary, he praised European scientific achievements and progress, which he contrasted to the backwardness of Moslems' state of knowledge. "Nowadays, the Infidels and foreign nations have established justice; we Moslems have parted from the path of justice."[18] He told his audience the reason behind this discrepancy lay in the general state of ignorance prevailing in the country:

> O you people. . . . You do not know the meaning of monarchy; you do not know the meaning of justice; you have no conception of history; you have no information on the new sciences. There was a time when people studied the sciences of the ancient (pre-Islamic) times, and did not obstruct the new sciences. Today, I say, it is necessary to acquire the new learning. Each epoch has its own exigencies. You must study international laws, mathematics, and even foreign languages. . . . Had you acquired knowledge of the new sciences, were you informed about history, about the science of law, were you knowledgeable; then you would have understood the meaning of monarchy. . . . The new learning is obligatory for all to acquire in order to understand the meaning of monarchy.[19]

Despite the ruthlessly enforced curfew, the secret meetings of the dissidents and the daily gatherings at the mojtaheds' homes continued. Shabnamas were printed and distributed clandestinely without interruption. On June 17, 1906, Majd al-Islam, Mirza Hasan Roshdiyya, and Mirza Aqa Isfahani, a merchant member of the secret societies, were charged with subversive activities and banished to Khorasan. This did not halt the opposition. Ain al-Daula intensified his harassment. A member of Behbahani's entourage was publicly beaten; an order for the arrest of some hundred individuals, including popular preachers, was issued. Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez managed to escape, having been warned in advance by Ain al-Daula's secretary, Dabir Hozur, who had secretly joined the opposition.[20] But an equally well-known preacher of the movement, Shaikh Mohammad Soltan al-Va'ezin, was arrested in broad daylight in the street. When Behbahani heard the news, he urged his tollab to organize his release. The rescue team was quickly assembled, and the military barracks was raided. In the struggle that ensued, the soldiers fired a few bullets, hitting a taleb by the name of Seyyed Abdol Hamid, who died shortly after. The move-

ment was thus provided with an instant martyr, unleashing the religious sentiment of the crowds. The crowd carried Abdol Hamid's body to the Jamaʿ mosque, where Behbahani, Sadr al-Olam, and their followers met, enacting Shia public mourning rituals: self-flagellating, shrieking and moaning, hoisting the dead man's bloodied shirt as their banner. The mourning procession turned rapidly into a mass demonstration. The bazaar and all shops closed.

Two groups, the tollab and the cloth dealers, played an important role in organizing the mob and packing it. Thus, from the start, the crowd was neither anonymous nor amorphous. The popular protest acquired sacred form, for the killing of a seyyed was a sin as well as a crime—this time carried out by soldiers under government instruction—yet the worldly nature of the crowd's objectives could not be camouflaged. Behbahani, who emerged in these eventful days as the uncontested leader of the movement, succeeded in having most of the olama of Tehran, including Nuri, join him in the mosque, where he convinced them to remain until Ain al-Daula was dismissed and a majles established. The olama's struggle was directed not against the state but against the individual who currently held the post of sadr-e aʿzam, not against the "loving monarch" but against a "treacherous minister."[21] Ain al-Daula hastily left the summer royal residence in Niavaran to come to town and "extinguish the fire of revolt" before it spread further. His message to the olama was rejected, and he was told their goal was to establish a majles to ensure the just application of the law and to abolish individual tyranny. Since Ain al-Daula was opposed to it, the olama argued, and since he failed to implement the shah's decree, he was in fact betraying the government and the nation, and consequently should be removed from office.[22] Ain al-Daula dispatched the royal forces to besiege the mosque.

Nazem al-Islam's account of the bast in the Jamaʿ mosque revealed its worldly goals. The ayatollahs spent the night in the mosque, joined by the "people," the "idle," the "commoners." At dawn their sons, led by Shaikh Mehdi Nuri, directed the "people's" chorus chanting from the roof "ya Allah," modulating at will their pitch, synchronizing it to echo through the sleeping town as other mosques responded in kind, thus impressing upon the capital the holiness of their cause. In a most self-revealing passage, Nazem al-Islam described how he was emotionally touched by the sacred appeal of the chanting, how he was on the verge of "believing in the truth and purity of the issue," and how he was about to "go toward God," when he overheard the sons of the ayatollahs, sitting together in a corner, deriding the "wretched people," referring to them as "tools for the execution" of the olama's intentions. The young olama allegedly stated in their conversation their aim was not to wage war against the government but to frighten the "Turks" in town and have them press the shah to dismiss Ain al-Daula. Disturbed by such cynicism, Nazem al-Islam communicated his sense of despair to Jamal al-Din Va'ez, sitting next to them. The latter reportedly cheered him with the comforting assurance that their aim was to be accomplished through these individuals; any sacred cause had to be achieved through profane means.[23]

A crowd of two thousand to three thousand, depending on the source of the estimate, had gathered in the mosque. As Ain al-Daula ordered reinforcement of guards surrounding the building, the tollab roamed in the streets and the closed bazaar carrying the bloodied garb of the dead, hailing the Imam of the

Age. They were followed by women and children wailing and lamenting: "O Mohammad, your community is destroyed!" The soldiers shot in the air to disperse them. One man was hit and died on the spot. The mourning procession, turned into an angry mob, rushed to the mosque, seeking from the olama permission to wage jehad. The request was denied, and the olama did not allow violence to erupt. Nazem al-Islam stated there were conflicting reports of the number of killed and wounded, and no one could find exact figures since most of the victims were unknown persons, the lonely destitute with no relatives, the strangers from out of town.[24] Though all sources agree the crowd was unarmed,[25] both Nazem al-Islam and Malekzada refer to Mohammad Reza Musavat's shooting and killing a Cossack on that day.[26] A couple of shots were heard inside the mosque, causing panic among the bastis, leaders and followers alike. It was not known who had pulled the trigger, but it did succeed in forcing the crowd to flee. A follower of Behbahani claimed the bullets were shot by a "friend" to warn the enemy they were armed.[27]

The city authorities enforced a blockade. Though it was still possible to smuggle in food and water by bribing the soldiers, those hot summer days spent in a single building, where the air rapidly turned stifling and stale, caused hardship and forced the leaders to change plans. According to Nazem al-Islam, Behbahani, who had demonstrated his "heroic" and "courageous" stand, enjoined the crowd to leave the mosque, open the bazaar, and resume their normal routine, promising them that he and the other olama would carry on the struggle. In fact, according to other sources, the olama's situation proved hopeless, as they were unable to break the siege. "The poor olama," wrote an eyewitness, "had neither the means to escape, nor the endurance to sustain the seige."[28] They had no choice but to leave town and accept the safe passage Ain al-Daula offered them for their exodus to Qom. On Sunday evening, July 15, they evacuated the mosque; the following morning they departed the capital.[29] The four-day resistance collapsed without achieving its goals, wrote a British diplomat to Browne.[30] The "flight from the capital," observed another British diplomat in his dispatch to the Foreign Office, meant that the "government had won the day."[31]

The decision to leave town helped defuse the tension that was mounting rapidly and thus prevented the most extreme elements from exploiting the situation and raising the standard of revolt. Indeed, as most sources attest, the capital was on the brink of popular uprising. Once more, the olama, confronting a crisis, reverted to a course of moderation and accommodation. By doing so, they again relinquished their role as de facto leaders of the opposition, content to remain its mere symbols for as long as it served their purpose and that of other interested parties. The center stage of the political drama shifted from the mosque to the grounds of the British embassy; the demands for the removal from office of the hated chief minister and for the establishment of a house of justice gave way to the demands for a constitution and a national representative government. The intelligentsia, the religious dissidents, and the merchants overtly assumed control of the movement.

Contrary to the commonly held view of the so-called traditional close ties linking the merchant class with the olama, the bazaar failed to demonstrate its

solidarity on the day of their departure. Nazem al-Islam explicitly complained that the bazaar remained open; that none of the shopkeepers intended to support the bastis in Qom; and that those who joined them did so out of fear for their lives and property, and not out of loyalty for the olama. Similarly, the bastis encountered difficulties in raising funds to cover their expenses while away from home and work.[32] The wealthy merchants began their financial contributions when the bast at the British embassy was organized and negotiations for a new form of government for the Iranian nation were seriously undertaken by members of the intelligentsia, the royal court, and the British envoy.

The Bast at the British Embassy

By June 1906, Abdollah Behbahani had contacted Grant Duff, the British chargé d'affaires, seeking "pecuniary assistance" to overthrow Ain al-Daula's government. The chargé, following London's instructions, responded in the negative, insisting that Great Britain did not support movements against the present government in any way.[33] However, that official statement of noninterference did not discourage Behbahani or other members of the opposition—nor was it meant to. It was no secret in Tehran political circles that Britain favored Mohammad Ali Mirza as crown prince and therefore would not support Ain al-Daula's effort on behalf of Malek Mansur Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana, another Qajar laying claim to the throne.

In May 1906, the British and Russian envoys in Tehran were sufficiently alarmed by Ain al-Daula's conspiracy to cable their respective governments and urge them to take immediate action to prevent the change in succession. By June 14, Lord Grey granted Grant Duff permission to supply the designated heir with "sufficient money" to pay the troops and secure their loyalty to Mohammad Ali Mirza. Aware of the shah's rapidly deteriorating health and Ain al-Daula's persistence in keeping the crown prince in Tabriz misinformed on the situation in the capital, Grant Duff conferred with his Russian colleague, then cabled London his opinion that "the time for some kind of foreign intervention is approaching." He asked permission to convey to the shah a "strong message" that Ain al-Daula was incapable of governing. Apparently Grant Duff was allowed to see the shah and warned him against the machinations of Ain al-Daula. He also assured Mohammad Ali Mirza of full British support for his right to succeed to the throne. The British diplomat was also in favor of exerting pressure to hasten Ain al-Daula fall from power, but that request was denied. Grey was emphatically opposed to "interfering in the internal affairs of Iran."[34]

Grey was to persist in maintaining an attitude of unfriendliness, even aversion, toward the constitutionalists, and in discouraging direct British intervention in the events of the summer 1906. Nonetheless, Grant Duff played a vital role as chief negotiator between the court and the bastis, and his well-known sympathy for the movement assured the opposition of the tacit approval of a major European power, thus conferring prestige, if not legitimacy, upon it.

Representatives from both the British and Russian embassies reportedly visited Behbahani and fellow olama at the besieged Jamaʿ mosque to express

their concern about the possible breakdown of security in the capital and to promise mediation on their behalf with the shah.[35] High-ranking members of the court and government officials also directly or indirectly contacted the olama, assuring them of their support in the struggle against Ain al-Daula.[36] This powerful backing certainly played a part in the olama's decision to leave town rather than give in to the minister's pressure and surrender. From Qom, Behbahani sent a note to the British embassy, announcing the olama's decision and requesting "cooperation in fighting tyranny."[37] Nazem al-Islam claims that Behbahani then instructed his aides to call upon a group of merchants to seek bast on the grounds of the embassy. The Bonekdar brothers were entrusted with financial responsibility. The author of the *Tarikh-e Bidari-ye Iraniyan* also gives credit to Mirza Mahmud Isfahani for organizing both the lesser and the greater migrations. Mirza Mahmud, a merchant who had resided for many years in Istanbul, belonged to the group of "progressive" expatriates surrounding Jamal al-Din Asadabadi. He was also a member of Nazem al-Islam's secret society and other anjomans. He was one of the very rare merchants, writes Nazem al-Islam, who knew that the issue of Joseph Naus was only a pretext for the olama's first exodus to Shahabdolazim, a means to achieve a nobler end of freedom and progress and the awakening of the Iranians to their human rights.[38] There were others working behind the scenes in preparation for the bast. One such channel involved the Zoroastrian community of Tehran, led by a Parsee-born naturalized British merchant named Ardeshirgi.[39]

On Monday evening, July 23, 1906, Mirza Mahmud, the Bonekdar brothers, and a few other merchants, knocked on the door of the embassy, seeking asylum and claiming they feared for their lives. Two Iranian employees of the embassy instructed them to link their cause to the olama's and to proclaim publicly that their bast was in protest of the religious leaders' exodus, and not only out of fear for their safety. They were also counseled to ensure the collaboration of as many tollab and other members of the religious institutions as possible. In response the merchants brought into the embassy tollab from the Sadr and Dar al-Shefa madrasas and eventually from other schools as well. All were paid a daily stipend.[40] Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, who had resumed their public activities at the time of the Jama' mosque siege, together with Haidar Khan Amu oghli, took over the task of sending the tollab and the guild tradesmen to the bast. The modern schools, the Roshdiyyas and the Dar al-Fonun, also sent their students to participate in this major political event. Dar al-Fonun graduates and some instructors grew invaluable in informing the masses of bastis on the legitimacy and merits of their basic demands.

Within less than a week, the bazaar was closed, its shopkeepers having moved to the British compound. Despite their number, estimated by various sources at thirteen thousand to twenty thousand, the bast was orderly and efficiently organized, food was plentiful, and cash flowed readily. The bastis were accommodated in separate tents according to their institutional or professional association. Some stayed overnight; others went home in the evening to return in the morning. Each tent had its own preacher, but the community was under the religious supervision of two prayer leaders, Zol-Riyasatin, a member of Nazem al-Islam's secret society, and Fakhr al-Islam, an Assyrian Christian convert to

Islam. Each group or guild selected one member to represent it at a central committee, or council, formed by the leaders of the bast.[41]

As Nazem al-Islam reported, the freedom seekers involved in organizing the bast strove to be moderate in their public demands, and, at least initially, no one dared proclaim any cause other than the safe return of the olama from Qom.[42] As all sources show, the demands of the bastis at the embassy were at first quite mild: the return of the olama, a majles, guaranteed safety of individual life and property, the just application of the Islamic laws. Privately, on the other hand, they were taught new, modern concepts of equality of all before the law, freedom, constitutionalism, and representative government, all explained in Islamic terms.[43]

Ain al-Daula continued to misinform the shah on the political situation in the capital, desperately struggling against the rising tide of the opposition. Once more, he resorted to the time-honored, often successful, tactic of sowing division among the high-ranking olama, offering gifts and vague promises. His protégé, the Qajar prince Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana, who aspired to succeed the ailing Mozaffar al-Din shah, wrote fiery, indignant letters to Qom, appealing directly to an old friend, Alaʿ al-Din Eʿtemad al-Islam, Behbahani's son-in-law. The prince accused the olama collectively of falling prey to a dangerous, Babi-inspired seditious movement, thus handing over the nation, religion, and the Moslems' life and property to the British and Russians. "The ship of faith," he declared pompously, "has fallen into the whirlpool of heresy. . . . Thousands of people standing in line, praying at the Embassy! By God, if the olama of Najaf hear of this, they would declare you heretics!"[44] He warned that "these very people," who were the olama's "instruments," once "awakened from their sleep of ignorance" and realizing their state of bondage, would turn against them; "they would burn you."[45] He urged Eʿtemad al-Islam to advise the olama to return as soon as possible, before it was too late, before they regretted their action.

Tabataba'i and Behbahani quickly responded in unison to such accusations. In a joint letter to Shoʿaʿ al-Saltana, they denied responsibility for the situation in Tehran and asserted they had no choice but to leave town. "We do not consider ourselves responsible for these disturbances. More than anyone else, we now wish to extinguish the fire of sedition" and restore order. However, justice must be established first, or their efforts would prove fruitless to all. It is not yet too late, they wrote, for the government to take immediate action and reach accord. Otherwise, "the blame would be entirely yours," and not the olama's.[46] But the prince was relentless, again and again charging the olama with conduct unbecoming their ranks, accusing them of failing to fulfill their religious duty, of destroying Islam and ruining the Moslems. "Do not shame the Prophet of God any more. . . . The foreigners used to fear the tollab; now the tollab . . . go to the house of the foreigner."[47]

Ain al-Daula then tried to send his officials to Qom to find a solution agreeable to him and to the olama. Informed by their allies in the government, the bastis at the embassy immediately cabled Qom, warning the olama against any attempt to defect and imploring them to resist the minister's tempting offers of reconciliation, to remain steadfast in their demands until they attained their goals.[48] Qom swiftly replied, assuring the bastis of their intention to cooperate

and not return to town until "all the goals of the Iranian nation have been attained," recalling recent events in which they had participated. They have "passed the test," they wrote, sufficiently demonstrating their "devotion to the nation."[49] By that time, the leading merchants had emerged as the chief negotiators between the bastis at the embassy and the government. They began to donate funds for distribution to the olama and their entourage in Qom, and they directed the Bonekdar brothers' effort to collect the bill for the huge cost of maintaining the bast at the embassy.[50] But some leaders of the bastis mistrusted their motives and refused to talk with them. They even went so far as to cable the olama, begging them "not to be fooled" by the merchants representatives.[51]

The close collaboration among the olama, the merchants, and the bastis at the embassy remained effective as long as the common, short-term goal of all parties involved—the fall of Ain al-Daula—remained to be accomplished. The coalition was strengthened with the secret defection of many high government officials, including the minister of foreign affairs, Mirza Nasrollah Moshir al-Daula. This former protégé of Amin al-Soltan was greatly encouraged to turn constitutionalist by his two sons, Mirza Hasan Khan and Mirza Hosain Khan, reformed-minded officials who were to work together with men like the Hedayat brothers, Sani' al-Daula and Mokhber al-Saltana, Vosuq al-Daula and his brother Dabir Hozur (the future Qavam al-Saltana), Ehtesham al-Saltana, and members of the intelligentsia. At the same time, powerful figures close to the shah joined the court anti–Ain al-Daula cabal, now headed by the monarch's uncle, Kamran Mirza Nayeb al-Saltana, who was related to the inner royal chamber through his daughter, one of the shah's wives. Both father and daughter maneuvered skillfully to bar Ain al-Daula's access to the shah.[52] But is was the decision of Crown Prince Mohammad Ali Mirza to support the opposition that finally decided the fate of Ain al-Daula.

The dissidents in Tabriz had closely followed all the events taking place in the capital. Throughout the winter of 1905–1906 and the spring of 1906, they organized public demonstrations, closing the bazaar, in sympathy for the bastis in Tehran.[53] Mohammad Ali Mirza, however, to avoid losing control of the situation in his own town, intercepted all communications from Tehran and established censorship in the public use of the telegraph system. Upon receiving strong support from the British and Russian envoys, he decided to side with the bastis for his own personal reason, to put a definite end to Ain al-Daula's intrigues aiming at displacing him as the official heir to the throne. He gave the order for the lifting of government censorship, thus allowing free public access to the telegraph system. News from Tehran finally reached Tabriz and other cities. He also reportedly called all the major olama of Tabriz for an audience. Following that interview, the olama sent a cable to the shah, and to the olama in Najaf and Kerbala, Tehran, and other cities. The Tabriz olama's letter to the shah significantly displayed the traditional respectful tone of the religious leaders addressing the monarch, from the "servants of the shariat" to the head of the Islamic state, the "shadow of God on earth," whose "blessed existence" served as the "model" of justice and piety. They complained of "spiteful" and "treacherous" individuals who intercepted their cables and letters to him, obstructing all means of direct communication with him and preventing the fulfillment of royal

promises made to the olama. They praised the Tehran olama's genuine interest in judicial reforms that would check individual abuse of power, and they condemned "self-serving" and "greedy" officials who did not hesitate to have two seyyeds killed and besiege the olama in their own mosque. Disrespect shown to the religious leaders, they added, is tantamount to disrespect to Islamic law. Two days later the crown prince himself wrote the shah that he would not have backed the olama had he not been absolutely confident their demands were not detrimental to the state, the dynasty, and Islam.[54]

Mozaffar al-Din shah, thus finally aware of the gravity of the situation, dismissed Ain al-Daula and replaced him with Moshir al-Daula. The short-term goal was accomplished; the coalition of all groups involved in staging it began to crumble. The constitutionalists openly proclaimed their intentions, as their movement gathered momentum and the conservative elements distanced themselves from their former allies.

The "Islamic" and the "National" Fronts: The Negotiations

The shah sent Azod al-Molk, the respected elderly chieftain of the Qajar tribe, to Qom as his personal emissary. Azod al-Molk met all the leading olama in private, announced the "resignation" of Ain al-Daula, and, offering a large sum of cash and assurance of the shah's intention to bring about the changes they had demanded, invited them to return to town. Their presence in the capital was expected, he told them, as a royal audience was scheduled for them. While Azod al-Molk awaited a response to his overtures, the olama broke ranks.

An eyewitness account reports that Nuri was already regretting the support he had lent Behbahani and Tabataba'i, disillusioned as he was with the outcome of their movement. On the one hand, he was unhappy with his share of the shah's gift, believing he deserved more than the others since, having broken ties with the government, he had to contract a large loan from the Russian bank to cover his expenses, and his entourage's, for the duration of their stay in Qom. Nuri, on the other hand, could not and would not entirely espouse the group's objectives, as explained to him by Tabataba'i at his request. The latter was apparently quite candid in his statement, openly adopting the term mashrutiyyat, constitutionalism, as the ultimate goal the nation had struggled for. This included the rule of law, the equality of all before the law, regardless of their social status; justice, liberty, freedom of opinion and of the pen; limitation of the power of the monarch and his ministers. It is then that Nuri allegedly expressed his opposition to the new course of the movement. He declared himself in favor of setting official, lawful limits to the power of the shah and his ministers, but he totally rejected the concepts of freedom of opinion, and individual liberty. In Islam, he asserted, the term liberty is completely heretical. He asked the olama present to refrain from using any word, or acting in any way, that could be detrimental to Islam. He insisted that the law to be enacted by the majles should be based on the shariat and the Koran. The shariat, he proclaimed, recognizes no limitation, no conditions; it is universal, and had been so for thirteen hundred years.[55]

Outwardly, all agreed with Nuri. Tabataba'i, it is reported, saw himself com-

pelled to go along and promised Nuri to seek his advice and views once they were back in Tehran and the majles was established.[56] But Nuri kept his distance, and the rift between him and Behbahani and Tabataba'i was to grow wider. Behbahani was then unanimously acknowledged as the leader of the olama in the capital, his status rising high with the departure of Ain al-Daula, and he acted accordingly. All deferred to him. Nuri decided to return to town on his own, before the others. Nonetheless, a semblance of olama unity was preserved, as the constitutionalists, backed by an enthusiastic, sympathetic British envoy, were steadily gaining ground. The olama also unanimously remained loyal to the Qajar shah. A letter signed by Behbahani, Nuri, Sadr al-Olama, and Tabataba'i thanked the shah and assured him of their good intentions to continue, under the shadow of the Islamic monarchy, to fulfill their sacred duty and worldly obligation in safeguarding the independence of the government and protecting the shariat.[57]

The bastis at the embassy escalated their demands. The central committee, composed of the leaders of the various guilds and the tradesmen, was controlled by the intelligentsia, who composed the list of demands and selected, from among the religious dissidents, the preachers charged with instructing the masses assembled in the British compound. The religious dissidents worked together with the students and graduates of the Dar al-Fonun school and with more radical secular figures such as the Transcaucasian socialist Haidar Khan. Though Daulatabadi and Sayyah were prominent instructors, the names of Zol-Riyasatin and Fakhr al-Islam appear frequently in the Persian sources. The former was a member of the secret society who had embarrassed Nazem al-Islam with his untimely, unorthodox public preaching. Fakhr al-Islam, an Assyrian Christian born in Urumiya, had emigrated to the United States before returning to Iran and converting to Islam.[58]

The preachers, using their traditional religious rhetoric, introduced modern Western liberal concepts to the unsophisticated, uneducated tradesmen and shopkeepers, to moneylenders, and to the tollab. Often their lectures were verbatim translations of French texts on the subject, sprinkled with Islamic symbols and metaphors. As a British correspondent wrote to E. G. Browne, "They are, of course, absolutely ignorant of the principles of government, with the exception, perhaps, of a few of their chiefs. When I was in the Tihran Legation, they used to come and ask me how our constitution was worked, and would show a naiveté which was almost pathetic. They see clearly the object in view, but they are very hazy as to the means of attaining it. . . . But many of the chiefs, amongst whom is a celebrated Babi, have a very clear conception of what is needed. If only they remain united . . . they should carry the day."[59]

Thus coached by the British diplomats, the committee demanded a consultative assembly. For a few days, the negotiations were tense. The bastis pressed the olama in Qom to delay their return until this demand was granted, advised them on the policies to adopt and the strategies to follow, and kept them informed of recent developments in the capital. Secret codes and the English telegraph were used to ensure confidentiality and security. The olama then wrote to the shah, requesting the establishment of a majles, which would consist of the representatives of the merchants, the olama, and the nobility. Such a majles,

they explained, should have jurisdiction over all affairs of state, and should ensure the eqality of all before the law, in conformity with Islamic principles, adding that it would be left under direct royal supervision.[60] The last clause underscored the olama's desire to accommodate the wishes of some court officials, who were raising strong objections to the concept of constitutional monarchy. But it ran counter to the wishes of the bastis' central committee.

When, on August 3, Mirza Hosain Khan, the new chief minister's son, announced at the embassy that the shah had signed a decree calling for the formation of a majles to enact laws subject to his approval, the committee rejected it. A new round of tough negotiations began. On August 5, the shah signed a revised decree granting the nation the right to establish a majles, a consultative assembly of elected representative of the nobility, the olama, the merchants, and the guilds. The decree defined the function of the majles as a consultative body for government affairs, advising the ministers on reforms to be undertaken for the general welfare of the population. It also granted personal safety and freedom of opinion to its members, who would communicate with the shah through his minister; and it promised the application of majles decisions "in due time."[61] The bastis, once more, balked. They objected to the obvious limitations, implicit in its careful wording, which still made majles decisions subject to royal approval before legislation and allowed the sadr-e a'zam the same all-important position of intermediary between the people and the shah, thus perpetrating the same evil consequences of indirect communication. They demanded, instead, full power of legislation for the majles, and they insisted on having the British envoy act as guarantor for the execution of the decree. At this point the wealthy merchants, in consultation with the chargé d'affaires, sided with the bastis in negotiating with Nayeb al-Saltana, Moshir al-Daula, and other court officials.[62] The merchants also sent money to Qom, where the olama promised to remain until the bastis in the legation obtained full satisfaction. On August 6, the bazaar remained closed and copies of the rejected decree, which had been posted all over the walls in Tehran, were torn down. On August 7, a delegation consisting of Mohammad Sadeq (Mohammad Tabataba'i's son), Ala' al-Din (Behbahani's son-in-law), and Seyyed Mohsen Mottahar arrived from Qom to partake in the negotiations. They first visited the legation, where the bastis, according to the *Tarikh-e Bidari,* viewed their arrival with misgivings, aware as they were of the latter two olama's corruptibility. Nazem al-Islam here explicitly commented, "Had they not intervened, had they left the people alone to work for their cause, everybody would have been better off."[63]

The olama's delegation then met with Nayeb al-Saltana and Moshir al-Daula, to whom they presented the draft for a decree acceptable to them. The draft was identical to the merchants'; it gave the majles absolute authority over legislation for government matters and made its decision binding on the shah himself.[64] In the evening Mohammad Sadeq came back alone to the embassy and informed the bastis of the progress he and his two colleagues had achieved in negotiating with the government. The shah, he told them, had promised to call for the establishment of a majles "in the right way"; all bastis would be pardoned and given absolute safety of movement; the banished individuals would be allowed to return to Tehran; relatives of the two seyyeds killed during the demonstrations

would be given compensation and the killers punished in accordance with the Islamic law; merchants and moneylenders would be paid back the debts of government and court officials. It was also announced that the shah had ordered the sadr-e aʿzam to set up a committee to draft the constitution for the majles-e shaura-ye islami (Islamic Consultative Assembly).[65]

A new issue raised by the bastis at this point was to lead to further, more intense, deliberations and negotiations. According to Nazem al-Islam, the merchants and the intelligentisa, supported by the chargé d'affaires, demanded the replacement of the term "islami" with "melli." Vakil al-Daula, in his own account, confirmed this statement, adding that the people demanded a "national" majles and said "they had nothing to do with religion."[66] Shabnamas were published threatening to use violence should the establishment of majles-e shaura-ye melli be further delayed.[67]

Nazem al-Islam wrote that members of the secret society were worried over the interference of the "uneducated" (bi savad) children of the olama in the "sacred cause." The progress of this cause, he explained, depended on the cooperation of the government and the support of the "enlightened" and "knowledgeable" individual ministers; he reiterated his conviction that the intervention of Tehran mollahs and their sons had complicated the task.[68] *Tarikh-e Bidari* relates the heated discussions taking place on August 8 between the merchants, accompanied by the chargé d'affaires, and the sadr-e aʿzam, joined by his son and Mohtashem al-Saltana, the former group insisting on a national assembly and the latter demanding the Islamic term. The discussion ended with the ministers giving in to the others' demands.[69] In this part of the narrative the sequence of events and negotiations is confusing; the exact position of the olama's representatives is typically left obscure.

The bazaar remained closed while the bastis at the embassy listened to fiery speeches on the merit of a national assembly and participated in political debates. Reports spread that the chargé had received new instructions from London to back the bastis' demands. These instructions were in response to the merchants' cable sent two days earlier, explaining their preference for the replacement of majlis islami with melli, arguing that a deputy might be declared heretical and expelled from the majles for religious, and not political, reasons, or that a mollah like Nuri might pronounce the entire assembly heretical and turn the populace against it. Morevoer, Jews, Armenians, and Zoroastrians should have the right to send their representatives to the majles, and, as they pointed out, the term islami thus would not be applicable.[70] It was apparently then that the merchants and the chargé convinced the sadr-e aʿzam to replace islami with melli. According to Nazem al-Islam, when Mohammad Sadeq, Mirza Mohsen, and Alaʿ al-Din met with government and court officials, Amir Bahador, who was to emerge as the most powerful reactionary, strongly argued against the majles. He claimed the religious leaders could not possibly support the majles, since it was contrary to Islamic law and would usurp the olama's function as the refuge and protectors of the masses against the government. Mohammad Sadeq allegedly replied that a consultative assembly was compatible with religious laws, since God had initially instructed the Prophet to establish such a council. Bahador then argued against the term melli. Mohammad Sadeq responded that the people preferred this term

as a protective measure against the potential threat of takfir by opponents, who would use religion for their own self-serving ends. Moreover, he added, the bastis at the embassy would not leave the compound unless "melli" replaced "islami." At this meeting, Nayeb al-Saltana, fearing Bahador's influence on the shah, convinced the sadr-e aʿzam to see the monarch alone to inform him of the olama's wishes and the results of the negotiations.[71]

Nazem al-Islam's fear that the olama's delegation would jeopardize the negotiations proved partly unfounded. The merchants, the intelligentzia, and Grant Duff had obviously succeeded in having the three representatives from Qom side with them in demanding a national, rather than an Islamic, majles. Moreover, judging from all available sources, Moshir al-Daula and his two sons were in complete agreement with the bastis' demands. However, the sadr-e aʿzam had to tread cautiously and, in appearance at least, wait till the committee, backed by the olama's delegates, overruled the court officials' objections. On August 9, 1906, Moshir al-Molk (the sadr-e aʿzam's son), accompanied by Mohammad Sadeq Tabataba'i, announced to the bastis in the embassy that the shah had signed the revised decree, bearing the term melli. The new decree, written on August 9, bore the date of the original decree, August 5.[72]

The *Tarikh-e Bidari* is the only source that offers an account of the debate over the wording of the decree. Such a highly sensitive, potentially explosive issue was not deemed important enough to be mentioned in the standard annals. The deliberate blurring of the national–religious, Islamic–European, and shariat–mashrutiyyat rifts throughout the various phases of the revolution, until the promulgation of the constitution, was intended to protect the cause from any charge of heresy or of emulating the infidels' system and ideas. The decree's inherent contradictions and paradoxes, not to speak of the confusion, were left unnoticed. The original decree was printed in the majles minutes, but with the word melli on one page and the revised version, islami, on another. Both Kasravi and Malekzada reprinted the original text, but with melli instead of islami.[73] More importantly, all sources failed to point out the incongruity in the wording of the revised decree, where the majles is referred to as the National Consultative Assembly entrusted with the task of legislating reforms in compliance with the Islamic law. The idea of a secular national assembly was not viewed as incompatible with religious laws. In fact, shortly after the bast ended, a shabnama was issued defining the majles as "national Islamic."[74]

The *Tarikh-e Bidari* reveals that a small group favored a more innovative decree that would avoid ambiguities and paradoxes. Nazem al-Islam wrote that some "knowledgeable" individuals at the embassy were not entirely satisfied with the decree finally agreed upon. They had written their own, but the leaders of the merchants turned it down, arguing that too many texts had already been sent to the shah for revision. "It is all over now," they were told. The proposed alternative, reprinted by Nazem al-Islam, is radically different: the majles was viewed as a national representative assembly, with deputies to be directly elected, and not on the basis of their group affiliation; it would promulgate a new code of laws to be applied throughout the nation with no reference made to the shariat; the central majles in Tehran would have authority over all national political affairs, but local affairs would be left to the authority of provincial

ministries of justice; all new rules and regulations would have to pass by majority vote before being presented to the shah, through a member of the majles, for final unconditional approval; the application of the decree was to be guaranteed by foreign envoys. Here, then, the sadr-e aʿzam would lose his powerful role, and the shah would be subject to the national will through the majles representatives. Nazem al-Islam rose in defense of this rejected draft and expressed his resentment that the olama partook in the negotiations. "Had they not come, the people would have carried on their task much better," he stated bitterly.[75] The final official decree was obviously a compromise to please all moderate parties involved in the negotiations. It lay the foundation for discord and conflicts of interest that were to erupt soon after the majles was convened, when the procedures for the elections and the draft of the constitution were debated.

Royal carriages were sent to Qom to bring back the religious leaders; their debts to local retailers were paid, and the merchants in Tehran donated money to be distributed to individual olama.[76] On August 10 the bazaar opened, and most of the bastis left the embassy compound. Only the members of the committee—the leaders of each guild and professional association—remained until Behbahani and Tebataba'i arrived in Tehran. By August 16, all the tents were at last folded. The bast in Qom and in the embassy had lasted exactly one month.

The olama's return was triumphant. The notables of the capital went outside the gates to greet them. Leaders of the religious minorities received them in a tent, set up in a village south of Tehran, praising and thanking them for their "historic" role in ushering in a new era of unity between the Moslems and the minorities.[77] Behbahani and the other olama, each in turn, reportedly spoke on national unity and common concerns and ideals for peaceful cooperation, justice, a national majles, public safety, and freedom of worship. "We have no religious disputes, each is free in his belief."[78] Here Nazem al-Islam eulogized Tabataba'i and Behbahani as the "life-givers of Islam," "the sources and cause of civilization in Iran."[79]

On August 18, 1906, the majles was inaugurated in the Nezamiyya school used as the temporary meeting place. A crowd of some five hundred people representing the various professional and ruling classes listened to speeches by the sadr-e aʿzam followed by Shaikh Mehdi Soltan al-Motakallemin,[80] or Malek al-Motakallemin.[81] Both speeches referred to the national assembly, to the people of Iran, to the Iranian nation. The preacher noted that a monarchy depended on the well-being and education of the nation it rules. He stressed the national assembly's task of strengthening the monarchy and protecting Islam. He insisted that the progress of a nation depended on national and government unity and mutual cooperation. Finally, he expressed the hope that the national representatives, enjoying the full support of the olama and the government ministers, would enact the necessary reforms and execute them properly.[82]

Reflections and Second Thoughts

The intelligentsia favoring reforms, the merchants advocating reforms as a step forward to the formation of the modern state that would foster national economic

and industrial development, the olama who sided with their cause, and the leaders of the religious minorities, the Christians, the Jews, and the Zoroastrians—all were satisfied with the latest turn of the events. But this satsifaction was not universal, and the euphoria that followed the inauguration of the majles, though contagious, was not deeply felt.

The British connection greatly worried many observers. The bastis were hailed by the author of *Ruznama-ye Akhbar,* a self-defined humble, uneducated, minor government employee, who called their accomplishment a "great wonder."[83] Yet he openly expressed his reservations and fear of the possible repercussions of the British role in the affair, making oblique references to a signed document the leaders of the bast had allegedly submitted to the chargé d'affaires, upon the latter's request, promising to support the bast until completion of their task. Stating his ignorance as to the content of the document, he worried over the significance of the "seeds that were planted," the potential power it might grant the British to interfere in national affairs, and the possible loss of independence for the country.[84] Indeed, he feared for Iran a fate similar to India's.[85] He pointed to the fact that the first consequence of the bast was already being felt; that is, no royal or government decree was acceptable to the Iranian subjects unless guaranteed by a foreign envoy.[86]

Vakil al-Daula's correspondence reflects the concerns of Tehran's ruling circles with the British connection. His detailed descriptions of the major events shed light on his, and others', opinion and general reaction to the constitutional movement. He informed his friends of the rumors circulating in town about the olama's alleged secret accord with the foreign missions to seek sanctuary in their compounds should there be trouble[87] and the duplicity of the British chargé d'affaires, who acted as a benevolent adviser to the bastis[88] while assuring government officials he was not the instigator of the bast.[89] Vakil al-Daula conveyed the strong public conviction then prevalent, that the British themselves were the main source of ready cash[90] and that the British diplomat had taken complete control over the bastis, shaping their opinions, directing their moves, and even, through them, instructing the olama in Qom on the course to follow.[91] Vakil al-Daula expressed his "sorrow" that the people in Tehran were then behaving and feeling as if they were British subjects: so sure were they of the embassy's protection that they would "walk in the bazaar and the streets, and no one would dare talk to them."[92] The British, he informed his correspondents, were issuing "tickets" bearing the official embassy seal, which were used as safe passage for the bastis, declaring them under protection of the British government.[93]

These assumptions, though not entirely founded on facts, were widespread in Tehran ruling circles and among the lower classes. Far from dispelling the myth of British protection, the organizers enforced the illusion to the point of forging a cable which they attributed to the king of England, and which conveyed British sympathy and support for the Iranian national movement. The king allegedly expressed his hope for the establishment of a national consultative assembly, which would bring tyrannical rule to an end. The telegram cheered the masses, wrote Nazem al-Islam, and, though its authenticity could not be verified, one thousand copies were made and widely distributed.[94] On the other hand, the British diplomats attempted neither to discount the rumors of their direct involve-

ment as champions of the opposition leaders nor to deny the authenticity of the cable. Thus they allowed the deceit to fulfill its intended purpose, to galvanize the crowd and mobilize their enthusiastic support.

Ruznama-ye Akhbar relates that on August 2 and 3 a small crowd took sanctuary in the Russian embassy, instigated by the Russian diplomats themselves. Thereupon a few bastis from the British compound were delegated to remove them from the Russian embassy, beat them, and threaten them should they return there. The author surmised that the Russians had belatedly joined the action to take some credit for the major historic event that was to transform the Iranian power structure, unaware of the fact, he commented, that "it was all over." What could a crowd of, say, one thousand do in contrast to a crowd of fifteen thousand, he wondered.[95] The Russian envoy had indeed complained to the British chargé that the latter was preventing the opposition from seeking sanctuary in the Russian compound. Grant Duff reported the Russians were paying one toman to each basti, but the "people" would not allow a bast there. That small incident, indicative of the British–Russian rivalry in Iranian affairs, reinforced the general view, prevailing in Tehran, that the British were emerging as the leading power in Iran, inflicting a blow to Russian prestige there. The British minister for foreign affairs was to observe sarcastically, shortly after the promulgation of the decree, "I expect every day to hear that Grant Duff has been proclaimed shah."[96]

The role the British embassy came to play and the credit it was given, rightly or wrongly, engulfed Tehran political circles in controversial debates throughout the period of the first majles and beyond. The incongruity of this movement—generally described as nationalist–religious and antiforeign in character yet owing its success to a European power fiercely resented for its encroachment in domestic political and economic affairs—was to provide convenient ammunition for the hostile conservative establishment, lay and clerical. The liberal nationalist leaders were immediately branded as lackeys of the Infidels, betraying Islam and the nation.

A bitter power struggle was to surface in no time, threatening this precarious marriage of convenience. Vakil al-Daula, in a letter addressed to Amin al-Soltan—who was still living in exile in Europe but closely monitoring events in Iran, pulling strings and manipulating his agents—predicted a collapse of the coalition. He surmised that the reactionary elements, then outwardly professing sympathy and support for the constitutional movement, were in fact betting on time to achieve their destructive ends. They anticipated, and planned, the eventual destruction of the newly founded majles by sowing division within the ranks of the olama, he wrote.[97] Elsewhere, Vakil al-Daula doubted the effectiveness of such old tactics, believing that the present situation was entirely different from the past, and that it would be difficult to fool the olama now that they had scored such a spectacular victory based on unity.[98] History was to prove Vakil al-Daula wrong on this point.

But it was the lay revolutionists and religious dissidents who, though numerically insignificant and dependent on more powerful social groups to carry on their struggle, most bitterly resented and feared the new allies. The olama wielded enormous influence among the masses, wrote Daulatabadi, and "the

masses do not go to meetings unless for a religious purpose."[99] Compelled to subdue their radicalism in public, the radicals realistically admitted that the part played by the olama, the ruling elite and wellborn intelligentsia, and the British diplomats, was indispensable. Nonetheless, they perceived the potential threat this role posed to the movement. Thus, Nazem al-Islam remarked: "Justice and national sovereignty must come about through and for the sake of the poor and the oppressed people. The foundation of a constitution, or a republic, or a house of justice, cannot be solid if brought about by the elite."[100] The same tyrant, he added, the same thief who today calls for justice, would turn against it tomorrow, if he found it detrimental to his personal interests; he would then turn reactionary. Moreover, the same individual would continue to rule over the people. Nazem al-Islam further argued that a majles acquired through the good offices of foreigners could not be based on a solid foundation: the people would not have learned the value of such an institution and thus might relinquish it too easily. Echoing the Transcaucasian Social Democrats, especially Narimanov, he lamented "the honor and pride that others earned for themselves through the establishment of a majles, we do not possess. For there is a great difference between giving and taking. They gave it to us; we did not take it. Indeed, there is a difference between taking by ourselves, or through a third party."[101]

Nazem al-Islam, fellow religious dissidents, and the lay revolutionists were kept well informed of events in the Russian empire. Haidar Khan was increasingly active in their groups, and Baku publications found their way to Tabriz, Tehran, and other major cities. Smart, the British diplomat who helped Grant Duff in the days of the bast, wrote to Browne that the "Russian Revolution has had a most astounding effect here. . . . A new spirit would seem to have come over the people. They are tired of their rulers, and, taking example of Russia, have come to think that it is possible to have another and better form of government."[102]

The ideas of revolution, sovereignty of the people, and even republicanism were indeed discussed by some of the bastis. Hence the sense of frustration, of revolution manqué, as reflected in Malekzada's account. Beneath the moderate façade of the olama-led movement, he asserted, lay the revolutionary fire of the freedom seekers. Were the olama not so totally opposed to bloodshed, he argued, were they not content with mere "negative resistance" to individual government officials, had they instead encouraged the people to wage war, a bloody battle would have erupted between the people and the state, and the course of history would have been altered. The nation would have been spared a five-year-long revolution. But the olama were satisfied with negative resistance, and the bast in the British embassy was based on this "philosophy."[103]

7

The Establishment of the First Majles

The first experiment with parliamentarism, from August 1906 to June 1908, marked not the climax but rather the beginning of the revolution. It was during this two-year session of the first majles that groups of constitutionalists, emerging from British tutelage, formed more clearly defined political blocs with distinct targets and goals. Beneath their commonly adopted rhetoric, beyond their commonly held ideal of a representative government working in unison to reform society while abiding by the sacred rules and traditions of religion and monarchy, lay the divisive forces that, dormant in the preliminary stages leading to the proclamation of the constitution, were to explode weeks after the euphoria accompanying the festivities subsided. It is highly significant that Nazem al-Islam, practicing taqiyya, first defined the term enqelab as a national uprising against the government in part 4 of his detailed account, barely a week before the destruction of the majles.[1] Of even greater significance is the fact that he contrasted it to the term coup d'état, which he defined as political change brought about by a king.

The open confrontation, which intensified during the last six months before Mohammad Ali shah's coup, exposed the sharp ideological differences between the reformers and the revolutionists, severely split the constitutionalists' ranks, considerably weakened their united front, and played into the hands of the shah. However, until then, the main spokesmen for the constitution, including the radical leaders who practiced taqiyya, spoke of reform and not of revolution. In fact, until October 1907, ideological premises did not help build alignments and professional or social affiliations did not help forge alliances. The intelligentsia, who were mostly government officials, the merchants, the high-ranking olama, the religious dissidents, and the lay revolutionists, formed no clear-cut, closely knit political groups.

The Electoral Laws

No sooner were the olama back in town than the court activists began to deploy their traditional means of sorting out and splitting their ranks. The routine was the same: heavy socialization between the shah and the olama, the olama and the court and government officials, the olama and the merchants, the olama among themselves. Mutual respect and support were openly expressed, and promises, gifts, and flattery were exchanged; meanwhile, at secret meetings, old align-

ments were forsaken and new ones forged, with publicly stated goals and ideals sacrificed for the sake of short-term personal gain. Not a single group of participants in the movement that led to the promulgation of the constitution was immune from political intrigues aimed at eroding the basis of their powerful coalition. It must be noted that, while the reactionaries were indeed actively promoting their designs and spreading their web to capture or neutralize their rivals and opponents, individual constitutionalists were seeking support and help in unlikely circles, through an equally tortuous labyrinth of networks, often suffering setbacks as a consequence.

Clashes erupted when the Electoral Law was being drafted. While an appointed committee headed by Moshir al-Molk and Mokhber al-Saltana (and including Sani' al-Daula, Mohtashem al-Saltana, and other members of the intelligentsia) eagerly worked on it, the reactionaries, led by Amir Bahador and the Qajar prince Sho'a' al-Saltana, secretly plotted to win over some of the olama to their side. The olama were lavishly entertained at court. They were offered gifts, which Tabataba'i reportedly returned when the news spread,[2] whereas Behbahani accepted land and cash and met with the shah in a private audience. Only when his "treachery" was widely publicized and shabnamas circulated, threatening the "tyrants" and the "hypocrites" with death should they sell out the nation's rights, was he compelled to deny publicly having taken bribes; he then began to actively support the Electoral Law drafted by the liberals.[3] The shah refused to sign it. The sources do not agree as to the causes of the friction. Browne wrote, "The mullas refused to accept the ordinances drafted by the Prime Minister, and the shah declined to allow the modifications they demanded."[4] Yet, he revealed, the draft was prepared by the prime minister's son and by Mokhber al-Saltana, who headed the committee appointed by the "popular leaders," and whom he referred to as dedicated to the constitutional movement.[5] According to Daulatabadi, the olama were adamant in denying the Babis any right to political participation and insisted on giving the new laws an Islamic character. The Bahador-led court faction wished to push for their own draft, which would concede to the olama little or no influence in the majles. In this sense, Daulatabadi wrote, there was perfect agreement between the liberals and the court officials.[6] Nazem al-Islam, on the other hand, claimed the merchants, the guild leaders, and the olama sided together against the government version of the draft, without giving details of the tough secret negotiations that he reported were taking place at Tabataba'i's home. Only the issue of the religious minorities' right to representation in the majles is accounted for.

Leaders of the Christian and Jewish communities in Tehran and other main cities had vested their hope for obtaining civil rights in the constitutional movement. They had welcomed back the olama on their return from Qom, lavishly entertaining them in separate tents they had set up on the highway south of Tehran. Behbahani explicitly promised them a "new era of unity." On the eve of the elections, however, they were "persuaded" by Tabataba'i and his aides to waive their rights for the time being and to entrust their interests to a Moslem deputy. They were told that the olama in the country—especially those in Najaf and Kerbala—would raise serious objections to granting equal rights to non-Moslems, objections which would damage their cause and imperil

the elections. The Zoroastrians, however, were more successful in defending their rights.

From the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the newly rediscovered Iranian pre-Islamic past was glorified in the works of major writers, poets, and, with the burgeoning national press, journalists as well. Fathali Akhundov, the Azerbaijani intellectual who resided in Tiflis, had set the trend with his famous *Three Epistles.*[7] In this anticlerical, antireligious polemic, he held Islam and the olama responsible for the decline of Persian culture and society. Considering Zoroastrianism the authentic national religion, he contended that the Arab conquerors had imposed an alien creed upon the Aryan people of Iran. Among Akhundov's many admirers and emulators, Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani ranks as the most zealous.[8] Kerman was the seat of an important Zoroastrian community, which had long suffered social discrimination and religious prejudice, despite its legal status as a legitimate minority professing a faith recognized by Islam. A violent anticlerical nationalist born into a family of Shia mystics, Mirza Aqa Khan had at first been attracted to Babism and its Azali branch before turning secular revolutionist. He and Akhundov created the Iranian nationalist ideology that sought authenticity and cultural identity in pre-Islamic times. By the early 1900s, Malek al-Motakallemin, who, during a sojourn in Bombay, had met with wealthy Parsee merchants interested in promoting their cause in their ancestral homeland, carried the torch to the constitutional movement. He transformed ideas into action, preaching about ancient Persian civilization in mosques and madrasas, acquainting his Moslem audience with their pre-Islamic heritage and Zoroastrian compatriots. The social rehabilitation of the Zoroastrian Iranians was further enhanced with the intensive press campaign undertaken by young secular nationalists. However, unlike Akhundov and Mirza Aqa Khan, who wrote their anti-Islamic pamphlets eulogizing ancient Iran while enjoying comparative safety in exile, the constitutionalists prudently refrained from direct attack. They refuted the view that Islam and the Arab conquest had caused the decline of Iranian culture, insisting that it was the Moslems themselves, not Islam, who were backward. The obstacle to progress, they argued, is not Islam but ignorance, or, rather, ignorant understanding of Islam. One has to acquire knowledge before one can teach the true meaning of Islam and the true religious principles, they stated again and again.[9]

Led by Arbab Jamshid, a wealthy and resourceful merchant who had helped finance the bast at the embassy and maintained close ties with the powerful Moslem merchants, the Zoroastrians in Tehran exerted pressure on the olama and the lay leaders of the constitutional movement. According to Nazem al-Islam, Jamshid paid Behbahani to speak publicly on their behalf at election time. Thus, Behbahani defended the Zoroastrians' rights and praised them as "honorable," "reasonable," well-educated children of Iran. Jamshid was then allowed a seat in the majles, while the Armenians and the Jews were represented by Tabataba'i and Behbahani, respectively.[10]

Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and Sani' al-Daula reportedly pushed hard for the adoption of the liberals' draft, which they presented as the basis for the constitution yet to be written. The draft was finally endorsed by Tabataba'i, Behbahani, Nuri, Sadr al-Olama, and their respective clerical follow-

ers, and by the merchants and the guild leaders,[11] although the court was still opposed. At this point the bazaar closed and preparations were begun for a second bast at the British embassy. Shabnamas were printed, threatening strong action in protest. Baku sent letters announcing the imminent arrival of fifty thousand volunteers to help their Iranian brethren. In one such letter, Tabataba'i is hailed for the historic role he played in the movement. "Until now, we believed that the nation's olama were to be blamed for our misfortunes," but now "your excellency have shown your readiness to sacrifice your life" for the cause, demonstrating that the olama could no longer be held responsible for the wretched conditions of the nation. The letter referred to the shah as "our affectionate crowned father" but warned him that the six thousand-year-old tradition of independent monarchy was now in peril because of the deeds of a handful of corrupt, self-serving individuals.[12]

The British diplomats once more intervened on behalf of the liberals. Grant Duff, in compliance with his instructions from London, contacted his Russian colleague, who agreed to cooperate "in bringing the matter to the serious attention of the Persian government." As a result, the shah signed the Electoral Law by mid-September, and the elections were announced for early October. "Victory was now won," wrote the British diplomat.[13] In fact, the law turned out to be, theoretically at least, a minor triumph for the reformists. It granted the right to vote to all eligible men who were "subjects of Iran," literate in the Persian language, at least thirty years old, owning land or business property. No reference was made to the religious affiliation of voters or candidates; only those "known for professing heretical views" were barred from the elections, as were women, minors, convicts, and men officially declared bankrupt.[14]

The Olama and the Majles

The elections resulted in the formation of a majles representing mostly the nobility, wealthy merchants and their agents, the bazaar retailers and guild members, the olama and their agents.[15] A minimum age requirement was overlooked;[16] bribes were offered and taken to circumvent regulations barring from election candidates involved in pending litigation;[17] ballots were rigged and candidates were arbitrarily selected.[18] Nazem al-Islam complained that bribery and intimidation led to the election of "ignorant, uneducated" deputies, and that few were as educated and well-informed as Sani' al-Daula and Mokhber al-Saltana.[19] Mokhber al-Saltana wrote in his memoirs that lawlessness and chaos prevailed during the elections, compelling him to use coercive means to restore order. "I ran the elections," he admitted, "with the stick of despotism, in order to save them from royal whims."[20] Together with other members of his family, he organized meetings in private homes to teach the newly elected deputies, especially those representing the guilds, "lessons on constitutionalism."[21]

Tabataba'i and Behbahani maintained the outward appearance of unity, working to consolidate the principles of constitutionalism.[22] In reality, though, the widening gulf between the two mojtaheds' camps exposed their respective ranks to infiltration from the right and left by extremists who sought a clerical umbrella

for their views and activities.[23] Members of Nazem al-Islam's secret society, which had met at the end of the first bast[24] and again in July 1906, upon the olama's return from Qom, became active after the majles was established. They discussed the need to expand their anjoman, since the old task of awakening the nation was successfully accomplished and their new responsibility was to watch over the majles, prevent sedition, and safeguard the people's hard-won gains. Government and court officials, newly converted to constitutionalism, were admitted. Two close aides of the minister of court, Amir Bahador, joined the anjoman as active members.[25] The anjoman's chief concerns were to maintain a semblance of clerical unity and prevent the disintegration of the precarious Bahbahani–Tabataba'i coalition. The relationship was strained by Tabataba'i's temperament and Bahbahani's corruptibility.[26] Tabataba'i, irritable and abrasive,[27] was vulnerable to skillful provocation by enemy agents. He lacked the necessary qualifications for leadership, where competence is more important than ideology or principles. Nazem al-Islam, his own apologist, confessed that Tabataba'i's singlemindedness was detrimental to the cause. For, unlike Behbahani and Sadr al-Olama, he was interested in attracting the attention of neither the elite nor the masses. He thus failed where his rivals succeeded, despite his genuine dedication to the movement.[28] Indeed, Tabataba'i was highly sensitive to the public image he projected, and he dreaded the rumor-mongering and character assassination his opponents indulged in.[29] On the one hand, he was easily influenced, especially by his liberal son, Mohammad Sadeq, and by the revolutionists; on the other, he remained highly suspicious of other olama's motives and continued to antagonize them. He consistently blocked his aides' political maneuvering in the battle for supremacy in the majles, refusing to concede or compromise to win the deputies' support. Thus he increasingly lost ground.[30] Moreover, intrigues and petty rivalry within his own entourage further narrowed his chances of success against Behbahani's rising star within the constitutionalists' ranks. Behbahani had mastered the art of clerical politics and emerged as the uncontested clerical champion of the constitution. When he attended the majles, the deputies would wait for his signal to begin the session; his pronouncements would carry considerable weight in the debates,[31] even though he was known for promoting his "clients' " (or patrons') views and wishes, rather than his own or the constitutionalists'. Indeed, shortly after the elections, a deputy representing the olama resigned and was automatically replaced—without vote or consultation—by Behbahani's son-in-law, Aqa Mirza Mohsen, who was also Sadr al-Olama's brother.[32] Not only was Behbahani able to eclipse a fellow constitutionalist mojtahed of Tabataba'i's caliber and status, but he was also capable of driving his more formidable clerical competitor, Fazlollah Nuri, to the opposition camp. All sources agree that Nuri's defection was initially caused by Behbahani, who had carried the old feud from the mosque and madrasa into the majles. Had Behbahani allowed Nuri a role equal to his in the political arena, or, to use the Persian colloquial expression, had he conceded "a corner of the rug," he would have spared the nation much of the subsequent trouble.[33]

The *Tarikh-e Bidari* reports that members of the anjoman, angry with Mirza Mohsen's appointment to the olama delegation in the majles, backed Mirza Mehdi Nuri's proposal to raise the issue in the majles itself. Mirza Medhi,

Fazlollah Nuri's son, had personal and ideological differences with his father and had joined Tabataba'i's circle at the time of the first bast. When, in the following majles meeting, he rose to denounce Behbahani's highhandedness, the latter, already forewarned of the move by a "treacherous" fellow member of the anjoman, angrily silenced him while his aides and supporters loudly proclaimed the Babis intended to destroy the foundation of the majles and "annihilate" the Moslems. In this ugly scene Mirza Mehdi Nuri found himself an outcast, accused of complicity with heretics, none of his friends and fellow members of the anjoman rising to his defense. Nazem al-Islam then commented on the widespread practice of "accusing of Babism anyone one wishes to defeat and destroy," any opponent or rival, regardless of the political stand taken, for or against the majles.[34] It was quite clear that Mehdi Nuri's association with Nazem al-Islam's group led Behbahani's faction to publicly denounce his action as part of a Babi conspiracy. Shaikh Fazlollah Nuri reportedly viewed this public scolding and humiliation of one of his sons, even one he was not very fond of, as a personal affront inflicted by his hated rival.

Known Babi connections did not necessarily hamper the formation of short-term ties deemed expedient. Thus, for instance, Nuri sought Daulatabadi's good offices to stage a rapprochement with Behbahani.[35] Daulatabadi himself had tried to improve his own relationship with Nuri, despite his explicitly stated mistrust of the conservative mojtahed and of the olama in general.[36] His relationship with Behbahani's group had cooled as a result of a dispute over the right to edit the official newspaper of the majles. The incident caused him to seek closer ties with Nuri, even though, he confessed, he tried to hide it from Behbahani for fear of retaliation.[37]

During this early period of the first majles, most of the leading olama in Iran and Iraq still supported and conferred legitimicy on the majles. While the mojtaheds in Najaf viewed it as a means to safeguard religion and ensure the application of the religious law,[38] some olama in Iran attempted to identify it with the early concept of shaura.[39] Pamphlets declaring that opposition to the majles was tantamount to opposition to religion suddenly appeared.[40] Events in Tabriz and the accession of a new reactionary shah to the Qajar throne were to precipitate the breakdown of the olama's fragile united front.

The Constitutionalists in Tabriz

Tabriz in the fall of 1906 was a main center of the Baku-based Hemmat group's activities. Its leaders, especially Nariman Narimanov, were sending newspapers, revolutionary pamphlets, and propagandists armed with the Hemmatists' political program. The program, as already discussed, was adapted from an Azeri Persian version of the RSDWP's to fit the special conditions of the Moslem Social Democrats and their religious-minded constituencies. However, as Hasan Taqizada reported in *Ershad,* the Baku Azeri paper, the leadership of the constitutional movement in Tabriz, unlike Tehran, included neither the high-ranking olama nor the big merchants. These two groups joined later.[41]

Shortly after the Electoral Law was promulgated in Tehran, a small group of

individuals met secretly to organize a bast in the British consulate to follow the example of the constitutionalists in Tehran and to demand that elections be held in Tabriz as well. Those involved in initiating the bast included members of various secret societies, which by then had merged into the Secret Center, the central committee of the Social Democrats.[42]

On September 17, a group led by Mir Hashem, Mirza Javad Nateq, and Mirza Hosain Va'ez, later joined by Shaikh Selim, requested permission for the bast from the British consul. The consul reportedly asked them to form a bigger crowd of bazaar retailers and olama, to have the bazaar closed, and to raise broad national issues, before he would allow them to use the legation compound.[43] Theqat al-Islam wrote in his diary that the group, realizing their lone action had created no public stir, sent a couple of tollab to the bazaar to compel the retailers to close shop and join the bast at the legation. A few bullets were shot in the air to intimidate the bazaar retailers.[44]

The same group also forced the main high-ranking olama in town to form their own bast in a mosque. Here again Theqat al-Islam revealed how Mir Hashem, Shaikh Selim, Javad Nateq, and Ali Akbar Mojahed—in other words, the low-ranking activist mollahs—controlled the situation from the very beginning, instructing the mojtaheds even in the choice of the mosque, selecting one close to the British legation for better communication. The mojtaheds were "kept imprisoned in the mosque for six hours," until they agreed.[45] In a speech discussing the merits of constitutionalism, Javad Nateq reportedly attacked the "false olama," implying the Imam Jom'a and Mirza Hasan, the mojtaheds known for their close ties to the crown prince. Theqat al-Islam protested this slander and insisted on inviting them to the mosque. When both arrived the following day, Shaikh Selim from the minbar and his followers from the floor greeted them with disrespectful remarks. The preachers lectured and incited the public to agitate against the government. "No one dared protest," Theqat al-Islam added.[46] The latter, though fully supporting the movement and its leaders, with whom he was well acquainted and whose secret meetings he had attended, was already hesitant to condone the extremists' tone and behavior. He was to remain caught between the two sides, for and against the constitution, as a result of the increasing radicalization of the Tabriz leaders' demands and political activism. He had from the start acknowledged the role of the initiators of the bast in the legation as leaders of the movement in Tabriz; his own commitment to their cause put him in a much more vulnerable position vis-à-vis his clerical peers than Tabataba'i and Behbahani were in the capital.

In one of the many meetings held during the eventful week of September 17–26, 1906, the mojtaheds in the mosque were aggressively provoked to accept the challenge of the bastis' leaders and call for the promulgation of the constitution in Tabriz. Mirza Hasan the mojtahed allegedly replied to Ali Akbar Mojahed, "You are the ones who want a constitution, and the British Consul has promised he would give it to you. What could we do?"[47] A fierce dispute arose over the choice of the term mashruta, which the Imam Jom'a identified with republicanism. Theqat al-Islam vehemently denied the charges and expressed his belief in the shah's right to reign on the condition that he consult the nation for all government affairs.[48] When the crown prince sent a delegate to discuss the

bastis' personal grievances and to bring the bast to an end by promising to lower the price of bread and to stop the hoarding of wheat, the preachers blocked their effort. They mounted the minbar in turn, addressed the crowd at the legation, and loudly proclaimed they were demanding justice and freedom, and not just bread. They exerted pressure on Theqat al-Islam, who was in favor of negotiating with the court in Tabriz.[49] The bast did not come to an end until the bastis' leaders were granted their constitutional demands and elections were held.

Eleven days later, on October 8, 1906, anjoman-e Tabriz, a new anjoman, was formed. Its founders had also established the secret societies prior to the revolution. Its function, its authority, and its role acquired new dimensions and scope; its social and ideological composition became more openly diverse, representing conflicting interests and objectives.[50]

The anjoman-e Tabriz was from the beginning dominated by a minority of radicals. The term radical within the Azerbaijani context needs explanation. Although information on this early period is scarce, the official statements and the politics of the anjoman, reflecting its dominant ideology, can be traced in both the recorded events and the anjoman's newsletter. The newsletter, founded within weeks of the anjoman itself, was originally named the *Jarida-ye melli,* but it soon was referred to as the *Anjoman.* It was a biweekly periodical that recorded the anjoman's minutes, reported on the major news in the province and the capital, and, more importantly, served as the official organ of the anjoman's leaders. Its editor was Seyyed Mohammad Shabestari, better known as Abu Ziya', a clerical member of the Secret Center. He was well versed in the French language and well read in modern European thought. In the 1880s he had collaborated with Talebov in Instanbul to publish a satirical paper. Despite the fact that he still wore the turban and clerical garb, Abu Ziya' fought alongside lay leaders such as Ali "Monsieur," who increasingly adopted Social Democratic programs.

Ali Monsieur had emerged as the dominant force among the radicals. His home was the regular meeting place of the Secret Center. He had direct contacts with the Hemmatists, who sent to Tabriz volunteers trained in political agitation and armed insurrection. According to Russian archival sources, in November 1906 the Secret Center, through the anjoman and with the help of the Hemmatists, had already begun training armed bands.[51] The mojahedin (holy warriors) of Tabriz helped the Secret Center consolidate its authority within the anjoman and stage public demonstrations in self-defense and against the crown prince's endeavors to destroy the constitutionalists' gains. They encouraged the masses to rise against tyranny and carry on an armed struggle to attain their rights. After the elections, Mohammad Ali Mirza ordered the closing of the anjoman. Its members from among the merchants and the olama agreed, but the Secret Center and the mojahedin categorically refused. They staged public demonstrations, forcing the crown prince to rescind his order and allow the continued existence of the anjoman.

Like their counterparts in Baku and elsewhere in the Caucasus, the Tabriz Social Democrats were particularly successful in appealing to lower ranking members of the religious institutions, preachers, and prayer leaders, as well as tollab.[52] Thus, the anjoman nominated Shaikh Selim, Mirza Javad Nateq, and

Mirza Hosain Va'ez as its official preachers, assigning to each a mosque where they propagated the idea of constitutionalism and kept the public informed of the anjoman's policies. All three preachers resolutely supported the radicals' policies and views. Consequently, both the Imam Jomʿa of Tabriz and Mirza Hasan the mojtahed declared Va'ez a Babi, Nateq a freethinker, and Selim a pawn in the hands of those two.

Vigilance against enemy infiltration was of paramount importance to the anjoman leaders. As usual in Iranian politics of the time, dissension was fanned and the integrity of individuals was undermined by rival groups. The anjoman grew suspicious of Mir Hashem, one of the initiators of the bast in the British legation. They accused him of accepting bribes from the anticonstitutional camp, and then denounced him as a traitor to the cause. Mirza Hosain Va'ez, who had publicly raised the issue, was subsequently assaulted by Mir Hashem's bodyguards. The anjoman quickly organized a defense, had the bazaar closed, and staged a street demonstration with a large crowd demanding the expulsion of Mir Hashem, who was forced to leave Tabriz two days later.[53] The anjoman was also successful in systematically harassing the two leading clerics in town, the Imam Jomʿa and Mirza Hasan the mojtahed. The preachers regularly attracted public attention to the two olama's share in the blame for the rising costs of bread and meat and for the hoarding of wheat. In the first days of November, an incensed mob compelled the Imam Jomʿa to leave town also, after Javad Nateq revealed to the anjoman the religious leader's offer to pay 300 tomans to be taken off its blacklist.[54] Reportedly the anjoman wished to expel the Imam Jomʿa's son as well, to prevent him from succeeding his father, and to give the mosque to a preacher of its choice; it was dissuaded from pushing this too far.

The anjoman-e Tabriz, within a month of its foundation, was acting as an autonomous government within the government of Tabriz. Repeatedly the crown prince reminded its members of its original purpose, which was solely to supervise the local election for the deputies to be sent to the majles in Tehran. In this he enjoyed Mirza Hasan the mojtahed's encouragement and religious blessings. But it was to no avail. The anjoman continued the activities it had assumed as part of its function. It became involved in price regulation, controlling the cost of basic food commodities; in organizing its own armed patrol; and in enacting its own laws. It encouraged its preachers to lecture on the peasants' right to own the land they tilled and to attack individual landowners verbally and physically. It called for freedom of the press and violently protested the banning of *Mollah Nasreddin,* the satirical paper published in Baku in Azerbaijani Turkish.

Posters attributed to the anjoman appeared on the walls of Tabriz, urging the people to disregard the "ancient terms" of "antiquated religion," to avoid the mosques. The majority of the olama in town responded by denouncing the anjoman as a Babi agency. Theqat al-Islam declared the posters were forged by the anticonstitutionalists to discredit the movement and the anjoman. In public he defended the constitutionalists and the anjoman, proclaiming that their differences did not constitute religious differences or innovations.[55] In private, however, Theqat al-Islam was already expressing his disenchantment with the "irreligious element" working to isolate the people from the olama, holding this group responsible for the anjoman troubles. "I said what I could say" in defense of the

anjoman, he wrote to his brother, "and now I am considered as a forceful champion of the constitutional movement."[56] He repeatedly counseled the anjoman leaders, and the three preachers, to adopt a more moderate tone and avoid extremist measures in implementing their policies and views.

Shaikh Selim, Javad Nateq, and Hosain Va'ez were calling for moderation, which somehow aroused the other members' suspicion. Mirza Ali Akbar Mojahed accused two of his fellow preachers, Shaikh Selim and Javad Nateq, of accepting a bribe from the Imam Jom'a, who wished to return to town, and had the anjoman call for their expulsion. Neither of the condemned preachers was to be expelled, as a bizarre sequence to the event turned Shaikh Selim, the supposed villain, into a victim and hero. In a meeting attended by Mirza Hasan the mojtahed, where Shaikh Selim addressed the ayatollah in disrespectful terms, the latter slapped his face and asked him to leave town, whereupon the preacher's followers and fellow members of the anjoman staged a riot in his defense and demonstrated against the mojtahed.[57]

In the following months, the anjoman-e Tabriz was to intensify its hostility to the leading olama in town and to further radicalize its views and demands. Theqat al-Islam, though he continued to defend the anjoman in public, increasingly expressed his misgivings on the "irreligious" trend that, he alleged, was so visibly and audibly undermining the legitimacy of the constitutional cause.[58] Ironically, it was the radicals from among the Azerbaijan delegates who, arriving in Tehran in December and January, were to save the constitutional movement from falling prey to the reactionary court and its clerical allies. For a new shah backed both politically and financially Fazlollah Nuri's long and vicious battle against his hated rival Behbahani, allowing him to carry on his feud in the name of Islam and the shariat.

The anjoman pushed for the selection of deputies of their choice. Abdol Rahim Talebov, the Transcaucasian Moslem merchant and writer, Theqat al-Islam, and Shaikh Selim were elected, but each declined the post. The final list of deputies who departed for Tehran represented the most ideologically progressive elements in Tabriz society. Hasan Taqizada, still wearing the clerical garb, was to emerge as the leader of the Azerbaijanis in the capital, as well as the most effective deputy of the majles itself. British diplomats in Tehran at the time believed he was an Azali Babi.[59] Indeed, he moved easily in Babi circles in Tabriz and in Tehran, but there is no evidence that he had converted to the sect. He acknowledged that in his early youth he had been interested in the Shaikhi school of thought,[60] which Theqat al-Islam headed. But he soon discovered Western thought and was completely dedicated to it by the time he founded the secret society on the eve of the revolution. Taqizada may have practiced taqiyya, like all other Azali Babis; however, again like other Azalis who turned ardent champions of the constitutional movement, his views were purely nationalist, secularist, heavily tainted with a Hemmatist type of Social Democratic ideology. He certainly belonged to the Secret Center and had close contacts with Transcaucasian Moslem Social Democrats. On September 3, 1906, two weeks before the bast at the British legation, Taqizada had left Tabriz for the Caucasus, where he spent nearly seven weeks, mostly in Baku and Tiflis. Judging from the scarce autobiographical sketches he left, Taqizada, then as in subsequent periods, did

not associate solely with the Social Democrats. In fact, he collaborated with Ahmad Aqaev, the editor of *Ershad,* who he termed a "radical nationalist,"[61] and with revolutionary secularists like Jalil Mamed-Qulizada, editor of *Mollah Nasreddin,* and the poet Sabir. None of these three intellectuals was an official member of the Hemmat or the Moslem Iranian Social Democratic groups. But they did work with them in joint publication ventures. Nariman Narimanov, S. M. Efendiev, and Mohammad Amin Rasulzada, the best known Hemmatists, published many of their articles in *Ershad* and in *Mollah Nasreddin.* Taqizada also contributed to both papers.

Among the other deputies selected to represent Tabriz, Mirza Ibrahim Aqa, a low-ranking mollah, was an active member of the anjoman and a close associate of the Secret Center. While in Tehran, he was to correspond with the anjoman leaders in secret code. Mirza Fazlali, another low-ranking mollah, was affiliated with the Shaikhi school. Mirza Sadeq Khan Mostashar al-Daula, a member of the Tabriz ruling elite, was no extremist by Taqizada's standard, but he was an equally ardent advocate of modernism and secularism. He was to work with the extremists in "complete unison" during the struggle for the drafting and the passage of the constitution. Mostashar al-Daula was ideologically closer to Theqat al-Islam and was to be equally torn between his genuine constitutionalist inclination and his dismay with some of the extremists' tactics. He was to correspond in secret code with the mojtahed throughout the period of the first majles. Finally, Hajj Mirza Aqa Farshi, a merchant by profession and a fellow member of the earlier secret societies, was also fiercely dedicated to modernization and secularism. His home, prior to the revolution, was the rendezvous of the champions of the new learning. He owned the finest collection of Western and Persian books and periodicals published abroad.

As noted previously, at this early stage, the so-called Iranian Social Democrats, like their Transcaucasian counterparts, vacillated among the ideals of the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and Social Democracy. Only major political events and personal circumstances were to help in determining and shaping the final ideological orientation of each individual. In that sense, Taqizada accurately assessed the ideological composition of the first majles. There were no political parties, he asserted, only conservative and extremist elements. The latters' view, he admitted, "resembled socialism,"[62] and their goals were revolutionary, that is, to uproot the old sociopolitical structure of the tribal, feudal, religious powers, and to lay the basis for a new system.[63] Though they were not strictly Marxists, they promoted the right of the workers and the peasants to own the fruit of their labor and their lands. But foremost on their political agenda were nation-wide reforms for the modernization and secularization of their society. Thus, they were even to work with members of the ruling elite and conservative court officials to push for the passage of the constitution.

The New Shah and the Majles

Mohammad Ali Mirza's attitude toward the majles and the constitutional movement generally reflected the various stages of his own power struggle against the

rival princes, influential statesmen and officials, and the two foreign powers traditionally involved in Iranian affairs. As stated in the previous chapter, fear of Ain al-Daula's plot to unseat him as crown prince had prompted him to side with the constitutionalists and to instruct the olama in Tabriz to cable their support to Tehran. Similar considerations motivated him to come to Tehran in mid-December 1906 to once more win over to his side the constitutionalist olama in the capital by pressing the ailing Mozaffar al-Din shah to sign the constitution. The prince, in a letter to Mohammad Tabataba'i, reportedly complained of efforts by some court officials and royal princes to block his access to the monarch and asked the mojtahed to "exert pressure on me and compel me to demand seriously" the royal signature. Otherwise, he warned, "you will have to give up counting on it."[64]

Mohammad Ali Mirza's ultimate success in influencing the shah to sign the Fundamental Laws on December 30, 1906, barely a few days before the latter's death, did not calm the constitutionalists' fears of his true motives, still fresh in the Azerbaijanis' mind. Indeed, once he acceded to the throne, the new shah brought to the court, and retained, officials known for their hostility to the movement. Chief among them were Amir Bahador, the late shah's minister of court, and Shapshal, his own Ukrainian-born Russian tutor. Conflict between the majles and the court erupted instantaneously.

Mohammad Ali shah was adamant in his determination to maintain absolute power. From the very beginning of his reign, he took a strong stand against the nominal adoption and application of a constitution that limited his power. He excluded the majles deputies from his coronation ceremonies on January 19, 1907, inviting only the high-ranking olama and those members who, by birth or family ties, were connected with the royal dynasty, such as Sani' al-Daula, the majles Speaker, and Sa'd al-Daula. Implicit in this obvious snub was the shah's intention to restore the old social order, distinguishing the olama of the capital from the national representatives, recognizing the religious leaders solely as high-ranking men of religion. Significantly, such a differentiation was noted in the majles, where some deputies, angered by the royal snub, insisted on the majles' prerogative to crown the monarch as a symbol of national and popular sovereignty.[65] In their view, the majles, as an independent institution, could not be represented by the high-ranking olama and a couple of wellborn deputies of the aristocracy. This alienation from the court was to intensify with the arrival of the Azerbaijan deputies.

Taqizada, who had been in Tehran since late October, along with his colleagues who arrived in early February, swiftly and effectively assumed a dominant, if not domineering position within the majles. With a brilliant speech that impressed all present in the assembly, Taqizada attracted national attention. "Today," wrote Nazem al-Islam, "Taqizada has become the leader of the nation."[66] However, he had to contend with the ambitions of a well-educated, polished politician, Sa'd al-Daula, known as "father of the nation" for his role in early events of the constitutional movement and his support of the bastis during the lesser and greater migrations. Sa'd al-Daula had returned to Tehran at about the same time as the Azerbaijan deputies. At that time, his short-term goals coincided with Taqizada's, and they joined forces in exerting pressure on the

court. They demanded that the shah's appointed cabinet ministers swear allegiance to the constitution and be directly responsible to the majles; that Naus and Priem, the two Belgian customs officials, be dismissed; and that a supplement to the Fundamental Laws of December 30 be immediately drafted.

The demand for the dismissal of Naus and Priem received the strong backing of all the major merchants seated in the majles. Amin al-Zarb, the deputy to the majles Speaker, wielded immense power in the national assembly. He headed the small group of entrepreneurs in charge of setting up a national bank. The foundation of the national bank, one of the oldest and most vexing politicoeconomic issues since the 1870s, was a matter of heated debate in endless majles sessions. Amin al-Zarb and his colleagues demanded, in return for their providing the initial capital, government concessions granting them sweeping monopoly rights,[67] highly reminiscent of the ill-fated Reuter concession, in financial affairs and economic development of the nation. To this end, they wished to see all foreign experts removed from office. Thus, the majles committee established to draft the supplement and to negotiate with the court included Sa'd al-Daula, Amin al-Zarb, and Taqizada. Each had a great stake in the formulation of a constitution that would lay the legal foundation for the structuring of an innovative, modern, centralized state. Amin al-Zarb and fellow merchants were content with the concept of a constitutional monarchy; so was Sa'd al-Daula, in theory though not in practice, for he was soon to defect to the royalist camp. On the other hand Taqizada—a youthful, zealous, activist mollah from the provinces; a convert to the new learning, to the lofty ideals of social justice and national progress; a symbol of the rising, ambitious, aggressive middle-class Iran—was to outmaneuver them in the national assembly. The press and the newly formed anjomans in the capital and in the provinces, both dominated by the radical secularists, were to provide him and his group with much-needed support.

According to the chronicle most sympathetic to Nuri without being partisan, Nuri began to distance himself from the majles at about the time Mohammad Ali Mirza ascended the throne.[68] Tabataba'i often pleaded with him to attend the meetings more regularly, although to no avail. Tabataba'i and Behbahani were not entirely in favor of the strong currents prevailing in the majles in those excitable days. When the time came to sign the Fundamental Laws, Behbahani hesitated but had to give in to the pressure exerted on him by some deputies and the spectators that crowded the galleries. "He was astute enough to realize this was no time to argue," wrote one eyewitness.[69] He signed without further delay, as did Tabataba'i. Nuri, however, insisted he needed time to study the document before deciding where his religious obligation lay. From that day, Nuri broke with the majles. He then began his long, intensive attack on the constitution. He declared that it had to conform to the shariat, and in a letter dated early January 1907, addressed to Aqa Najafi, the mojtahed in Isfahan, Nuri expressed his firm conviction that the majles should officially proclaim the application of the shariat. The adoption of the European models, he added, would only cause the downfall of the Moslems and the eradication of Islam.[70] Kasravi observed that Nuri had written this letter at a time when the European-inspired laws enacted in the majles were not yet identifiable as such.[71] However, the majles minutes

clearly reveal the European models were openly consulted, emulated, even translated verbatim, and men with "good knowledge of French and Turkish" were eagerly sought. Undoubtedly, the lay and clerical representatives were fully aware of their source of inspiration. References were made to European practices; European words with no Persian equivalents—*ordre du jour, interpellation,* tribune, commission—appeared throughout. Even mundane subjects, such as the use of chairs instead of rugs, were discussed.[72] Armed with Nuri's objections, the shah waged his war against the majles, arguing that the term mashruta was un-Islamic. Ironically, it was the politically motivated temporal ruler who led the controversy over the theoretical role of religion in Iranian politics and public affairs.

The Revolutionary Tide in Tabriz

During January and February 1907 events in Tabriz were decisive in saving the constitution from Mohammad Ali shah's first major assault. Nazem al-Molk, the new governor who reached Tabriz in mid-December 1906, was known to have hostile reactionary tendencies. From the start, the anjoman intended to make it clear to him that it was in full control of local political affairs and determined to remain so. By mid-January, the activists members of the Secret Center organized general strikes in sympathy with events in Tehran; they called for the dismissal of foreign officials and a boycott of foreign banks. The bazaar, factories, artisans' workshops, and even schools were shut down. The press, owned and produced by members of the radical societies, published inflammatory articles inspired by the Baku Hemmatists reflecting the Moslem Social Democrats' political program.

Tarbiyyat, Adalat, and *Anjoman,* edited by Mirza Mohammad Ali Tarbiyyat, Mirza Hosain Khan, and Abu Ziya', respectively, intensified their revolutionary tone. Fear is the basis of the political theories and principles of the people of the East, the editor of *Adalat* asserted.[73] That is why they remain backward and subjected to the tyranical rule of their political, social, and spiritual leaders. Unscrupulous olama educate the youth with the stick, further instilling fear into their soul. Iran's happiness does not depend solely on a constitution but, more importantly, on reform of the peasants' wretched economic conditions, on lifting the yoke that burdens them. They must be instructed on their rights. Land belongs to those who till it; agricultural development is tied to the peasants' sense of well-being and pride of ownership. The peasants have the absolute right to dispose of the fruit of their labor. State-owned banks must be established to provide them with the necessary financial help to ensure their freedom from feudal bondage.[74]

In an article entitled "The Rotten Constitution of Iran,"[75] the editor of *Adalat* attacked the social composition of the majles. Arguing that the wretched peasant class (ro'aya) is excluded, he deplored the fact that only the upper classes of the merchants, landowners, and olama are represented. These upper classes view the peasants as if they were born to work like animals: to construct buildings and to own not a single nail of them; to plant rice and wheat and to have no right to the grain; to weave highly priced rugs, silk, and wool and to

wear only canvas. Lucky are the wealthy that the workers (kargaran) are still asleep. Should the workers become aware that the fortunes of the upper classes are the product of their own sweat, should they stop working—then these wealthy people would be reduced to the state of need and would be destroyed. "O you partisans of justice and equality, strive to educate the workers and to build a more just world, so that the rights of all classes . . . are preserved." Finally, the author of this radical article expressed his disenchantment that the Iranian constitutionalists, who "borrowed the Fundamental Laws from the civilized nations" (dowal-e motamadana, Western Europe), gave no consideration to the peasants' situation.

The writers of these articles, and the editors, were as careful as the leaders of the Tabriz anjoman in seeking to give their views a semblance of religious legitimacy. Thus, when a letter to the editor of *Adalat* rejected the constitution as contrary to the shariat, Hosain Khan virulently denied this charge. Otherwise, he retorted, how could Theqat al-Islam, Mohammad Tabataba'i, and other olama in Tehran champion it? After all, they insisted that Islam could be preserved and protected only through the application of the Fundamental Laws.[76]

As the crisis was rapidly developing in Tehran, and the shah continued to resist the majles's demands, the Azerbaijan deputies reported to Tabriz. Taqizada sounded the alarm and urged the anjoman to take drastic steps to save the constitution from destruction.[77] The news galvanized the revolutionary leaders in Tabriz. By the end of January and early February, the public demonstrations turned into mass armed insurrection. Crowds erupted onto the streets, chanting patriotic hymns, some written by the Russian Azerbaijani poet Sabir, demanding the completion of the constitution. The mojahedin seized government buildings, invaded the military arsenals and took their stores of arms, and organized a bast at the post and telegraph building. Red flags flew over the building for two days, and they were raised in the major squares of the city. The governor was placed under arrest, as were government officials who resisted the anjoman's orders. The anjoman's leaders camped in the telegraph building, keeping in constant communication with Tehran. They cabled their intention to establish an independent republic should the shah persist in his refusal to accept the authority of the majles and grant its demands.[78] Tabriz was on the verge of a revolution.

The role of the Baku radicals in these events was undeniable, according to most Russian sources.[79] Baku was still the headquarters of the Moslem Iranian Social Democratic group, but the field of its activities had by that time shifted from Transcaucasia, where it was active among the Iranian migrant workers, to Iranian Azerbaijan and, more covertly, elsewhere in Iran. The flow of smuggled arms and the movement of armed workers' detachments steadily increased. Revolutionary literature, threatening leaflets, and copies of the Transcaucasian papers covering news of the Russian and Iranian revolutions found their way into Azerbaijan and, from there, into Tehran and other cities. A printing press was clandestinely installed in Tabriz. According to a Soviet historian, support for Tabriz came also from Batum's RSDWP branch, where some individual Iranian revolutionaries had direct contacts, unbeknownst to the Hemmatists. Moslem migrant workers who volunteered to join the ranks of Iranian revolutionaries were joined by Georgians, Armenians, and Russians, who were involved as early

as February 1907.[80] Transcaucasian revolutionaries in general, be they Moslems or non-Moslems, loudly encouraged Iranians to transform their constitutional movement into a revolution. Amin Rasulzada echoed the Social Democrats in a demagogic article published in *Tekamol.* "Of course, the oppressors will not of their own free will put an end to their tyranny, and will not transfer their power to the people. The people must seize it. . . . The people are not offered their rights; they have to win them."[81] These words were to resonate in Tabriz, Rasht, and Tehran in the months to come.

Compromise in Tehran

News from Tabriz and the threat to depose the shah played into the hands of the radicals in Tehran. As the majles–court confrontation reached its climax, the anjoman-e tollab, led by Malek al-Motakallemin, surrounded the majles building, demanding speedy action. On February 15, Tabataba'i and Behbahani, who were by then vigorously protesting the violence in Tabriz and the lawlessness prevailing in the majles, were forced to remain in the majles building until the shah conceded its demands. Tabataba'i's strong admonitions and rebukes of the anjomans' assumption of authority, on the ground that "there is only one majles" for the nation, went unheeded.[82] Fear of being accused of collaboration with the reactionaries and of accepting bribes compelled Tabataba'i and Behbahani to go along with the extremists, the Russian ambassador wrote to St. Petersburg.[83]

The shah had to negotiate with the majles delegation. Mokhber al-Saltana once more acted as the mediator, reaching a formula acceptable to both parties. He suggested the term mashruʿa should replace mashruta, arguing that Iran was a Moslem country. As he wrote in his memoirs, his chief concern in conducting the negotiations was diplomatic maneuvering to achieve the top-priority goals, the rule of the majles, constitutional monarchy, and reforms. He insisted that the term mashruʿa, if applied as it should be and not as the "ignorant mollah" thought it was, could be viewed as "the father of mashruta," adding that he had proposed the Islamic term as a compromise.[84] The court accepted, but the majles, upon Taqizada's initiative, turned it down. Saʿd al-Daula had apparently acquiesced, until Taqizada raised his objections and reminded him that the dismissal of the Belgian officials, Saʿd al-Daula's chief goal, had no priority in their list of demands. "We want a constitutional government," he told the deputies, and they had supported Saʿd al-Daula's fight against Priem and Naus on the condition that he support their demands. The committee deliberated with Mokhber al-Saltana for hours before reaching a compromise. The majles would officially recognize Mohammad Ali shah as the sole legitimate monarch and his own appointed crown prince as his legal heir; in return the shah would pay allegiance and support the constitution and would recognize the provincial anjomans as official organs. Mokhber al-Saltana explained that the concessions to the shah were "bribes" for his concessions to the majles. Armed with that new list, he then used his most persuasive arguments and diplomatic talent to convince the shah that this was the best solution. One of his arguments that was successful in winning the shah's consent was that the adoption of mashruʿa would

in effect confer authority on the olama. The shah's decree mentioned the term constitution in transliterated French. As Mostashar al-Daula, the Azerbaijan deputy, wrote to Theqat al-Islam, "It would be no exaggeration if I tell you that it was the three of us [himself, Taqizada, and Mirza Aqa Farshi] who took the constitutional monarchy."[85] But Mostashar al-Daula was exaggerating. Had it not been for the tacit support of Mokhber al-Saltana, Sani' al-Daula, and fellow reformers in court and government circles and for the religious dissidents who led the crowds in Tehran and preached for the cause, the Azerbaijanis would not have scored such an easy victory. But it was the revolutionary leadership in Tabriz that saved the majles.

Reporting on these events, Spring-Rice asserted that the "shah was induced to yield by the alarming news which reached him from all quarters and especially from Tabriz," warning him against an association of armed mojahedin, or feda'is, "with the avowed object of imitating the policy of the ancient Persian sect of the Assassins." The "great Mujtaheds," he went on, "although their popular sympathies are supposed to be lukewarm," sided with the majles. He then concluded: "It is clear that a national movement of a semi-political and semi-religious character does exist and is spreading. . . . Patriotism, of a distinctive Persian type, has always been the characteristic of the Shi'ite believers . . . [it] does not center in the person of the Kaliph, but is, or can be, of a highly revolutionary character," since in the view of the religious leaders the shah has "no fundamental right to the allegiance of the Persians, whose real chief is no living king, but the twelfth Imam."[86]

Obviously, and typically, the British envoy was ill-informed. He mixed radical Shi'ism with mainstream orthodox Shi'ism of the ayatollahs, confusing the mojtaheds' views with those of the religious dissidents, which were never tolerated by the religious establishment. Traditionally the religious leaders had accepted the de facto state as necessary for the safeguarding of Islam and the protection of the Moslems, and they had enjoined the faithful to submit to its rule. Even at the height of the constitutional movement, the mojtaheds of Najaf and Iran never failed to refer to the king in respectful terms, acknowledging the need for harmony and cooperation between government and religion. Significantly, Behbahani, Tabataba'i, and Theqat al-Islam, to mention only the best known proconstitution olama in Iran, shared their Najaf colleagues' view of the constitution and the majles as necessary for the development and progress of Iran and the Moslems and similarly did not identify the constitution with the shariat. They all upheld the position that, in time of ghaibat, the political aspect of the shariat cannot be legitimately implemented, that, in the absence of the Imam, a majles representing the nation and a code of orf laws constitute the best alternative to check the abuse of power by the government and thus alleviate the yoke of prevailing corruption, which is the necessary condition of existence in times of ghaibat. In fact, as we shall see, they insisted on the separation of orf and shar' jurisdiction, though wishing to ensure the compatibility of the new laws with the religious precepts.

Similarly, Spring-Rice in his report overlooked the real issue at stake in this tense week of court–majles negotiations, namely, the increasing secularist trend dominating constitutionalist circles. While the shah fought for the adoption of

the term mashruʿa, symbolic of the old order of coexistence of religion and government, with the olama politically dependent on the government, Taqizada and fellow Azerbaijanis who led the battle for the term mashruta intended to emphasize the limitations set on the executive power as well as the separation of legislative power from religion. The fierce quarrel over the supplement to the constitution was to provide ample evidence of this growing secularist trend which Spring-Rice, at the time, failed to notice in his remarks on the so-called semi-religious, semipolitical revolutionary movement.

8

The Mashruta–Mashruʿa Battle

The struggle for the supplement lasted eight months. Two broad issues were central in the power struggle, one political, over the limitations of the shah's authority in government affairs, the other sociocultural, over institutional and legal reforms aiming at the secularization of Iranian society. Neither issue constituted a state–olama confrontation. In fact, all sides involved in the bitter battle, from the reactionary court to the equally intransigent constitutionalist leaders in the majles, sought to gain clerical support. Clerical and factional politics, rather than religious considerations, determined the individual ayatollahs' stand. Paradoxically, the sociocultural issue created greater turmoil, as the shah chose to wage his political battle through a reactionary clerical front opposed to the reforms mainly because they were endorsed by rival olama. Politics and social issues were so entangled that, in the legislative process, neither the court nor the majles was to lose ground as drastically as the religious institutions. For, as we shall see, in legislating social and cultural reforms, an unlikely alliance united the political conservatives and the constitutionalists against traditional clerical dominance of society. This was clear throughout the months when the battle for the supplement was raging.

Political Alignments and the Anjomans

With the establishment of the majles the anjomans surfaced, forming new alliances and networks. Their number in the capital proliferated, reportedly from one hundred to two hundred, depending on the sources; their ideological composition varied from conservative to radical. Most sources name many anjomans as separate entities, overlooking the very important fact that their membership lists overlapped. By sorting out the individual members of of each anjoman, one can observe two main categories referred to in the annals as moderate and radical.

Among the radical groups, the most militantly active were the anjoman-e Azerbaijan, led by Taqizada; the anjoman-e darvaze-ye Qazvin (a residential quarter in Tehran), led by Solaiman Maikada; the revolutionary committee led by Malek al-Motakallemin; the Social Democratic cell led by Haidar Khan; and the anjoman-e Shah Abad (another quarter in the capital), led by Mirza Reza Musavat. Their membership overlapped, and their separate actions and declarations were closely coordinated.[1] Of the five anjomans, the anjoman-e Azerbaijan was the best organized and most powerful, chiefly because of Taqizada's

position as the most prominent deputy in the majles and his ability to dominate the Azerbaijani representation. The Social Democratic group was the most nebulous. According to the Persian accounts, the Social Democratic group during this period included Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Ali Akbar Dehkhoda, Reza Musavat, Jahangir Khan, Solaiman Maikada, the Qajar brothers, Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, and Ibrahim Hakim al-Molk—a membership list identical to that of Malek al-Motakallemin's own anjoman. Haidar Khan wrote in his autobiographical sketch that he had founded a secret cell, which he had affiliated to the Hemmat group by order of the RSDWP committee of Baku, and that he received his instructions directly from the Hemmatists.[2] Persian sources confirm the impression that Haidar Khan was no independent leader, pulling his own strings and commanding his groups, but rather a man in charge of terrorist activities determined by others, a specialist in home-made bombs and hit-and-run tactics. He was also a courier, traveling between Maku, Tabriz, Tehran, and probably Mashhad, organizing strikes in factories, stirring labor unrest.

Both the anjoman-e darvaza-ye Qazvin and the anjoman-e Shah Abad were served by their own trained and armed militias of some hundred or hundred and fifty mojahedin. The Social Democrats also had their own mojahedin (or feda'is) detachment, with many members trained in the Caucasus. According to one member of the anjoman-e Shah Abad, most of these associations were disorganized and lawless; most of them included members who were ignorant, even illiterate. Residents of each street or quarter of the city formed an anjoman, collectively assuming its expenses and raising funds to buy arms. Often, however, residents witnessed the emergence of several rival anjomans for the same locality, thus adding to their financial burdens.[3]

At this point, the ideological composition of the radical anjomans was still fluid. Although many of their leaders publicly advocated distribution of land to the peasants who tilled it and often attacked the wealthy merchants for their shady deals, they did not officially adhere to the RSDWP program, supporting instead its Hemmatist version. S. M. Ivanov, the Soviet historian, citing Russian archival sources, confirms the view that even the anjoman-e Tabriz, the most radical anjoman of the period, was reluctant to carry on a policy of agrarian reforms.[4] But then, as most historians of the Baku RSDWP assert, Transcaucasian Social Democrats themselves were slow in paying attention to the rural areas in the Caucasus. On the other hand, the Hemmatists certainly resorted to the Shia traditional time-honored practice of taqiyya. In their effort to mobilize the masses, they were careful to avoid religious controversies and to spare the Moslems' religious sentiments. They monitored very closely the major events in Iran and, in preparing the revolutionary literature destined for distribution in Iran, they refrained from attacking Islam or the religious leadership in general. Their pamphlets, designed to reach as large a constituency as possible, reflected their desire to go along with the constitutional movement, step by step, rather than go against it; to ride the tide, while simultaneously seizing the moment for mass mobilization for their ultimate social and political program. In one such leaflet, dated September 1906, Tabataba'i's leadership is hailed: "O poor people of Iran, assemble. O shopkeepers of Iran, o peasants of Iran . . . unite. . . . Free

yourselves from the tyranny of the oppressors. . . . Until now, you believed that the olama were obstructing the poor people's path to progress, and that they were partners to the thieves and friends of the ignorants. Now you have witnessed with your own eyes . . . how Behbahani and Tabataba'i have stepped forward to save the community of believers."[5] After a lengthy exposé of Iran's social and economic ills, the people are urged to sacrifice their lives for the sake of freedom and to follow the path of Tabataba'i, thus sparing Iran the fate of its Russian-ruled Moslem neighbors. In Tabriz, the Social Democrats likewise toned down their radicalism and proclaimed themselves the true defenders of Islam.[6]

Prominent members of the radical anjomans also belonged to, and associated with, nonradical groups. Malek al-Motakallemin continued to solicit financial support from ambitious Qajar princes who coveted the throne. Ibrahim Hakim al-Molk, born into a family of the ruling elite, was a graduate of the Dar al-Fonun, a physician at the royal court, and a member of both the revolutionary committee and the Social Democrats—and at the same time he was founding a Freemasonic lodge in Tehran, drawing members from among the aristocracy and the moderate intelligentsia. Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, for their part, were active members of the moderate constitutionalist anjoman, the Adamiyat, until late 1907.

On the other hand, Mostashar al-Daula, the deputy from Tabriz, belonged to the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and collaborated closely with Taqizada; yet he was ideologically more akin to the moderate anjomans of Mokhber al-Saltana, Ehtesham al-Saltana, Sani' al-Daula, and other wellborn members of the intelligentsia. Similarly, the religious dissidents Nazem al-Islam, Majd al-Islam, Malek al-Motakallemin, and Jamal al-Din Va'ez formed separate anjomans. Though Taqizada did not appear on their membership lists, he was indirectly associated with them through Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, his "close friends."[7] Yahya Daulatabadi appeared on the list of the revolutionary committee, often siding with the anjoman-e Azerbaijan in many issues. But he also collaborated with Mokhber al-Saltana and Ehtesham al-Saltana. As we shall soon see, many of the members of the moderate anjomans would eventually join in common cause with the radicals. For as long as the battle for the constitution and its supplement was still raging, disagreement was confined to tactics rather than ideology.

Nazem al-Islam, the religious dissident fighting to curtail the olama's influence in Iranian society, was not always averse to accommodation and compromise with conservative opponents. He had tried to stage a rapprochement between Tabataba'i and Amir Bahador through the good offices of Borhan al-Din Khalkhali, the activist taleb member of Nazem al-Islam's reformed secret society. The scheme led nowhere, as it encountered Mohammad Sadeq's strong objections.[8] Moreover, Nazem al-Islam's group was not immune from infiltration by court elements.

Nazem al-Islam was easily talked into forming another secret society in February 1907. At a meeting hosted by Zol-Riyasatin Kermani, he was convinced of the need for an association that would keep vigil and prevent dissension from destroying the gains achieved by the original secret society.[9] The new secret

society met officially the following week at the home of Borhan al-Din Khalkhali. Ali Khan Ershad al-Daula, a Qajar prince and close associate of Amir Bahador, was present together with his brother. Detecting some distrust and reserve among the assembled guests, Ershad al-Daula reportedly attempted to erase their doubts by swearing patriotic sentiments were his motives. He assured them of the genuineness of his concern for the preservation of the constitution against the evil designs of the shah. The four-hour session ended with the group pledging support for the constitution and for the holy cause of Islam and the shariat. Then Ershad al-Daula "revealed some government secrets which they needed to know"[10] (which Nazem al-Islam did not feel free to print either then or in later entries) and instructed the members to form, each on his own, another secret anjoman with no more than eleven members. The proliferation of anjomans, they were told, would serve the cause better and would help the majles in its formidable task. According to the regulations that were then set up, the members were to observe the utmost secrecy in their activities and associations, to meet on a weekly basis, to abide by Islamic codes of behavior, to shun "religious discussions" or any other topic not related to the specified goals of the anjoman, and to follow a democratic procedure in their meetings, debates, and votes. Nazem al-Islam claimed these regulations were the model adopted by all other anjomans.[11]

Nazem al-Islam, however, continued to feel suspicious of Ershad al-Daula's ulterior motives in joining his anjoman, believing him to be still closely associated with Amir Bahador and intriguing to promote the latter's interests.[12] Other constitutionalists shared Nazem al-Islam's suspicion of Ershad al-Daula and of other secret anjomans formed in those days.[13] And yet, again judging from the *Tarikh-e Bidari,* when a group of three mollahs and their followers were hired by some anticonstitutionalist officials to attack the majles, the anjoman worked hard behind the scenes to dissuade them from pursuing their destructive action, and they published shabnamas in favor of the constitution. Nazem al-Islam's own paper, *Kaukab al-Darri,* was receiving financial help from Ershad al-Daula.[14]

As early as April 1907, and not later as most secondary sources claim, some members of the court had reportedly formed their own societies that officially endorsed the constitutionalist cause. Though very little is known of their number and membership lists, Nazem al-Islam wrote that Ershad al-Daula had called on the kolahiha (those wearing the European headgear, that is, the modern educated) to set up anjomans[15] and had mentioned one he himself had formed with the cooperation of Mirza Ibrahim Khan, a clerk at the French embassy.[16] The *Ruznama-ye Majles* reported that a Qajar prince had told the deputies that the princes had founded an anjoman to defend the constitution.[17] And Nazem al-Islam noted the sums spent by the princes Hosain Mirza Farman-Farma and Zell al-Soltan to gain favor among the constitutionalists, observing sarcastically, "Until now people used to fear takfir; now they fear both takfir and association with tyranny."[18] Regardless of the liberals' mistrust and feat of the princes and nobility (and, as we shall see, some of these fears were well founded in some individual cases), the fact remains that a number of them had sided with the secularists in drafting the constitution and its supplement. Sani' al-Daula and his brother Mokhber al-Saltana, Ehtesham al-Saltana, Sa'd al-Daula and his brother Ala' al-

Daula, and Dabir Hozur, are some prominent nobles who appeared on the anjoman-e omara list. They also appeared in the majma'-e Adamiyat, the anjoman that played an influential role not only in recruiting members of the aristocracy to the constitutional cause, but also in pressing the case of the secularists, be they moderates or radicals, until the supplement was finally signed by the shah in October 1907.

The majma'-e Adamiyat, a successor to Mirza Malkom Khan's secret society known as faramushkhana, was founded by Mirza Abbas Qoli Khan Qazvini, who later assumed the name Adamiyat. Abbas Qoli Khan had studied at Dar al-Fonun and was a member of the faramushkhana as well as a close friend and collaborator of Malkom. He was also reportedly an aide to Sa'd al-Daula, and he had held a number of court and government posts, enjoying the support of many reform-minded ministers and members of the intelligentsia—the "brains" of the freedom movement and the agents of secular nationalism. They were no revolutionists, but they were in favor of a constitutional monarchy, a government divorced from religious influence, and the promotion of science and industry. They constituted the "nucleus" of the Constitutional Revolution.[19]

Sources do not agree on the exact date the Adamiyat was founded. As early as July 1906, Nazem al-Islam refers to the Adamiyat as one of the active secret societies in the capital and to Abbas Qoli Khan's role in dissuading the soldiers and officers of the royal regiment from attacking the Jama' mosque, where the bastis were besieged.[20] A year later, in a letter to Theqat al-Islam, Mostashar al-Daula mentions the formation of the anjoman, which he viewed as a party Sa'd al-Daula formed to promote his own interests.[21]

The disparity between Nazem al-Islam and Mostashar al-Daula's dates is superficial. In fact, both are significant since they represent two different phases in the history of the society. In 1906 it was active underground, reaching out and enjoying the support of similar groups and of reform-minded members of the court and upper classes. In 1907 it was already a sizable semiofficial party, promoting the cause of constitutional monarchy and of sociocultural reforms through the moderate means of diplomacy and accommodation. Such moderation created tension within its rank and file and aroused the radicals' suspicion. A look at the society's membership conveys a clear picture of evolutionary development in the political outlook some of its leading figures underwent.

By the summer of 1907, Sa'd al-Daula, one of the chief architects of the constitution and its supplement, was already cautiously shifting toward the shah's camp, mainly as a result of his unsuccessful competition with Sani' al-Daula in assuming the majles leadership.[22] He had given up his seat in the majles, despite Malkom Khan's and Abbas Qoli Khan's plea to remain loyal to the majles.[23] Nonetheless, Kasravi, never averse to showering scorn on "traitors," noted that Sa'd al-Daula had devoted himself to the cause of constitutionalism and to the majles and was the first deputy to have called for the drafting of a supplement to the constitution.[24]

Another prominent member of the Adamiyat group was Ehtesham al-Saltana, the Qajar prince noted for his secular liberal nationalism. He had already clashed with Amir Bahador in 1905 when he attempted to stage a reconciliation between the court and the constitutionalists, suffering banishment from

the capital as a result. A fierce opponent of Saʿd al-Daula, he nevertheless worked for the same goal, the drafting of the supplement, and was to succeed Saniʿ al-Daula as president of the majles when the latter resigned following the assassination of Amin al-Soltan in August 1907. Throughout his eight-month leadership, Ehtesham al-Saltana was to fight hard against both the radicals and the olama, until the extremists on both sides forced him to resign. The Qajar princes Solaiman Mirza Eskandari and his brother Yahya Mirza, together with their uncle Mohammad Ali Mirza, known as Prince Ali Khan, were among the prominent members of the Adamiyat society until they seceded and gave the anjoman-e Hoquq, originally formed as a branch of the majmaʿ-e Adamiyat under Soleiman Mirza's direction, a more radical coloring. Solaiman Mirza in the second majles was to become a leader of the Democratic party and later was to form the first Socialist party in Iran. The break occurred in December 1907, at the time of the Tupkhana events. The Adamiyat membership list includes individuals with a wide variety of interests and political views: Amin al-Soltan shortly before his death; the shah shortly after the latter's death; members of the ruling class and of the olama; poets, artists, doctors, students of the modern schools newly founded in the capital. Some were, or proved to be, genuine constitutionalists, of the moderate or radical variety; others turned reactionary following the Tupkhana and other events leading to the June 1908 coup. On the whole, according to Feridun Adamiyat's chart, the society included 15 deputies of the majles, 135 officials, 20 Qajar princes, 13 merchants, 14 olama, and 90 of the middle class representing the modern professions.[25] What brought them together was the desire, genuine or expedient,[26] for constitutionalism and all the social, cultural, and political reforms the concept entails. What severely divided their ranks was the lack of consensus over the means to achieve their goals, as well as greed, petty personal quarrels, and rivalry. The fate of the society was determined by its own composition, a coalition of forces it created which could not have outlived a specific short-term goal, and probably was not meant to.

The story of Amin al-Soltan's return to power is another good case study of group alignments and individual alliances, with such disparate ideological colorings that the conventionally accepted reactionary–progressive dividing line was blurred. The pro–Amin al-Soltan faction, small yet highly influential in Tehran politics, had added weight to the constitutional movement in its earlier phases and had also been viewed as one of the causes of the revolution. With the fall of Ain al-Daula, the group began to stage the Atabak's return. Most sources agree that the appointment of Mirza Nasrollah Moshir al-Daula to the premiership was conceived as a temporary solution, and that he was neither expected nor meant to last long in office. A protégé of both Amin al-Soltan and Ain al-Daula as well as of Amir Bahador, he was without any power base of his own, either from among the traditional elite or from among the constitutionalists, being trusted by neither yet manipulated by all.[27] He served many causes and many grandees, often at one and the same time, and thus came to play a role in the negotiations that ushered in the constitutional regime, even though he was neither its architect nor its spokesman. His sons, as stated earlier, played a more vital part both in drafting the constitution and in pushing for its adoption through their father, who was under their influence.

Mohammad Ali shah and his entourage reportedly were in favor of weakening considerably the function of the sadr-e a'zam, if not eliminating the position entirely. However, whereas the shah wished to ensure his own control over the cabinet, some members of his court were in favor of granting greater authority to each individual minister over his respective department's affairs.[28] The reasons behind the shah's decision to allow Amin al-Soltan's return to office remain to be investigated. Opinions vary, with some sources arguing that his reappointment was part of the shah's Machiavellian plot to destroy the majles, using him as a scapegoat for the court's lack of cooperation and making the most of his notorious talent for sowing division whithin the constitutionalists' and deputies' ranks. Others viewed Amin al-Soltan's well-tested statesmanship as the chief reason why ministers, deputies, merchants, courtiers, olama, and even liberal intellectuals, fully supported his candidacy as the best means to restore pragmatic accord between the court and the majles. Mohammad Ali shah had assured Amin al-Soltan's supporters of his intention to bring back the latter to head his government even before Mozzafar al-Din shah's death.[29] Shortly after his coronation he reportedly succumbed to their pressure and began the secret negotiations with the Atabak, who was then in Europe. High on the list of prominent men of the capital who staged his return were Zell al-Soltan,[30] Mokhber al-Saltana (although he denied this in his memoires)[31] and his brother Sani' al-Daula, Sa'd al-Daula,[32] Hosain Qoli Khan Nezam al-Saltana Mafi, Behbahani, Mirza Abol Qasem Tabataba'i, Mohammad Tabataba'i's son,[33] Amin al-Zarb, Mo'in al-Tojjar, Mohammad Ismail Maghaza'i, from among the leading merchants,[34] Mirza Malkom Khan and members of the Adamiyat society,[35] and Talebzada,[36] from among the intellectuals. Mostashar al-Daula, one of the leading members of the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and most secularist of the majles deputies, supported him as well.[37]

In the majles, strong opposition to Amin al-Soltan's return was led by Taqizada, Shaikh Ibrahim, and their small group of supporters and allies. They attempted to block it by proclaiming the former minister a "traitor" and arguing that traitors were not to be forgiven for their past crimes, let alone allowed to return and assume office again.[38] Mohammad Tabataba'i added his voice to the opposition, asking the deputies "not to tolerate tyranny." He strongly called on the majles to stop the former premier from returning to power.[39] The opposition was nevertheless silenced. Tabataba'i himself, within twenty-four hours, reversed his stand and spoke of Amin al-Soltan as a "good servant of the government," asserting that the majles should accept his return since the government wished him back. He dismissed a deputy's question on the reasons for such an "overnight change of opinion" with a vague statement that time was needed to "think the matter over."[40] A week later, when Amin al-Soltan was prevented from coming ashore in Anzali, a majority of majles deputies voted in favor of cabling the port authorities to allow him into the country.[41] According to Daulatabadi, Behbahani and Amin al-Zarb, with Sani' al-Daula's support, were responsible for the majles vote.

Like his predecessor, Soltan Ali Khan Vazir Afkham, who had presided over a newly formed cabinet following Moshir al-Daula's resignation in mid-March 1907, Amin al-Soltan bore the title of minister of the interior, even though he assumed

also the function of "Supervisor" of the cabinet. In a formal speech delivered at the majles when he introduced his cabinet, he assured the deputies of his, and the shah's, full support for the constitution, using the French term in transliteration. Amin al-Zarb welcomed him warmly on behalf of the majles and expressed his hope for unity and accord between the nation and the government.[42]

In his account of Amin al-Soltan's return to power, Kasravi writes that with his smooth behavior and speech, the minister had "fooled" many, including such dedicated constitutionalists as Malkom Khan and Talebzada.[43] Indeed, Amin al-Soltan's rapid success in controlling the majles was due to his ability to win over to his side a majority of the deputies through bribery, cajolery, and promises of future favors, and to skillfully manipulate Behbahani and other olama and fellow supporters within and outside the majles. However, Kasravi's simplistic conception of the revolution as a struggle between two opposing forces, the reactionary court and the liberal majles, the "government versus the nation," overemphasized Amin al-Soltan's machinations to break the ranks of the constitutionalists. In fact, the new cabinet was composed of almost the same individuals, with minor changes, as the preceding, short-lived one, which Kasravi had hailed as the first lawful cabinet in the country.[44] Moreover, regardless of the position individual deputies took in the political conflicts with the court, the majles, which Amin al-Soltan dominated from the time he assumed office until he fell victim to the assassin's bullet, carried on the struggle for the passing of the supplement drafted by the liberals and the reformers. Amin al-Soltan doubtlessly did exercise his best talents to divide and conquer, and he did have close contacts with Nuri's camp, as sources reveal. This did not detract from the fact that the constitutionalists, including members of his own cabinet—notably Mokhber al-Saltana, who was then minister of science, press and auqaf (religious endowment), and Naser al-Molk, the Oxford-educated aristocrat who was to stand firmly by the majles's side in the subsequent majles–court confrontations—scored high in their fight against the anticonstitutionalist, antimajles elements.

The Preachers and the Journalists

The Constitutional Revolution brought to the fore two new social elements that were to dominate Iran's social life in the twentieth century, the activist preacher who used the minbar to usher in cultural and political modernism and the journalist who committed his pen to broad nationalist causes and issues. Jamal al-Din Va'ez and Malek al-Motakallemin emerged as the two most prominent and most poular orators of the revolution, attracting the largest crowds to their mosques, transforming the place of worship into a public forum for mass rallies and political demonstrations. Majd al-Islam and Nazem al-Islam, the two clerical dissident members of the Azali network, established their own newspapers, *Nedaye Vatan* and *Kaukab al-Darri.* Jahangir Khan, another Azali, worked together with Ali Akbar Dehkhoda in the paper *Sur-e Israfil.* Mohammad Reza Musavat founded *Musavat,* which came to be known as the most radical of all Iranian newspapers of the time. *Habl al-Matin* of Calcutta began to publish a paper of the same name in Tehran. The daily *Ruznama-ye Majles,* which ap-

peared soon after the majles first met, specialized in reporting on the majles proceedings. Mohammad Sadeq Tabataba'i, the more liberal of the mojtahed's sons, assumed the editing together with Sadeq Adib al-Mamalek, an experienced publisher and editor. Before the revolution, he had worked for *Ershad,* the Baku-based organ of the Social Democrats, and owned a Persian journal, *Adab,* where Majd al-Islam acquired his first journalistic experience upon his arrival in the capital. Fakhr al-Islam, the Assyrian-born Moslem convert who had preached in the British legation during the bast, followed the general trend and established his own paper, *Tadayyon,* where he introduced novel ideas wrapped in traditional religious rhetoric.

While the deputies and the anjomans fought for the drafting of the constitution and its supplement, the preachers and the journalists took up the additional task of enlightening the public on the significance of the issues at stake. They lectured in mosques and squares, wrote regular columns in the papers, and circulated pamphlets to disseminate their views while participating in anjoman activities. Through them the public was informed daily of the political debates and decisions of the majles, as well as other events and, when it became necessary, was mobilized to fight back counterrevolutionaries. These were the intellectuals who were to dominate the cultural scene and formulate the national ideology. Marked differences in temperament, educational background, and long-term goals did not hamper their collaboration. Nor did the turban, which Malek al-Motakallemin, Nazem al-Islam, Majd al-Islam, and Jamal al-Din Va'ez persisted in wearing, symbolically clash with the European hat or collar that their lay associates wore. Shared views of sociocultural reforms and their common antiolama stand overcame differences in style and rhetoric.

Whereas the preachers' sermons in the mosques followed the traditional theological discourse—commentary on koranic verses and on the holy texts of the Imams, through which they demonstrated the religious validity of the modern ideas inserted in their speeches—the lay writers adopted a literary style with little or no reference to religion. For instance, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, lecturing on the Islamic concept of knowledge, put forward the un-Islamic distinction of worldly from other-worldly fields of knowledge. Though he insisted that the latter category was the noblest, and its specialists, the high-ranking olama, were the noblest of all learned men, he argued for the need to further human knowledge of this world, too. He lamented the fact that science and technology had progressed in Europe but not in Iran because of the olama's opposition. He passionately proclaimed that ignorance lay at the root of all national problems, and that the reform of the country's educational system was of utmost importance.[45] Dehkhoda, writing on the same subject, bluntly declared there could be no limit to knowledge mankind could acquire, that no one—be he Socrates, Aristotle, Spencer, or Kant—could set the limit. Human knowledge was perfectible, and ignorance could never obstruct the path to progress. Neither the temporal ruler's stick nor the religious leader's commands could prevent men from seeking knowledge in total freedom. There was, and there could be, no limits to individual liberties.[46]

Such blunt sacrilege invited the wrath of Nuri and many conservative clerics. Jamal al-Din was often harassed, declared heretical, and even threatened by

small groups of armed ruffians sent to disrupt his sermons. Secret agents working for the court reported that the preacher was enticing the masses to turn against religion and the state. Dehkhoda was periodically called upon by the minister in charge of the press. Put on the defensive, the preacher and the journalist would attempt to distinguish what they called the "true Islam" from that of the olama. In a lecture on human rights, Jamal al-Din explained to his audience that the masses had historically suffered from two types of tyranny, political and religious. Of the two, he asserted, religious tyranny was the worse to bear, since the religious leaders imposed their views by claiming to be the successors of the Prophet. He then dramatically addressed his followers: "O Moslems! Enough with the sleep of ignorance! . . . Do not worship your olama instead of God. Open up your eyes, broaden your mind!" He then proceeded to demonstrate the Islamic validity of such concepts as liberty, equality, and freedom of opinion, audaciously stating that, in the absence of the Imam, the majles itself was the collective vali al-amr (holder of authority), since it assumed the task of protecting Islam and implementing the shariat. The constitutionalists, he asserted, were merely attempting to bring the Moslems back to the straight Islamic path.[47]

Dehkhoda also wrote extensively on the concept of human rights. He declared Iranians could no longer be blinded by kings and akhunds; they should not expect the angel Gabriel to descend from heaven once more or wait for the mojtahed to grant permission, or the shah to sign a decree, in order to obtain their rights.[48] Although he specifically mentioned Fazllolah Nuri and other anticonstitutionalist olama, referring to them as olama-ye su, false olama, or tojjar-e din, traders in religion,[49] his acerbic attacks implied broader anticlericalism. Iran was the only nation, he wrote, which continuously produced false prophets, despite the spread of the light of Islam. Widespread ignorance, and the traditional cult of personality, made it easy for imposters to find gullible masses to convert. Iranians were not properly educated; they were prevented from broadening their minds and from expanding their intellectual horizons. The olama were responsible for obscuring the real meaning of Islam. Their discursive theology and their philosophy was a diluted mixture of Greek, Indian, Chaldean, and Jewish nonsense. "Those are our authorities, the successors of the Prophet, the representatives of the Imam. They still wish to remain the guardians of our lives, and the trustees of our properties. . . . Those are the learned men of the community, who have no other purpose than the cult of the self and love of leadership."[50]

Such statements often caused the journalists trouble with the authorities, lay and clerical, including some of the constitutionalists. Mirza Qasem Khan, the publisher of *Sur-e Israfil,* responded to critics by claiming it was his right to "reform the Islam of the olam-ye su."[51] At times Dehkhoda himself would adopt a classical religious dissidents' argument that the hidden truth of the Koran and the holy texts needed gradual unveiling, following human maturity and development. The Koran, he argued, was to be interpreted allegorically, and the holy laws to be readjusted, abrogated if necessary, to fit new conditions. However, despite such feeble attempts, mostly emulating the religious dissidents, whose views he was familiar with, having attended the late Hadi Najmabadi's lectures and discussions, Dehkhoda never missed an opportunity to proclaim defiantly

his freedom from clerical and temporal censorship. In one highly virulent article, he proudly predicted human rights principles would eventually eradicate superstitions from the entire world, and that the "worshipers of the old" would be forced to adopt them.[52]

The preachers and the journalists relentlessly attempted to educate the public on the significance of some of the most controversial clauses of the supplement being drafted at the time. They wrote and talked about the need to reform the entire educational system, to introduce European science, to enforce the concept of universal education, which included women, and under state, and no longer religious, control. Jamal al-Din held the crowd in his mosque spellbound, describing the "magic" effect of the telephone, the wireless, the telegraph, which, he told them, was no magic at all, merely the "fruit of science and technology."[53] The preachers defended the right of the religious minorities and called for the equality of all Iranians before the law; they often lectured on the pre-Islamic Zoroastrian legacy in Iranian history and civilization, enticing the tollab to discover their great pre-Islamic past.[54] They all condemned the repeated discrimination against non-Moslems. Majd al-Islam published in *Nedaye Vatan* the story of the Dreyfus Affair, which was capturing the attention of the French press at that time, and passionately proclaimed his own intention to emulate the French intellectuals' commitment to the cause of the persecuted minorities. They unanimously called for freedom of the press and of opinion. Jamal al-Din identified the concept of freedom of speech with the Islamic principle of promoting good and forbidding evil, but he denied the mojtaheds the exclusive right to enforce it. God's command to promote good and forbid evil, he insisted, is incumbent on all individuals, not just the mojtaheds.[55] Freedom of the pen, he argued, meant the right for the newspapers to explain God's commands to the believers without prejudice or bigotry.

Most of the issues the preachers and the journalists chose to introduce to the public were social and cultural issues. The chief target of their pen and of their sermons was the olama. Again and again they would verbally assault the religious establishment and religious traditions. "We cry for the wretched condition of our religion," Dehkhoda wrote in his famous self-defense against charges of heresy. He proclaimed his intention to continue in his taks of instructing the people on how to combat this social disease, how to find a cure for this "wound which was the nation's worst plague." He blamed religion for the political, military, cultural, and scientific backwardness of the nation, and he lamented the fact that the public was still made to believe that "our religion has remained as progressive as in the past, and that there has been no decline."[56]

When his writings created a furor in some clerical circles, Dehkhoda was compelled to justify his views; he argued that he had been declared heretical by those who stood to lose from his denunciation of tyranny. He claimed that his use of the term "worshipers of the old" was political in intention, meaning the conservatives, those in favor of the status quo, not those who professed belief in the old religions. In fact, he added, the term had nothing to do with religion, and therefore could not be construed as anti-Islamic. Similarly, "superstitious beliefs" did not mean Islamic principles but referred to what 99 percent of Tehran's population believed in and practiced, even when not sanctioned by religion.

Dehkhoda also argued in defense of the religious validity of the concept of constitutional monarchy. It was originally Islamic, he asserted, but it was forgotten by generations of Moslems since the rule of the righteous caliphs had come to an abrupt end. Now we find ourselves forced to borrow it from Europe and call it constitution, he added.[57] Dehkhoda, like the preachers, was reduced to practicing taqiyya.

In Tabriz the radicals maintained their hold on the anjoman and increased their calls for social reforms. While instructing the peasants on their right to own the land they tilled, they launched virulent attacks on the landowners, the wealthy merchants, and the high-ranking olama. Shaikh Selim and Mirza Ali Akbar Mojahed continued to preach from the minbar, allowing their sermons to reflect the social views of the Tabriz anjoman's radicals. The leading olama, on the other hand, intensified their criticism of the preachers, demanding their expulsion from the city. They condemned the anjoman as well, declaring it a nest for the heretics. Although his shady deals and his involvement in hoarding wheat, as well as his protection of the venal merchants, constituted the official reason for the anjoman's final decision to expel Mirza Hasan the mojtahed from town, anticlerical sentiments lay behind the drastic move. In a number of meetings the olama confronted the anjoman leaders, holding them responsible for the alarming behavior of the masses against religious precepts, and they insisted on the obligation of the faithful to obey the olama's commands. Theqat al-Islam was by then acknowledging the harmful presence of the "irreligious element" within the anjoman, even though he continued to side with the association and its leaders.[58] With the expulsion of the mojtahed in April 1907, Theqat al-Islam's position became precarious. On the one hand, he was generally regarded as the "religious pillar of the constitution" in Tabriz by conservative fellow olama who reported to Najaf and Kerbala. On the other hand, he was highly apprehensive and full of misgivings with the turn of events, finding himself, because of his basic sympathy for the movement, falling prey to the extremists. The prompt rebuke from the olama in Tehran, including fellow constitutionalists Behbahani and Tabataba'i, who were shocked and appalled by the turn of events in the province, added to his discomfort.

Sources relate Theqat al-Islam's role in continuing to support the anjoman-e Tabriz and in signing cables sent to Tehran, demanding the completion of the supplement to the constitution, refusing to allow the mojtahed's return to town until their demands were met. However, his private correspondence reveals his vacillation between desire to support the movement and reluctance to condone the extremists. In a series of letters to his brother in Najaf and to his acquaintances in Tehran and elsewhere in the country, he expressed utter powerlessness in controlling the anjoman leaders. He wanted to leave town, to stay away from upheavals beyond his control, but the leaders would not let him. He was forced to attend meetings that he wished to avoid; he was constantly asked to give his opinion, to take action, to send cables; when he refused, or chose to remain silent, he was threatened with expulsion. He repeatedly counseled moderation, patience, cooperation, instead of confrontation, but to no avail. When asked to take a strong stand and demand the completion of the constitution, he replied that such a demand was "not part of our religious obligation; nor is it our

concern."[59] The tone of his letters reached despair when he noted the influence of the radicals in controlling the politics of Azerbaijan. He expressed his fear that the constitutional movement was being destroyed by a "handful of ruffians," that the constitution was no longer the real issue, and that civil war was raging in the provincial capital.[60] However, in a rather naive fashion, he refused to acknowledge the fact that the controversies, and the confrontations, constituted an important part of the movement, a natural development of the politicial freedom theoretically attained with the promulgation of the constitution. He viewed what he termed the "chaotic upheavals" as the result of the seditious deeds of the ruffians and opportunists.[61] Though he conceded such consequences normally accompany any revolution, he refused to see the social issues raised by the anjoman as inherent in their acquired constitutional rights. More importantly, given the mashruta–mashruʿa controversy taking place in the capital at the time, a trial that severely undermined the constitutionalist olama position, Theqat al-Islam overlooked, or failed to appreciate, the significance of the anticlerical trend prevalent among the intelligentsia, the religious dissidents, and the radicals alike. In neither his letters nor his diary did he seriously contemplate the radical socicultural implications of the controversial clauses then being debated in the majles.

Theqat al-Islam felt the need to rise in defense of Islam against the increasing assault of the secularists. He condemned the rapidly spreading view of religion as the cause of the Moslem world's backwardness, which sharply contrasted to Europeans progress. He refuted those who, quoting European opinion on Islam, held that Islam was an obstacle to scientific knowledge and progress, claiming they were ignorant of its true inner meaning. Such individuals, he asserted, were aware only of "the apparent religious obligations and rituals," matters of worship and legal transactions. He felt the need to teach the commoners how to understand and attain the esoteric aspects of religious knowledge. Here, Theqat al-Islam was merely stating the traditional argument of the Shia speculative thinkers, and of the Shaikhis in particular. However, unlike the Shaikhis, his allegorical interpretation of the holy texts reflected a stark modernist European influence. For instance, he defined the doctrine of the Imamate as the right of the twelve Imams, descendants of the Prophet, to rule by divine appointment within the limits set by the divine laws: "In other words, the Imams' rule is a constitutional monarchy."[62] Similarly, he argued that the shariat enforced the equality of all classes in all matters pertaining to worship, commercial transactions, politics, and constitutional rights, without providing any explanation on how the believers' constitutional rights could be distinguished from their religous obligation to obey divine commands.

Theqat al-Islam never failed to express his support for the constitution, which he viewed as necessary to undertake the needed reforms, to found new schools, to promote new learning, to help foster national pride and self-reliance, and to attain self-sufficiency. He fully trusted theoqala, the well-informed, educated men whose acquired knowledge in the art of politics and of statesmanship qualified them better than others to lead the nation to the path of progress.[63] More importantly, he relentlessly stated, in unequivocal terms, his opposition to identifying the constitution with the shariat. In a highly interesting essay, he elaborated on this theme to defend the constitutional movement. A long time ago, he

wrote, the viceregents of the Iman and the transmitters of the Traditions, that is, the olama, had withdrawn from direct participation in government affairs, distinguishing shar'i from orfi jurisdiction. The constitution was related to the latter, to the monarchy. Why should people call for a mashruta–mashru'a, he asked. Do they want to change the monarchy into a mashru'a monarchy? But that was impossible in times of ghaibat; and, by the same token, the shariat could not be mashruta, for one could not set limits to holy laws. Moreover, he went on, one could not mix the shariat with non-shar'i laws. He strongly denied the fact that the Iranian constitution was emulating European codes of law, or that it was enacting rules contrary to the shariat. The constitution, he insisted repeatedly, dealt with public affairs, orfi matters, having nothing to do with the shariat.[64]

Theqat al-Islam firmly believed in the separation of state and religion and was therefore ideologically opposed to Nuri's effort to impose the shariat upon the majles and to grant the mojtaheds authority in the legislation. However, like most of his contemporaries, he did not always argue his views consistently or coherently. He would entitle his essay "The Principles of Islamic Politics" while stating his belief in the separation of religion from state. He denied the possibility of mixing the shariat with non-shar'i laws, but he would defend the concept of freedom of opinion in religious terms, echoing Jamal al-Din Va'ez's view that it was identical to the religious obligation to promote good and forbid evil. He claimed this was the time of "spiritual jehad," and not political or military jehad, to help the nation of Moslems reform its social and political systems by instituting new schools and enacting reforms, fully aware of the fact that Europe was providing the models to emulate. But he also argued that the shariat was all-encompassing and superior to all codes of law. His conviction that it was only a matter of correctly interpreting, or unveiling, the hidden truth of the holy texts was no different from the religious dissidents' own conviction. And, like them, he was unable to proclaim himself openly in favor of a secular state.

The Sena-ye Ruhani (Ecclesiastical Senate)

In May 1907, Nuri, adamant in his effort to bring the majles under the control of his own clerical faction, proposed an addition to the supplement requiring that all laws be reviewed by a council of five mojtaheds before passage.[65] The proposed council, dubbed sena-ye ruhani by the secularist opposition within the majles and in the press, became the subject of a controversy that divided the constitutionalists' ranks. Contrary to expectations, not all olama supported the motion. Najaf's response was positive; and Khorasani and Mazandarani, the high-ranking olama who had sided with the constitutionalists from the very beginning, cabled their endorsement and asked the deputies to conform to the principles of the shariat.[66] Mirza Fazlali Aqa, the clerical deputy from Azerbaijan, also supported it, and worked together with Nuri for its passage. Other olama in Tehran and the provinces were urged to follow suit and thus prevent sedition and heresy from destroying the shariat and Islam. Intimidation and threat of takfir, according to most sources, forced some leading constitutionalist olama to practice taqiyya. Theqat al-Islam himself, as already stated, refused to

take a stand on the issue, telling both the anjoman-e Tabriz leaders and his brother in Najaf that it was not part of the olama's obligation or concerns. When pressed by the Tehran and Tabriz constitutionalists, he would invariably identify the constitution with orfi matters and insist on the separation of orfi from shar'i matters. But he continued to support the constitutionalists who constantly deferred to him; those who secretly worked with the enemy, like Fazlali, were compelled to deny any charge of defection. Fazali repeatedly wrote to him to assure him of his consistent loyalty to the movement, stating he was only defending Shia Islam as the official religion of Iran and complaining that he was slandered by individuals who wished power for themselves by excluding the olama and denying them the right to review the law before passage.[67]

Behbahani and Tabataba'i, on the other hand, opposed the motion and sided with Taqizada, Mostashar al-Daula, and Farshi, the three deputies from Azerbaijan who led the opposition to Nuri's proposed clause.[68] Mostashar al-Daula and Farshi wrote to Theqat al-Islam on the controversy that was then raging in the majles and the political circles in the capital, keeping him informed of new developments and alignments. In one of his dispatches, Mostashar al-Daula reported that Nuri was in fact encouraged, if not incited, by Kamran Mirza Nayeb al-Saltana and other reactionary court officials to condemn the entire constitution as contrary to Islam. Sixty tollab under Nuri's command kept a vigil outside the gate of the majles, ready to assault anyone who publicly refused to support the mojtahed's motion. This induced the constitutionalists to organize their own defense, gathering a band of armed tollab and Tabriz retailers to confront Nuri's. "With one word from us," he wrote, "the Baharestan would have been filled with blood."[69] But, he added, they were forced to "remain silent."

The secularist deputy, in the same letter, complained of Tabataba'i, describing him as "simple-minded" and "naive" and willing to side with Nuri. However, Tabataba'i, as all the standard sources reveal, was not siding with Nuri but was eager to negotiate with him in order to contain his destructive opposition. Behbahani, on this particular issue, was less willing to compromise than Tabataba'i, chiefly because of his long personal feud with Nuri, which predated the revolution. Nonetheless, he was compelled to back the proposal in public while secretly complaining about it.[70] Behbahani lost ground temporarily, as Nuri and his supporters persisted in their demand for the inclusion of the proposal, which had gained the endorsement of Najaf.

All the leading olama in Tehran and those representing the provinces in the majles met daily to discuss the laws in feqh juridical terms.[71] There were serious religious objections to some clauses of the supplement: equality of all Iranians before the law regardless of their religious affiliation; compulsory education for all, including women; state control over the system of national education; the teaching of European science; freedom of the press and opinion. Nuri seized upon these issues to wage a fierce campaign for his proposal for a council of mojtaheds. He insisted this clause be made as integral a part of the constitution as the clause declaring Shia Islam the state religion of Iran. He reiterated his earlier pronouncement that complete liberty is tantamount to heresy, and that the clauses guaranteeing freedom of opinion and of the press should be erased.

In letters to his relatives in Najaf, he expressed his concern that the Babis and the naturalists had taken over control of the majles, forcing the Moslems to practice taqiyya. He accused Jamal al-Din Va'ez of heresy and sedition and of inciting his public to forgo prayers and the reading of the Koran and to read heretical newspapers instead.[72] In a strong letter addressed to the olama in the provinces, he stated that the enemies of religion and the "hypocrites" were conspiring to weaken religion and government. The freedom seekers were pushing the tollab into the hands of the heretics, just for the sake of two ideas, justice and a consultative assembly. They would bring to an end the era of the olama's leadership. Absolute liberty and unlawful deeds were on the verge of abrogating the shariat. He solemnly declared to the olama that their religious obligation was to warn the shah against this state of affairs.[73]

Nuri's most important collaborator in Najaf was Seyyed Kazem Yazdi, a powerful mojtahed with a sizable following among the anticonstitutionalists in the holy cities and in Iran. In the majles, Nuri won the support of Seyyed Mohammad Taqi Herati, a former follower of Behbahani elected deputy with the latter's endorsement. Herati rose in defense of the shariat and insisted on the olama's right to supervise all legislation.

The virulence of Nuri's charges compelled most of the moderates and clerical constitutionalists to seek a compromise and appease him, and thus save the constitution from total destruction. Tabataba'i persuaded Nuri to attend the majles and take part in the debates, but what Nuri heard and witnessed in the sessions he reluctantly attended only confirmed his views. He was not alone: a large crowd of loud, belligerent students, followers, disciples, and "various people," added fuel to Nuri's fire. "Their purpose was to intrigue and stir up troubles," wrote an eyewitness sympathetic to Nuri.[74] The press and the radical anjomans reacted vociferously to their provocation. Nuri and fellow "false olama" were verbally attacked in meetings and articles. Street demonstrations were organized, demanding his expulsion from the capital. The situation was explosive; violence was imminent.

In private meetings and in the majles, debate over the proposed clause continued. A compromise was attempted by the secularists; they suggested that the five mojtaheds who were to form the council be elected by popular vote, and not appointed by the olama, as Nuri demanded. Mostashar al-Daula argued that the majles could not grant "five handpicked individuals" authority over all legislative issues without their being accountable to the nation. "We have no right to impose upon the nation the rule of four or five mollahs of Tehran" or to have "thirty million people surrender to the will of five olama," he wrote to Theqat al-Islam, adding that Nuri wished to transform the constitutional monarchy into an "ecclesiastical rule."[75]

Kasravi contends that the pro-shariat anticonstitution element in the majles was so dominant in those days that it intimidated the constitutionalists.[76] Taqizada had to maneuver skillfully to block the passage of the olama's draft, in order to save the movement from falling under complete clerical control. Taqiyya was practiced at all levels. In one of the sessions, Shaikh Yahya of Kerman, Nazem al-Islam's former student and longtime friend, expressed his fear that the clashes over some issues might prove to be "a sword in the hand of the despots," who

would endeavor to sow further dissension. He minimized the differences among majles deputies, claiming they could be resolved in a matter of hours. Aqa Mirza Mohsen, Behbahani's son-in-law, confirmed Shaikh Yahya's view and denied the existence of differences; he asserted that the delay in passing the draft was due to Behbahani's "indisposition." Seyyed Nasrollah, a Tehran constitutionalist deputy of the tollab, deplored the rumors spread in town on the existence of such differences. The olama, he stated, had called for the establishment of the majles before anyone else thought about it; they wished to strengthen religion and safeguard Islam and the shariat. It was important to lift oppression and establish justice, but maintaining the independence and status of the shariat had top priority. No laws contrary to Islam were to be enacted. Statements to the contrary were lies, spread by the opponents of the majles. Hajj Mirza Ibrahim Aqa, the radical deputy from Azerbaijan who sided with Taqizada, ended the discussion predicting the despots would not succeed in their evil design aimed at arousing public hostility to the majles, and he dramatically cursed "whoever betrays Islam."[77]

Kasravi wondered whether such views expressed in public by the constitutionalists were not, after all, based on fear. He deplored the fact that even Tabataba'i felt the need to reprimand the Azerbaijanis; and he accused him, Behbahani, and other constitutionalist olama, including those in Najaf and Kerbala, of giving in to pressure from the reactionaries.[78] The constitutionalists, he wrote, did not yet have the power to "push the shariat into the corner," even though the Tabriz leaders were relentless in their demands for a "European constitution."[79] Elsewhere Kasravi lamented the fact that the movement did not provide leaders to educate and instruct the nation on the goals and nature of constitutionalism. Behbahani and Tabataba'i, he commented, played a memorable and worthy historic role, but they were content with the mere promulgation of the constitution and the establishment of the majles. They felt no need to do anything else. "They aroused the nation, but failed to show them the path to follow." Consequently, the matter fell into the hands of the akhunds and preachers, who saw in the mashruta nothing but the promotion of the shariat. By quoting akhbars and hadith, (religious texts) they taught the masses to identify the mashruta with the mashru'a. The path was thus laid for Nuri to take over.[80] Kasravi also criticized the intelligentsia, claiming they had identified constitutionalism with patriotism and concern for national development (industries, railroads, new learning) without feeling the need to explain the meaning and implication of the concepts of patriotism and national development or to show the ways and means to achieve these objectives. Among this group, he added, many ended up siding with the reactionary mollahs.[81]

Kasravi failed to appreciate, or simply ignored, the fact that, when it came to legislating sociocultural reforms, the struggle involved a network of crisscrossing ideological boundaries and personal ties and loyalties. Outwardly, all groups professed loyalty to Islam and "orthodox" views, including members of the Babi network, radical secularists like Taqizada and fellow deputies from Azerbaijan, and the lay intelligentsia. The time-honored practice of taqiyya helped them all dissemble their true motives and/or their ultimate goals as long as they worked toward the attainment of their goal, the secularization of social and cultural institutions. Tabataba'i and Behbahani, on the other hand, were not fighting for

their institutional interests but for personal motives. However, their tactical maneuvers to neutralize Nuri's opposition to the constitution allowed him a victory decisive enough to appease him and rally the clerics. Both Tabataba'i and Behbahani were high-ranking members of Tehran religious leadership, with strong backing and influence in the majles; both were still courted and consulted by the majles deputies and government officials, as were other constitutionalist olama. There was as yet no reason for any of them to realize the potential threat to their role in society and the culture of Iran implicit in the constitution. The olama's factions were political in nature and objectives, as in the past. To them, the mashruta–mashru'a disputes were in substance no different from the other cabals that had so divided the ranks of the ruling elite in Qajar times. In that sense, Kasravi was indeed right; the constitutionalist olama were content with a mere promulgation of the shah's decree, followed by an attempt to save the majles from their fellow clerical rivals' vengeful acts.

The anjoman-e Tabriz was disturbed by the role conceded to the olama in reviewing the draft. Pamphlets were distributed in Tabriz and Tehran, claiming that if the constitution first had to be approved by the olama, than "other matters" also would have to be approved by them, such as the right of Mohammad Ali shah to rule.[82] This threat to extend clerical authority in temporal affairs was a cleverly calculated move to win over the court's support for the majles draft of the constitution and to bypass clerical objections.

Leaders of the Tabriz anjoman were convinced that the shah and the court officials were responsible for the delay and objections raised to the supplement. They strongly suspected that the cables to the majles were intercepted and that Tehran cables were censored, and even written by anticonstitutionalists in the name of the majles leaders. Their doubts over the authenticity of the cables were reinforced because neither Taqizada nor Sa'd al-Daula had signed them. (Sa'd al-Daula had withdrawn from the majles by then.) The anjoman kept the bazaar closed and vowed to keep it closed as long as the supplement was not promulgated, despite Tehran's daily denials of royal opposition and assurance that it was only a matter of time. They refused to allow the expelled olama back to Tabriz. The anticlerical faction among the Tabriz constitutionalists was larger and far more vocal than those in Tehran's liberal circles. The Tehran faction would cable Tabriz that the constitution could not be promulgated and implemented unless it won the support and approval of the olama. Tabriz, in response, would contend that the shariat and the Fundamental Laws were separate. Quoting Theqat al-Islam, they would argue that the nation was in need of a code for political and public affairs, to delimit the monarch's rights and the governors' prerogatives, preserve the Iranian subjects' rights and privileges, regulate commercial and banking transactions and taxation, and to set guidelines for foreign relations. Such a code, they emphatically asserted, would neither replace nor abrogate the shariat; religious affairs would continue to be under strict olama jurisdiction. The majles would ensure the Fundamental Laws would not encroach upon the shariat.[83]

By the spring of 1907, the anjoman-e Tabriz was more overtly radical. In open meetings it discussed the plight of the poor peasants subjected to the greed of their landlords and called on them to demand their right to own the land they

tilled. It even suggested the idea of sending "inspectors" to the rural population to help them organize themselves.[84] Armed mojahedin regularly attended the meetings and exerted pressure on the members to combat the local authorities and on the majles deputies to speed the completion of the supplement to the constitution. The mojahedin also called for a quick majles resolution to abolish the old traditional landholding system (tuyyul),[85] a resolution delayed by the undue deliberations of the majles in Tehran. Fierce resistance to the abolition of this important privilege of the nobility, and to the loss of large pensions and other prerogatives, lay behind the court's stiff opposition to the majles.

The mojahedin also organized the bast at the telegraph building, where the leaders of the anjoman camped day and night, keeping an open communication line with Tehran. The bazaar was closed and shopkeepers received a stipend to go to the bast. Red flags were again hoisted. Teachers and students of the modern schools marched in the streets, wearing red badges on their uniforms.[86] The preachers gave daily sermons on the religious legitimacy of the constitution. Radical Armenians were welcomed by the Moslem prayer leaders and hailed as brothers and compatriots of the Moslems, all united in one common cause.[87]

Finally, pressed by Theqat al-Islam and their own deputies in the majles, the leaders of the anjoman decided to give one week to Tehran to settle the conflicts over the constitution. After that, they threatened, "we shall say what has not been said, and we shall demand what till now has not been demanded."[88] This was a not-so-subtle threat of secession and proclamation of an independent republic.

News of the threat spread rapidly in Tehran. Behbahani and Tabataba'i cabled Theqat al-Islam and other olama of Tabriz to convey their objections and to remind them of the importance of Azerbaijan to Iran. Here Kasravi reported that Theqat al-Islam, "unaware of the rumors," had replied that the goal of the Azerbaijanis was only the promulgation of the constitution. However, Theqat al-Islam was perfectly aware of the "rumor"; he had witnessed its formulation and articulation. He had promptly written to his brother in Najaf to explain the situation to the olama there.[89] He was, indeed, anxious in his desire to safeguard his innocence and protect himself from any charges of complicity with the "radicals and heretics."

The expulsion of the mojtahed from Tabriz, and now the threat to secede and form an independent republic, alarmed the constitutionalist olama in Tehran as well as the moderate Azerbaijani deputies themselves. Mostashar al-Daula and Farshi, intransigent secularists as they were, feared the possible consequences of breaking the ranks of the constitutionalists and polarizing clerical discontent with the constitutional movement, even though both realized the legitimacy of the anjoman's action.[90]

Theqat al-Islam also strongly objected to the anjoman's increasing extremist policies and what he termed acts of unnecessary violence and lawlessness.[91] Thus, when the anjoman ordered the confiscation of a recent shipment of guns from Russia, he quickly condemned the action. He angrily told its leaders that a constitutional monarch was not to be kept unarmed and defenseless, and that the nation had no right to confiscate government weapons. But the anjoman was adamant in its decision. It even took upon itself the right to rebuke the Russian consul, who

had also protested, telling him the dispute was a matter of domestic concern.[92] A few days later, a notorious former convict by the name of Rahim Khan, allegedly upon the shah's order, instructed his son to march to Tabriz with an armed band and raid the anjoman headquarters; when many were wounded and one killed in the raid, the anjoman leaders staged a violent mass demonstration.

In Tehran, the Azerbaijan deputies seized the occasion to rally all parties concerned and recreate the national unity and fervor that had rapidly disappeared as the fight over the constitution severely broke its partisans' ranks. The shah was accused of masterminding the plot and of conspiring to destroy the nationalist movement. Mass demonstrations were staged at the gate of the majles, and the angry crowds demanded the arrest of Rahim Khan and his son. For a week Tehran was in turmoil. Public squares rang with fiery speeches denouncing the shah and his reactionary court officals. The Qajar monarch envisioned the fate of Louis XVI when students demonstrated in the streets. Newspapers published accounts of the atrocities committed by the brigade against the nationalists. In the majles the deputies were remarkably united in their emotional reaction to the news, unanimously condemning the government for its alleged responsibility in the crimes.[93] A delegation, composed of Behbahani and his son and son-in-law, Amin al-Zarb, Mo'in al-Tojjar, Mokhber al-Saltana, Mohtashem al-Saltana, and Azerbaijani deputies, went to the court to press Amin al-Soltan and the shah to arrest the guilty party.[94] The Azerbaijani element emerged as the leaders of this massive popular protest and thus succeeded in regaining some control in the majles. The pro-shariat element was eclipsed as a consequence of this week-long upheaval, since Nuri's association with the court was common knowledge. Tabriz and its deputies in Tehran were able to justify their intransigent stand, since their distrust of the shah was proven well-founded.

Kasravi, noting the people's inertia during the struggle over the supplement, in contrast to their active participation in the demonstrations protesting royal involvement in the Tabriz events, concluded that only concrete evidence of the court's hostility could spur the masses to action.[95] Both the constitutionalists and the partisans of the old order were fully aware of this fact. And each group, each individual leader, attempted to mobilize the crowd in the streets to stage mass demonstrations for their own ends. This time the shah was forced to arrest Rahim Khan and hand him over to the Ministry of Justice to stand trial. "The National Assembly," wrote a British eyewitness sympathetic to the constitutionalists, "is at present stronger than ever, largely due to the folly of its enemies."[96]

Another political event proved instrumental in compelling the shah to be more conciliatory toward the majles. One of the younger Qajar princes, Salar al-Daula Mirza, had been plotting against his brother even when their father, Mozaffar al-Din, was still alive. As a pretender to the throne with no power base of his own (unlike his other brother, Sho'a' al-Saltana, who enjoyed the support of Ain al-Daula, the prime minister against whom the constitutionalists fought bitterly and successfully), Salar al-Daula joined the ranks of the liberals by contributing large sums to liberal leaders. Malek al-Motakallemin was his chief agent. Though the story of this ambitious prince's link to the liberals remains obscure, it was apparent that the majles did not encourage his candidacy. Nor is

there any evidence that they ever took his claims to the throne seriously, even though a great number of them took his money. In early June, Salar al-Daula and his force of some two hundred Lur tribesmen began a march from Hamadan to Tehran to depose his brother. Royal troops were sent to crush them and, after a three-day battle in Nahavand, Salar al-Daula was forced to withdraw and seek asylum in the British consulate at Kermanshah. From the beginning the majles took a strong stand against Salar al-Daula's uprising. The deputies, in a special session, affirmed their loyalty to Mohammad Ali shah as the sole "lawful" monarch and expressed their readiness to fight for his rights as much as they would for the rights of the majles and for the constitution.[97] Malekzada deplored the fact that the majles did not make better use of the prince as leverage against the shah.[98] The newspapers followed the majles example, condemning Salar al-Daula's military adventurism. *Sur-e Israfil* declared that this was no longer the era of struggle among princes for the crown, but that of the reign of the lawfully crowned monarch and of his lawfully selected heir.[99]

While political accommodation was temporarily achieved between the court and the majles, the debate over Nuri's proposed clause continued to divide the constitutionalists' ranks. Tabataba'i, Behbahani, and their supporters began negotiating with Nuri to keep him from more destructive action against the majles. Taqizada and the liberal press argued that the clause was redundant since article 27 of the supplement stipulated that all laws must conform to the principles of the shariat and all olama collectively, and not just a few, were acknowledged as its guardians. The majles Speaker, Sani' al-Daula, announced a resolution to consult with the olama of Najaf and seek their juridical opinion on these issues. Contrary to Kasravi's assertion, Sani' al-Daula was not in league with the reactionary olama; he was in fact assured of their endorsement. The three ayatollahs Khorasani, Tehrani, and Mazandarani had consistently sided with the majles against its opponents. The following day, a cable was drafted and sent to Najaf. The majles-e shaura-ye melli, it read, was founded in order to implement the shariat and safeguard Twelver Shi'ism, to spread justice, and to strengthen the Moslem government vis-à-vis the enemies of religion. Nevertheless, it went on, some self-serving individuals wished to destroy it. Would they, the olama of Najaf, soothe people's apprehension and determine where their religious duties lay? Najaf responded immediately. A cable bearing the names of the three ayatollahs urged all Moslems to endeavor to consolidate and strengthen the majles.[100] The statement was so vaguely worded, however, that it did not put the controversy to rest.

Taqizada and his small group of radicals maintained opposition to the inclusion of what came to be known as article 2.[101] A meeting of all the contending forces at Tabataba'i's home ended with reconciliation and general agreement. Nuri promised in writing he would no longer attack the majles.[102] In the days that followed, some deputies vigorously defended article 2, while emphasizing the separation of orf from shariat laws. They conceded to the majles the power to legislate rules and regulations pertaining to public matters that, prior to the estabishment of the majles, had been arbitrarily issued by despotic rulers. They assured all that no legislation would pass if found incompatible with religious principles. Nor would the constitution alter the shariat, which was left to the

mojtaheds' jurisdiction. In regard to issues that overlapped with the shariat, the olama's opinion would prevail over matters of general principles, while the majles decided the specifics. For instance, in matters of national defense, the olama would decide when to declare war, but the majles would determine the size and composition of the armed forces, duration of military service, military training, taxation, and international relations and agreements, which were also subject to the olama's approval. Orfi legislation was defined as separate from, but not opposed to or incompatible with, the shariat. All mobah matters (religious acts that may or may not be performed) were declared subject to review in accordance with the exigencies of time, some to be applied, other abandoned. The majes, again with the olama's approval, would decide.[103]

Issues were left deliberately vague, and, as we shall see, when the time came to clarify the distinction between orf and shar'i jurisdiction, disputes abounded. But compromise had been achieved and, in the middle of June 1907, article 2 was added to the supplement. It required the creation of a council of five mojtaheds to review all laws before their passage. Olama members of the majles would submit a list of twenty olama deputies, and the majles would vote for five from among them. It also declared the council's decision to be final, and the clause was not be to be amended or eliminated until the manifestation of the Twelfth Imam—in other words, indefinitely.[104] The inclusion of this clause, which nominally grants veto power to a clerical council, dubbed the sena-ye ruhani (Ecclesiastical Senate) by the anticlericals, marked a significant victory for the champions of the shariat. Its implementation, however, was not assured, as subsequent events clearly showed. The high-ranking olama were not united enough to defend their newly acquired, historically unprecedented political power, and no lay politician, constitutionalist or reactionary, was ready to concede such power to them in practice. If a united front was ever successfully formed in that period, it was in league against the olama's ascent to power and for further curtailing of their social influence. Bearing in mind this fundamental feature of the constitutional struggle, one can understand better how the supplement, despite all the odds against it, was to be signed and promulgated in early October 1907.

The battle for the supplement was not yet won. Contrary to Tabataba'i's and Behbahani's expectations, Nuri was not satisfied with the passage of article 2. All sources agree Nuri's increasing ties to the court and members of the landed nobility, who saw their stipends drastically cut and their fiefdoms confiscated by laws swiftly passed by the majles, reinforced his hostility to the majles and its leaders. He received funds and moral support to intensify his campaign against the majles.[105] Government secret agents reported that Nuri met with landed nobility every night at Asef al-Daula's house, and that he had to bribe an individual to stop him from publicizing these meetings.[106] He even sought Russian help, though his request for permission to seek bast in their legation, together with some two thousand followers, was apparently turned down.[107] Throughout the third week of June, Nuri's men verbally assaulted the constitution in mosques, madrasas, and public squares, provoking violent responses from the majles supporters. The religious centers were thus torn by virulent political disputes, engaging clerics against clerics. On June 20, Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and their followers pressed Tabataba'i to take swift action, raid Nuri's

homes, and expel him and his followers from the city. Tabataba'i refused, vouching for Nuri's intention to honor his written promise; and he attempted to contain their anger.[108] On the same day, Behbahani, Sadr al-Olama, and other olama and majles deputies met with Nuri and his son-in-law, Ahmad Tabataba'i, at Mohammad Tabataba'i's house. When news reached them that a crowd had gathered at the madrasa Sadr to march on Nuri's house, they parted company. Tabataba'i went with Jamal al-Din Va'ez and Sadr al-Olama to "pacify the crowd."[109] The following morning, Nuri and Ahmad Tabataba'i, together with Aqa Hasan, the expelled mojtahed of Tabriz, led a group of five hundred people out of the capital to take bast in Shahabdolazim. They then cabled to Najaf and other cities in Iran, calling their exodus a protest against the heresy reigning supreme in the majles and Tehran mosques. The cables were sent free of charge by order of the shah.[110] Moreover, the bastis were given their own printing press to publish their propaganda leaflets and a newspaper for wide distribution in the capital and elsewhere.[111]

9

The Passage of the Supplement

Nuri and the Majles

Within a few days, nearly one thousand people followed Nuri to Shahabdolazim. Of these, eighteen were high-ranking and thirty middle-ranking olama; fifty were preachers and low-ranking mollahs; three hundred were tollab, two hundred small shopkeepers, one hundred domestic servants, and some two hundred idle followers seeking free meals.[1] The bast, like previous basts staged by the constitutionalists, was well organized and well provided for. Daily sermons and lectures instructed the crowd on the reasons why Nuri and his companions had turned against the constitution, which they had initially supported. Nuri was particularly eager to explain that he was still fully supportive of the concept of constitutional monarchy and agreeable to the majles's attempts to set up political reforms. But he was adamant in condemning the Fundamental Laws and the supplement being drafted as contrary to Islamic principles and the shariat. He was especially virulent in denouncing the laws granting freedom of opinion, the pen, and the press. In fact, his attacks focused on the press and the constitutionalist preachers. Freedom, he said again and again, does not mean that the press and some ill-guided, heretical preachers have the right to insult and offend the shah, the olama, the nobility, and the deputies. An eyewitness sympathetic to Nuri commented that "in appearance, these statements are appealing to the masses. But in reality, because Nuri's social standing is not equal to Seyyed Abdollah's [Behbahani] and Seyyed Mohammad's [Tabataba'i], love of power and opportunism, in addition to the court's enticement, caused him to raise the flag of opposition."[2] The court gave him money to cover the expanses of the bast until its objectives were achieved.

Nuri's exodus heightened the tension in the capital. It also underscored the deepening rifts and discord prevailing in olama circles. In the majles there was consternation among some, anger among others, and general protest against the Islamic legitimacy of the concepts and reforms under consideration. Behbahani proclaimed loudly, "We have always expressed our belief that the majles is under the protection of the Imam Zaman, and that it has no aim other than defending the Moslems and safeguarding the shariat. So far, nothing was accomplished in the majles that in any way could be viewed as contrary to this specific aim." He denied all charges of disrespectful behavior toward any religious leader but conceded that people sometimes acted uncontrollably through fear that the majles would be destroyed by some olama. The nation, he asserted, was deter-

mined to protect the majles. He himself, Behbahani went on, wished no harm for any of the olama and would not tolerate their being ill treated, but, he wondered, why had Nuri chosen to leave town after he had promised Tabataba'i full cooperation? "We believe that the olama must reach consensus and cooperate; otherwise there can be no majles." Taqizada confirmed the general deputies' opinion that the majles was there to protect people's property and rights and to defend Islam. Then he added, though the olama enjoy an "honorable status," they forfeit this privileged position when they violate the law and indulge in wrongdoing. The majority of the deputies voted against Tabataba'i's suggestion to visit the bastis and bring them back.[3]

Thus, the stage for a three-month-long struggle over the constitution was set. On the religious front, the olama circles in Iran and in the holy cities in Iraq were dominated by two clerical poles, those of Behbahani and Nuri, the two most powerful ayatollahs of the capital. Each represented important political factions and leading statesmen, each enjoyed financial support from diverse groups and individuals, and each claimed religious righteousness. Barely three days after Nuri and his group migrated, a mollah disciple of his, in the middle of a sermon commemorating Fatima's death at the Sepahsalar mosque, pronounced all persons who slander the olama heretical. From the floor a colleague assisted him by adding, "The European emulators have destroyed Islam and eradicated the shariat." As a group of constitutionalist akhunds rose to respond, a group of tollab armed with clubs began to hit them. The fight intensified as the constitutionalsits received reinforcements from the crowd outside the mosque. Order was restored only when government forces put an end to the fight. But the bazaar closed, and some anjomans, led by the radicals, threatened to attack the bastis in Shahabdolazim. The majles voted against it and sent a delegation to the bazaar to talk the merchants into reopening their shops. Bloodshed was thus avoided.[4]

Meanwhile, the British envoy met with the shah to warn him that internal conflicts imperiled the throne and to remind him that his and the Russian government would not intervene "except in defense of their own interests and subjects, should the Empire break up and the central authority be destroyed." Thus, he advised the shah, "as he could not fight the popular movement himself, and as he could not count on foreign aid, the only alternative was to come to an amicable agreement, to accept the inevitable, to assist at the work of reforms, and to wait until the gratitude of his people and their inherent love of the throne restored him to a power as great as, or greater, than that of his ancestors." He also reminded Mohammad Ali shah of the oath he had taken to observe the constitution and warned him of possible takfir should he break it. "What would Kerbala say to such an action?"[5]

British pressure helped preserve the peaceful coexistence between the majles and the court, despite the religious troubles and the political intrigues. On the day marking the first anniversary of the martyrdom of Seyyed Abdol Hamid, a religious ceremony was held in a mosque, organized by the anjoman-e tollab, which remained under the control of Malek al-Motakallemin, who, along with Jamal al-Din Va'ez, was the main speaker. The ceremony was attended by government ministers, olama, majles deputies, and members of the anjomans. As

Kasravi put it, "It was a good day for Tehran," displaying national unity and cooperation.[6] So was the day celebrating the first anniversary of the constitution on August 5. Browne's correspondent, who had attended the festivities held in the majles, wrote enthusiastically about it. "It was truly a strange spectacle, and my mind went back to the same time last year . . . when those 12,000 refugees were encamped in the garden of the British Legation. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, and it is no longer the people who require to take *bast* anywhere. As I stood there, looking around now at the tribune, with its strange medley of foreign representatives, Persian ministers and deputies, now at the seething crowd below shouting enthusiastically, 'Down with Despotism,' 'Long Live Freedom,' etc., my last doubt vanished . . . the National Assembly will triumph." He was especially moved by "the cry of the multitude. . . . 'Long Live the National Consultative Assembly of Persia.' "[7] The exuberant British correspondent was prematurely optimistic.

Hostility to Nuri and fellow bastis raged unabated in town. The radical anjomans organized a force of some two thousand armed young men, prepared to march to Shahabdolazim to bring the bastis back to Tehran by force. Had the march taken place, it is reported, bloodshed would have been profuse, since the bastis were also armed and ready to fight. Tabataba'i and Behbahani sent a delegation to the anjomans, imploring them to keep calm, insisting that only the olama, and not the people, had the right to warn and prosecute members of the olama class. They promised to assume the responsibility of bringing the bastis back to town.[8] Despite some violent opposition in the majles, Tabataba'i and Behbahani went to visit Nuri.

Nuri received them cordially but conceded nothing. He reiterated his stand and made the following demands: (1) No non-Moslem could be elected deputy to the majles; all deputies must be Shia Moslems, pious and practicing. All heretics currently elected in the majles would be expelled. (2) The Fundamental Laws had to be based on the shariat. Freedom is contrary to religion; therefore freedom of opinion and the pen must be erased from the constitution. (3) Heretical preachers must be expelled from Tehran or banned from the mosque. Both Tabataba'i and Behbahani were thus caught between Nuri's intransigence and the majles's refusal to concede to Nuri any changes in the constitution.[9]

Nuri and his fellow bastis were intensifying their campaign against the constitution, using their printing press, and distributing freely their papers and leaflets throughout the nation and in Iraq.[10] Kasravi asserts the impact of the pamphlets was undeniable, and the bastis would have succeeded in abolishing the constitution then, were it not for the continued support of the three ayatollahs of Najaf.[11] The majles repeatedly informed the ayatollahs of Nuri's wrongdoing, which, they alleged, was motivated by his personal grudges and envy. Najaf would then respond with a fatwa signed by the three mojtaheds, declaring the majles melli–islami a religious necessity and opposition to it tantamount to opposition to the shariat, since its sole purpose was to protect the Moslems, strengthen Islam, lift oppression, and establish public (orf) reforms—in short, to promote good and prohibit evil.[12] In retaliation Seyyed Kazem Yazdi, a Najafi anticonstitutionalist, ordered his followers to protest and demonstrate against the constitution and to

harass his three rival mojtaheds. The Ottoman official reportedly backed Yazdi and his group.[13]

Nuri's leaflets insisted that the bastis' opposition was not motivated by "worldly concerns" or personal grudges but inspired by fear for Islam and the shariat.[14] Nuri reminded the readers that the late Mozaffar al-Din shah had decreed the establishment of the majles in order to help the nation reform its orf laws and to set limits to abuse of power; that the olama had unanimously approved the formation of a majles shaura-ye melli–islami; and that now the term islami was erased, the deputies referring to the mashruta and no longer to the mashruʿa. His leaflets accused "well-known Babis and naturalists" of spreading their heretical views and attacking men of religion through the newspapers and shabnamas; of talking of the need to adapt the shariat, which had survived thirteen hundred years, to the new conditions of the day; and of instituting reforms that were anti-Islamic, aimed at eradicating religion, such as allowing alcoholic beverages, houses of prostitution, and schools for women, and diverting the budget for religious rites and pilgrimages to the construction of factories and railroads. The heretics, the leaflets asserted, held European philosophy and European knowledge superior to the Prophet's; they also demanded equality of non-Moslems with Moslems. The leaflets also criticized the commemoration of those considered martyrs to and of the constitution and attacked the adoption of some European customs, such as wearing a black band around the sleeve and using crowns of flowers for the mourning of the dead, as well as allowing non-Moslems in mosques and hailing Iran and the constitution but not Islam. The blame was put squarely on the anarchists, nihilists, socialists, naturalists, Babis—all viewed as identical in their effort to destroy Islam and to overthrow the monarchy. The Babis were especially mentioned as the chief villains in Iran and as members of the worldwide network of conspirators. They were charged with diverting the majles goals and establishing the "Parliament of Paris." Nuri had fallen victim to these Babis, it went on, when he attempted to block their evil deeds. The leading newspapers were also the targets of the bastis' most vicious attacks; they were often misquoted and their contents distorted or taken out of context. The *Majles, Sur-e Israfil, Kaukab al-Darri, Nedaye Vatan,* and *Tadayyon* were especially mentioned as vehicles of heresy. And it strongly reprimanded the people of Tehran for allowing themselves to be the dupes of such papers and of corrupt preachers.

Nuri warned the believers not to be fooled by the "satans" who, he claimed, had distorted, altered, or hidden the real cables from Najaf, asking them not to accept as authentic those cables read in the majles, which bore the signature of the three mojtaheds. This country is a Moslem country, the ruler is a Moslem ruler, the olama are Moslem olama, the law is the koranic law; four irreligious individuals must not be allowed to bring into a Moslem country the laws of the foreigners, he emphatically stated. It is interesting to note here that during this period Nuri accepted the idea of a majles and tolerated the concept of government affairs separate from religious affairs. However, the bastis' main demands were as follows: mashruʿa to replace mashruta; the appointment of the five mojtaheds for the council to be the olama's prerogative with no majles interven-

tion; a clause to be added regarding the application of the shariat in the case of the Babis and the heretics in general; all laws inspired by the Europeans and deemed contrary to Islamic principles, such as freedom of the press and opinion, to be erased from the constitution.

In the majles, Nuri was furiously repudiated by most deputies, be they lay or clerical. Taqizada was the most intransigent in his denunciation, cutting short any attempt to bring the bastis back through diplomacy and offers of peaceful negotiations. He asserted that such treatment would establish a double standard in carrying out justice. Whereas a wretched porter would be punished immediately for his wrongdoing, he protested, "this man," with all his evil designs, would still given the benefit of the doubt because of his social standing and professional rank. Taqizada's call for swift retribution to put an end to sedition was supported by some deputies, who insisted that a mojtahed who behaved contrary to the shariat considerably undermined his authority. They reminded the Assembly of the famous role played by the olama in establishing the majles, warning that "such types" (the bastis) were now ruining that fame. Other deputies raised the issue of such "types of olama" harming the reputation of Islam and corrupting people's beliefs as well as obstructing progress. They expressed the imperative need they felt to denounce these types, to help the nation identify them as such, and to forbid obedience to them. However, the merchants, led by Mo'in al-Tojjar and Vakil al-Tojjar, categorically refused to sanction any action to "defame or dishonor" the bastis; they felt it was the government's duty to settle the dispute. There was also talk of offering Nuri a large sum of cash to bring him back.[15]

The majority of the majles deputies, including Tabataba'i, were in favor of having the council of olama function from within the majles as an integral part of it. Nuri and fellow bastis demanded the formation of this council as a separate institution, independent from the majles,[16] but to no avail. The majles was declared a legitimate institution. A deputy from Khorasan, Hajj Mirza Ali Aqa Mojtahed, compared its deputies to the medieval Islamic jurisconsults who had derived new laws from the holy texts and helped codify a comprehensive legal system. "The majles," he emphatically proclaimed, "is like a madrasa," and its laws were authentically deduced from the Koran and the holy texts.[17]

From the minbar the constitutionalist preachers supported the deputies' assertions that the majles was merely enacting God's laws. Jamal al-Din Va'ez, throughout this tense period when Nuri was launching his assault from Shahabdolazim, assured his audience of the Islamic validity of the constitution and reserved all his oratorical talents for the denunciation of the olama taking bast in the shrine. Religious tyranny, he stated repeatedly, is worse than temporal tyranny, for the damage inflicted upon Islam and the Moslems by corrupt olama is far more serious. A religious leader is the guardian of Islam, the protector of the holy law; a corrupt cleric "is worse than an animal, worse than an ass."[18] The Shia believers, he said, have to follow the rulings of a mojtahed, but which mojtahed? "Not any one who wears the turban must be obeyed."[19] One has to distinguish the true mojtahed from the false. A corrupt mojtahed discredits the Prophet, the Imams, and Islam; he causes doubt in the believers' minds. Dehkhoda, in a column published weekly in *Sur-e Israfil,* intensified his attacks on the olama, mentioning them by name. "We have no right to investigate the

principles of our faith," he wrote, "since we do not wear the garb of religion. But Hajj Mirza Hasan Aqa [the expelled mojtahed of Tabriz] and Aqa Shaikh Fazlollah [Nuri] can state 'when we exit, religion, too, exits.' "[20] As a lay man of the pen, Dehkhoda felt freer than Jamal al-Din to denounce the olama. He argued that current students of the religious sciences were incapable of carrying on a debate with leaders of other religions; he accused the olama of not training them properly. The "servants of religion" have failed to serve their religion well. They do not know philosophy, they have not learned any foreign language, they are not well read in the history of religions. They know only Arabic, "the language of their religion alone." Moreover, they write in this "foreign language," not in the national language; thus their work remains inaccessible to their countrymen.[21]

The radical anjomans controlled by Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din, Taqizada, and the Transcaucasians, who were by then flocking into Tehran to join the movement and swell the ranks of the revolutionists, brought the majles and mosque disputes into the streets. Both Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din reportedly came to their mosques escorted by gangs of one hundred to two hundred armed men, chanting anti-Nuri slogans and proclaiming their readiness to march to Shahabdolazim and force him out of the holy shrine. Spies who worked for the court reported that the preachers, especially Jamal al-Din, were ordering the anjomans to recruit volunteers to fight the enemies of the majles; to a large extent, they were successful in mobilizing members of the artisans' and retailers' guilds. People in the coffee houses discussed the preachers' sermons, "Bahai-like talks" that asked the believers to stop wasting their money on pilgrimage to Kerbala and donate it, instead, to schools and the national bank. The trade in weapons was booming in the capital, as tension mounted with the public hostility generated by the preachers and the anjomans. Crowds reaching twenty-five hundred people jammed Jamal al-Din's mosque when he preached.[22]

The court spy also reported that the mojtahed Mohammad Tabataba'i was involved in the radical anjomans' activities, that he was aware of their efforts to heighten conflicts and prepare the ground for armed confrontation. His home was the regular rendezvous of these anjomans and of the radical preachers as well as the constitutionalist majles deputies. It is doubtful that Tabataba'i was in fact condoning violence. One of the spy's reports reveals the mojtahed's frustration and anger with Jamal al-Din. He is depicted as losing his temper one evening, asking his visitors to leave his house. "I shall close the door of my house, and shall have nothing to do with you all anymore. What is happening? Against whom do you wish to fight?"[23] One of the deputies present had to go to the anjomans' headquarters and ask them to calm down. Nonetheless, Tabataba'i allegedly was a regular attendant of Jamal al-Din's sermons; the two never broke relations. In fact, the radical preachers and Behbahani also maintained contact. Jamal al-Din acceded to Behbahani's demands to cease his attacks on Amin al-Soltan and individual ministers and deputies of the majles and devoted a whole sermon to the need for unity between the people and the government.[24] The compromise was a significant one, given the fact that Jamal al-Din, in alliance with Taqizada and the Social Democrats, had relentlessly assaulted Amin al-Soltan verbally since the latter's return.[25]

Despite the heat of the religious debate, political expedience, social pressure, and personal motives facilitated the passage of many, if not all, of the controversial clauses.

Article 8 of the supplement, granting equal rights before the law to all subjects of Iran—fiercely opposed by Nuri and his clerical group—was passed, chiefly as a result of the relentless lobbying of the wealthy Zoroastrian merchants from Iran and India. They were able to influence public opinion and the majles through their contacts with the powerful Moslem merchants, their business associates; with members of the olama, especially Behbahani and Tabataba'i; and with the preachers Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez. They promoted the burgeoning press in Tehran, which periodically published articles on the Zoroastrian community, its leaders, and its ancient cultural ties with the Iranian nation. Judging from official British documents, the Zoroastrians also enjoyed the full support of the British representatives, again through the intermediary of the wealthy Parsee merchants who were British subjects. Thus, in February 1907, when a Zoroastrian merchant of Yazd by the name of Parviz Shahjahan was murdered, Spring-Rice received numerous cables from influential Parsees in India, asking him to intervene with the local authorities and demand justice be done. The British minister lost no time "in making representations, in an unofficial capacity, to some of my friends among the chief priests at Tehran." Tabataba'i, he reported, was "in full sympathy," and had sent cables to Yazd olama "urging them to raise no objections to the punishment of the criminal."[26] According to the Islamic law then in effect, criminal offenses done to members of the religious minorities were not subject to retribution similar to that enforced for crimes inflicted on Moslems. No Moslem could be severely punished if the victim was a dhimmi. Therefore, to ask the olama to punish the accused killer of the Zoroastrian merchant, at a time when article 8 was still being debated, entailed a radical departure from judiciary norms.

The Zoroastrians continued to send the majles petitions in support of article 8. They expressed concern for the safety of their life and property and fear of the constant harassment and intimidation their community was subjected to. They stated their conviction that their safety could be guaranteed only through the implementation of the law granting equality to all before the law. They denied that their request implied a demand for equality in religious affairs as well, insisting they they were concerned with the penal code of the country, and not with the shariat. They also informed the majles that their community in India enjoyed full rights as British subjects, but they wished to return to their homeland after suffering 1,256 years of "exile." They were proud of their ethnic Iranian heritage and were ready to serve the Iranian nation as they had served "foreign government." The general response in the majles was positive, and references were made to the Prophet's command to treat the dhimmis well. Some deputies, however, demonstrated their impatience with the Zoroastrians' demands for speedy action to improve their legal status and raised doubts as to the possibility of granting them more rights, even questioning their motives and those of their "instigators." Taqizada quickly responded no one had called for change in the shariat or for an increase of the religious minorities' rights; he argued that oppression and injustice were sufficient motives in themselves, and

there was no need of instigators. He and other deputies asserted the Parsees' rights as authentic Iranians to return to their homeland.[27]

Article 20 of the supplement granting freedom of the press and publication, except for issues and views deemed contrary or harmful to Islam, was much less clear-cut in definition and objectives. The olama could, and often did, object to publication of books and articles which, though not heretical in content, they wished to censor for personal or group interests. On the other hand, conservative pro-shah politicians wished to censor articles and books they thought were politically undesirable and detrimental to their own interests, even if the content was religiously respectable. Here again the majles votes were determined by the individual deputies' political, rather than religious, stands. As the newspapers increased the publication of articles offensive to both the olama and the politicians, be they for or against the constitution, the issue of censorship was repeatedly discussed in heated sessions of the majles. The minister of the press, education and religious endowment, Mokhber al-Saltana, was periodically questioned and reprimanded. The minister, a member of the committee in charge of drafting the constitution and its supplement, was a champion of freedom of the press. However, when the majles deputies voted unanimously to instruct him to confiscate the printing press of the bastis in Shahabdolazim, on the ground that Nuri and his supporters were involved in seditious acts harmful to the nation and Islam,[28] he proved to be powerless in executing the order. Some conservative court officials and clerical leaders obstructed his action.[29] On the other hand, while Mokhber al-Saltana warned the press against publishing anti-olama or anti-shariat articles, he periodically argued with individual olamas, especially those amenable to his views (Tabataba'i, for instance), in defense of the press as an institution. The individual writer accused of violating the press law is to be punished, he would tell the majles, but not the paper. "The writer is guilty, but not the paper itself, not the pen." The radical deputies from Tabriz, Tabataba'i and his followers, supported his argument, while the Imam Jom'a Kho'i, Aqa Seyyed Mohammad Ja'far, and other individual deputies stung particularly by press revelations of their shady deals and corruptibility, opposed him.[30]

In matters related to the judiciary, most of the deputies were in favor of institutionalizing the traditional distinction of shar' from orf laws. However, the lines were often blurred when cases of political concern to either party were involved. For instance, Taqizada voted to refer the case of Asef al-Daula, the notorious governor of Khorasan charged with many politically criminal acts, to shar' court for the application of hoddud (koranic) laws for his punishment. He invoked koranic verses pertaining to "corruption on earth," and he turned against the minister of justice, who protested that the case fell under orf jurisdiction. Taqizada's motive was political, keen as he was to sentence Asef al-Daula and put an end to the latter's family bribes distributed generously to individual deputies. The Speaker of the majles, Sani' al-Daula, and Imam Jom'a Kho'i sided with him; the merchants' representatives, led by Hajj Mohammad Ismail Maghaza'i of Tabriz and Amin al-Zarb, rose in defense of the minister and argued that the majles was not to try cases but only to refer them to the appropriate court. The Speaker then argued that the majles had the right to investigate

and judge, since there existed no efficient state court at the moment, and the case needed immediate attention.[31]

Despite the continued disputes and bickering that often marred the debates in the majles, blurring issues and ideological stands, the supplement was enjoying majority support. Persistent denunciation by Nuri and his fellow bastis merely delayed its official promulgation. Once more, a major political event brought to an end the religious controversy and hastened the passage of the laws favored by the secularists. The violent death of Amin al-Soltan served as a catalyst that neutralized—in fact, disarmed—the opposition.

Amin al-Soltan's Death

The assassination of Amin al-Soltan is another political episode shrouded in mystery. Existing accounts do not agree as to who was actually behind it. Who ordered the assassination, and who armed the assassin? Given the fact that the statesman was both feared and hated by most political groups active in those days, including the court, and that many were to profit politically from his sudden death, solving the case is no easy task. The issue of responsibility would not have mattered much had this assassination not been so entangled with vital problems regarding the passage of the supplement and the subsequent radicalization of the majles, which, in turn, caused the polarization of the constitutionalists' politics.

Kasravi firmly believed Amin al-Soltan was anticonstitutionalist and that he worked with the reactionary olama, especially Nuri, to subvert the movement and destroy the majles.[32] Daulatabadi and Mokhber al-Saltana, on the other hand, portray the minister as a man caught in between two fires, the court reactionaries and the majles extremists. He attempted to tread cautiously, cultivating ties with all, and even staging a reconciliation among Behbahani, Tabataba'i, Nuri, the majles, and the court. But it was to no avail. As Mokhber al-Saltana put it, "The majles had its own demands; the people had their expectations; the shah was lying. While the people expected the shah to turn Constitutionalist with Amin al-Soltan's return, the shah was counting on the latter to wipe out the Constitution."[33] Doubtless, the shah was expecting his minister to destroy the majles—or at least to use his artifice to manipulate and control individual members, thereby dividing its ranks and thus turning it into an ineffective assembly of treacherous, mutually mistrustful deputies. Amin al-Soltan had indeed succeeded in controlling the majles, bribing and threatening its members to collaborate. But there is no evidence that he was in fact fulfilling the shah's expectations, or that he was undermining the majles. He was in close contact with Nuri and fellow bastis in Shahabdolazim; but he was maintaining equally close, if not closer, ties with Behbahani and fellow constitutionalists.[34] Moreover, his control of the majles, which left Taqizada, and his small group opposed to the minister, in the minority, did not stifle the lively debates over each clause of the supplement. In fact, during the months of his ministry the supplement survived the anticonstitutionalists' ferocious attacks and was not revised or altered in any way Nuri wished. The nominal support of the olama of Najaf[35] could

not alone account for the remarkable success of the secularists in pushing for legislation deemed un-Islamic by a cleric as powerful as Nuri, who not only enjoyed moral and financial support from the court but also had effectively compelled Behbahani to seek means for reconciliation. Moreover, both Daulatabadi and Mokhber al-Saltana, known for their close ties with Amin al-Soltan, were active in preventing Nuri and his collaborators from achieving their ends. They persuaded the bazaar, through the anjoman-e asnaf, which was controlled by Mokhber al-Saltana's brother, not to close, as ordered by Nuri's agents.[36]

Nonetheless, among the radical anjomans Amin al-Soltan had vengeful enemies, who, though numerically insignificant, were in a position to create disturbances in the capital and in the northern provinces. Malek al-Motakallemin periodically gave inflammatory speeches against Amin al-Soltan and the court, which, according to the preacher's biographer, inspired the assassin to action.[37] Political control of the majles, and not the supplement, was at issue. It was a power struggle involving several dominant personalities. Neither Amin al-Soltan nor Taqizada wished to concede to the shah absolute authority. However, while the minister was nominally enjoying the support of the moderate constitutionalists, including Theqat al-Islam of Tabriz and Mostashar al-Daula, the majles deputy from Azerbaijan, Taqizada was fully backed by the radicals, religious and lay alike. By August, when Amin al-Soltan had not proved to be the instrument needed for the destruction of the majles, the court, ironically, found itself in common cause with the radicals. Both parties wished to see him eliminated. Who actually was responsible for ordering the assassin to accomplish the task is a matter of debate, but the outcome served everybody's purpose.

In the mid-August a crowd led by Solaiman Mirza and Yahya Mirza—members of the moderate, reform-minded Adamiyat Association who were increasingly being drawn into Taqizada's orbit—gathered outside the majles and denounced Amin al-Soltan. They recalled the letter of takfir issued in 1903 in Najaf, to remind the people of Amin al-Soltan's unworthiness and incite them to revolt against his ministry. They also charged the deputies with corruption, accusing them of taking bribes from Amin al-Soltan, and they insisted that the majles was not functioning as it should. In the majles itself, while Taqizada intensified his attacks on the minister, the latter's supporters, including Speaker Sani' al-Daula, rose in his defense and called for an investigation of the Qajar brothers' motives in slandering him so viciously. As Kasravi put it, the charges and countercharges in the majles led nowhere, as bickering and backbiting was the norm in those days.[38] In the north, on the other hand, the radicals who controlled the anjoman dominated the politics of Tabriz and other towns of the province. The anjoman in Khoy wrote a pamphlet in full support of Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, denouncing Amin al-Soltan as a traitor and calling for his dismissal. The tone was, as usual, threatening. Copies were sent to the capital, to Tabriz, and throughout Azerbaijan. According to Kasravi, Mirza Ja'far Zanjani, a radical from the Caucasus, and some of his compatriots were responsible for the writing and distribution of this and similar pamphlets. It was Farman-Farma, then governor of Azerbaijan who had turned constitutionalist and fully supported both the majles and Amin al-Soltan, who dissuaded them from taking more drastic measures to eliminate the minister.[39]

A number of sources agree that Mohammad Ali shah was influenced by his uncle and father-in-law, Kamran Mirza Nayeb al-Saltana, and by Sa'd al-Daula, one of the leaders of the constitutional movement, former member of the committee that drafted the constitution, and the most outspoken advocate of the supplement, who had by then resigned his deputyship to join the royal inner circle of advisers. Sa'd al-Daula was also one of the founding members of the anjoman-e Adamiyat and had close ties with its director, Abbas Qoli Khan Adamiyat. Partly because of Sa'd al-Daula's connection to the anjoman and partly because of fundamental differences in aprroaches and tactics, the radicals in the majles developed a strong hostility toward Abbas Qoli Khan. On the other hand, the Speaker of the majles, Sani' al-Daula, because of his personal feud with Sa'd al-Daula, sided with the radicals against the anjoman, to which he and his brothers had originally belonged. The shah reportedly was involved, through his advisers, in masterminding Amin al-Soltan's elimination. Various anjomans were either approached directly or infiltrated for that specific purpose. The anjoman-e Adamiyat apparently was one of these organizations the court exploited to the fullest to further discredit the powerful statesman and engineer his downfall while simultaneously manufacturing a crisis that would call for, and justify, a coup against the majles. Both Amin al-Soltan and Sani' al-Daula were aware of the court intrigues.[40]

Whether or not the charges of complicity with the court were well-founded, the fact remains that the anjoman-e Adamiyat did campaign for the supplement. In that summer Abbas Qoli wrote a report that was distributed in the main mosque in town, the masjed-e Sepahsalar, and in which he insisted that the supplement should be reviewed in the majles itself and nowhere else. He strongly opposed article 2 and denied the olama the right to participate in public affairs and national politics. He attacked Nuri's effort to impose on the majles the rule of the shariat, on the ground it was unconstitutional.[41] Furthermore, the anjoman sent a delegation of twelve members, which included the Qajar brothers Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, to seek from Amin al-Soltan a clarification of his position and a promise to commit himself fully to the battle for the constitution.[42] According to Mokhber al-Saltana, who had gone with Daulatabadi to visit the minister just before his death, Amin al-Soltan was indeed confident that he had won the trust of the anjoman-e Adamiyat as a result of the meeting with its delegation. Mokhber al-Saltana and Daulatabadi remained skeptical and tried to warn the minister against the anjoman's machinations.[43]

On August 31, 1907, Amin al-Soltan was killed by Abbas Aqa, a moneychanger from Tabriz with known links to both the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and its inner radical group of Social-Democrats. He fled the scene of the crime, killing a soldier; then, realizing he was about to be arrested, he committed suicide. On his body they found a membership card bearing the words "fida'i no. 41." Abbas Qoli's oldest son, Sadeq Khan, who was estranged from his father and had joined the rival anjoman-e Azerbaijan, was arrested for complicity in the murder. Sadeq Khan, upon interrogation, accused his father and the anjoman-e Adamiyat of hiring the assassin and masterminding the plot. Abbas Qoli was then arrested by order of the majles Speaker, Sani' al-Daula.[44] Mokhber al-Saltana insisted that the shah, through the anjoman-e Adamiyat, had instigated

the murder but allowed its attribution to the liberal nationalists. The anjoman-e Azerbaijan categorically denied the assassin was ever a member of the Adamiyat organization and claimed full credit for the "glorious deeds" in ridding the nation of its infamous traitor.[45] Abbas Qoli protested his innocence, and members of his anjoman petitioned the majles for his release.[46]

The elimination of Amin al-Soltan did not fulfill the shah's intentions. Far from creating chaos, it engendered popular exultation and renewed the nationalist zeal to combat the "opponents of liberty" and the "enemies of the nation." On the other hand, both the British and Russian envoys strongly warned the shah against staging a coup against the majles and advised him to entrust the matter to his ministers, the olama, and the majles.[47] The shah refrained from direct confrontation, instead sending a letter to the majles, pledging his full support to the constitution. Members of his court followed suit.[48] More important for the course of the legislative process, Amin al-Soltan's death also brought about the end to the Shahabdolazim bast led by Nuri. Soon after news reached the bastis, Nuri began negotiating with Behbahani and Tabataba'i, expressing his willingness to return if given a written statement on the goals and function of the majles. The majles complied. Nuri was assured in writing that the shariat would not be abrogated and that the majles would deal with orfi matters alone; the constitution would not be contrary to the spirit or principles of Islam but would restrict its jurisdiction to safeguarding the nation's rights in public affairs, delimiting the monarch's power, eliminating tyranny, defining the function and obligations of civil servants. Under no circumstance would the majles intervene in shar' affairs; freedom of opinion would not be granted if it led to sedition or propagation of heresy; freedom of worship to heretics would not be allowed. In the last analysis, the written promises were vague, with no new concessions to Nuri. The agreement served the purpose of allowing the bastis to return to town without too much loss of face.[49]

The Triumph of the Secularists

The secularists were in control in the majles, and the conservative olama were subdued. In late September, they won the debate over the *Sur-e Israfil* paper and prevented its elimination. The paper had created an uproar in religious circles by publishing two articles in which Dehkhoda proudly proclaimed himself in favor of total liberty for all individuals, including freedom of opinion, which he viewed as a fundamental part of human rights. "No Moslem mollah, no king . . . has the right to interfere" or to block the path to progress. It was in the first article that the fiery journalist had prophesied that the principle of human rights would subjugate the "worshipers of the old" and "eradicate their superstitions from the earth."[50] In the second article Dehkhoda defended himself against charges of heresy, denying he was attacking Islam or any of its principles and claiming that his views were based solely on the holy texts, which, properly understood, were identical to the European principles of human rights. Despite the fact that he cautiously adopted a conciliatory tone, cloaking his ideas in traditional Islamic garb, he could not refrain from ending his article with a thinly veiled threat. He

dramatically announced his intention to ask his present prosecutors to account for their deeds once the secular court of justice was established, the constitution was promulgated in its completed form, and the "right contacts" with government officials could no longer ensure immunity. "The pages of *Sur-e Israfil* in one hand, and the Koran in the other, we shall then cry out loud and raise our objections, defending ourselves."[51]

In the majles, many deputies defended the articles and, with great impunity, pronounced them political in nature and therefore not contrary to religion. A decision was finally reached to have the paper suspended for just a few weeks, until the press laws were enacted.[52] *Sur-e Israfil* resumed publication barely a month later, triumphantly carrying on its self-proclaimed mission of combating political and religious tyrannies. Meanwhile, the radical preachers never ceased their sermonizing.

The lively debates and fierce battle over the issue of freedom of the press and over the judiciary reforms kept the deputies fully engaged while totally absorbing the attention of most participants in the political process of the day, in the capital and in the provinces. Ironically, it was at this time that the secret Anglo-Russian Entente, signed on August 31, 1907, was revealed to the majles. Judging from all the sources available, the little controversy it stirred was short-lived. In fact, the mild response clearly shed new light on the political reality of the time. Domestic sociocultural issues overshadowed—even eclipsed—vital national political interests. Moreover, the agreement was not then perceived as threatening, and its implications were not understood. When, on September 5, 1907, a letter written by the British envoy to the minister of foreign affairs was read in the majles, promising British and Russian guarantees for national independence, the response was naively optimistic. It was argued that the agreement did not concern Iran's interests and affairs, but those of the two powers. Iran was a sovereign, independent nation and would remain so; Great Britain was a friend and supporter of free nations and would continue to support Iran's independence.[53]

The press and the radical preachers raised objections for a relatively short while. The *Habl al-Matin* published a series of articles from September 9 through September 16, 1907, informing the public of the agreement's potential threat to the nation's independence. It offered a sophisticated analysis of the two powers' rival interests and their respective strategies and designs in Asia and the Middle East. It presented possible scenarios for future occupation or colonization or direct takeover of the country's budget and finance by the one and/or the other. It mocked the British and Russian guarantee of Iran's independence, pointing at the fact that those who are "versed in the jargon of politics know very well that wherever one of these powers has acquired influence, it has done so under the guise of just such specious and fair-seeming words. Now, if these two powers really desired the continuance of Persia's sovereignty, then there was no need for such an Agreement."[54] It expressed its moral outrage at the rights the powers had granted themselves at the Iranians' expense. "The beauty of the thing is that Russia grants permission to England to open the doors of her commercial influence in the North, while England kindly vouchsafes the same permission to Russia in the South! But what business has Russia in Persia either to grant or withhold such permission? From North to South, Persia is ours: we are neither

minors needing a guardian, nor lunatics needing a keeper."[55] It called upon the minister of foreign affairs to inform Britain and Russia that "no agreement having reference to Persia and concluded without her knowledge is valid . . . and that any power desiring to enter into relatons with Persia must address itself directly to the Persians themselves."[56] In response to the British envoy's assurances to the minister of foreign affairs, *Habl al-Matin* urged the Iranians to acquaint themselves with all articles included in the agreement and to be constantly on guard against British and Russian intentions. "We must assume that they actually intend to divide our country. In this case it is clear that their method or their procedure will not be to bring in troups and forcibly take possession. They will rather insert their claws gradually, and adopt such means and methods as will result in finishing us off in another ten or twenty years."[57] Finally, it advised the nation and its leaders to "strenuously endeavor to set our house in order, put a stop to the increase of foreign influence, and make it so clear to them that we are alive and awake that they will leave us alone."[58] In the last two articles in the series, *Habl al-Matin* adopted a milder tone, almost ceasing to attack the agreement. Judging from the content of the first articles, it is hard to believe that the newspaper's editors, like many politically conscious individuals of the time, were convinced of the two powers' sincerity of motives and promises of support for national independence.

In Tabriz, the *Anjoman* declared the agreement to be "tantamount to reducing Iran to the colonized status of Morocco," with two powers instead of one sharing in the spoils. It attacked the deputies for their powerlessness and expressed the opinion that Iranians could no longer rely on the majles to save their country from occupation. "We must think for ourselves, what can be done before it is too late."[59] In another issue, it reprinted an essay written for a Baku paper by a "devotee to the Iranian nation," pleading with the olama to stop their inner struggle for power. "This is not the time for our religious leaders to takfir one another, or sow the seeds of national divisions"; and it went on to warn that Iran could end up suffering the same fate as India and the Caucasus.[60] The *Anjoman* also reprinted the series of articles published earlier in *Habl al-Matin,*[61] thus reopening the controversy.

In mid-October 1907, Mirza Reza Musavat, one of the most radical members of the radical anjomans in Tehran, began the publication of his paper, *Musavat.* It won instant celebrity for the uncompromising tone of its articles devoted to the denunciation of the "enemies of the nation" and of liberty. In its second issue, Musavat lashed out at the credulous people at home and at the foreign exploiters. The nation, he wrote, rendered weak and defenseless as a result of its despotic governments, is now unable to protect its independence. The despots have reached the conclusion that the preservation of Iran's independence must be kept under "the shadow of the two affectionate neighbors." For two years the editor of *Habl al-Matin,* he went on, had tried in vain to awaken the nation to this danger, sounding the alarm that Iran's independence would last only as long as the two powers wished it to last. "Our sleep of ignorance has prevented us from acting upon his words of advice."[62] Refusing to believe that the agreement guaranteed Iran's sovereignty and independence, he asked the right for all Iranians to officially declare to all governments of civilized nations that they do not,

recognize it and never would. Iranians must now assume the task of defending their land and water. But Musavat, too, came to subdue his tone. Two weeks after publishing this fiery declaration, he was to respond to a letter from a reader protesting against the agreement by merely informing him that the minister of foreign affairs had taken "the necessary steps," sending letters of protests to all European governments.[63] A month later, Musavat printed the translation of a French article in *Le Temps* which viewed the agreement as "reasonable policy," with a bitter comment: How could France, the land where the "light of freedom" first appeared, tolerate such infringement on the independence of an ancient nation?[64] Even such mild expressions of bitterness soon ceased to be printed in the radical papers.

Jamal al-Din Va'ez, alone among the preachers, addressed the issue in his mosque sermon. He denounced the majles deputies for their lack of courage to stand up and defend the nation. The whole world knows about it, he stated, and Iranians read about it in their own papers, but no one is crying out in protest.[65] But even Va'ez, in comparison to the general virulence of his polemics against his opponents and the anticonstitutionalists at home, was astonishingly meek. Equally remarkable was the silence of the high-ranking olama, the leading merchants, and the major politicians on this matter of national importance. Indeed, it was this silence that induced the British envoy to express his satisfaction to the Foreign Office that "on the whole, the Agreement has been well received in Iran."[66] One must here draw the conclusion that, for the Iranians engaged in the deadly fight over the constitution in the summer and fall of 1907, domestic battles received priority over foreign threats. As Safa'i wrote, the majles did not fight the agreement a fraction as much as it did Mohammad Ali shah.[67]

The supplement passed on October 7, 1907. Contrary to the commonly held view, its success was not due solely to the "progressive elements" in the majles and among the constitutionalists, be they moderate or radical. As already stated, it was the result of a combined effort on the part of most social groups and individuals who stood to win from curtailing the olama's social influence. Article 2, granting the council of five mojtaheds the authority to review the laws before passage, was indeed included in the final draft. However, its implementation was not contemplated then, as the secularist element in the majles had gained absolute control following the death of Amin al-Soltan, nor was it subsequently, as historical events unfolded, drawing the olama further and further away from the center of political power. Article 8 granted all Iranians equal rights before the law. This, in addition to the 1906 constitutional clause granting the religious minorities the right of representation in the majles, marked a radical departure from Islamic traditions of treating the dhimmis as protected but unequal subjects of the Islamic state. Article 19 established compulsory universal education under the control of the state. Article 20 granted freedom of the press, excepting heretical publications. Articles 71 through 89 dealt another severe blow to clerical power by giving the civil courts of justice and an appeals court supreme authority in the judiciary, although recognizing the mojtaheds' authority in shar' matters.[68]

The secularists' triumph underscored the considerable erosion of the olama's power and prestige. The supplement left no doubt as to the coalition of liberal,

radical, and conservative forces' intention to secularize institutions traditionally under religious control and to introduce new institutions. The religious dissidents, the revolutionists, and the moderate reformers, in alliance with the conservative ruling elite, laid the legal basis for the radical social and cultural transformation of twentieth-century Iran. The traditional Islamic social order and the religious leadership were to suffer the consequences. Their losses were neither accidental nor unforeseen, as often stated; they were already detected in the events and socioreligious trends of the second half of the nineteenth century, culminating with the promulgation of the supplement in October 1907.

Browne's analysis of the majles successes, no doubt relying too much on selective Iranian information coupled with oblivious disregard, or unawareness of, taqiyya practiced by the religious dissidents, led to a general misunderstanding of the role of the olama and of religion in the politics of the day. Article 2 by no means indicated the olama's power and authority over the majles and the court, as Browne stated.[69] It was adopted by all parties involved, with very few exceptions, as a means to pacify Nuri, a compromise reached after weeks of negotiations between Nuri, who had originally proposed it, and Behbahani and Tabataba'i, who had opposed it. It was a symbolic gesture of reconciliation at the bargaining table, displaying the constitutionalists' position of strength in contrast to the sulking Nuri's public decline.[70] It signified Behbahani's and Tabataba'i's final willingness to concede to their hated rival a place in the limelight, a share in the glory.

The Anjomans and the Press

With the promulgation of the supplement in October 1907, the majles emerged as the most important center of power. Both the court and the high-ranking olama, in contrast, appeared weak and disoriented, unable to sustain their authority against the will of the majles. The majles itself witnessed the resurgence of Taqizada and fellow radicals, who had been eclipsed while Amin al-Soltan was in control of the majority of the deputies. Behbahani, left without Amin al-Soltan's long-lasting support and patronage, saw himself forced to join Taqizada's faction as the new Speaker, Ehtesham al-Saltana, proved to be a virulent and outspoken majles leader determined to curtail the influence and prestige of the clerics, especially Behbahani. Normally Taqizada would have found ideological affinities with the Speaker, rather than with the mojtahed. Indeed, the two had at first joined forces against Behbahani and all other former supporters of Amin al-Soltan in the majles.[71] However, the Speaker's political moderation, his known ties with the anjoman-e Adamiyat, which had staged his successful nomination as Speaker of the majles, and with the newly founded anjoman-e omara, which included most notable Qajar princes and court officials, quickly aroused the extremists' suspicion and hostility. Politics once again determined alliances and shifted allegiances. As the hostility intensified, Behbahani expediently drew closer to Taqizada and the radical anjomans. Malek al-Motakallemin reportedly had initially mediated this rapprochement.[72]

The anjoman-e omara, also referred to as the anjoman-e khedmat, or ashraf,

or akaber, was founded soon after Amin al-Soltan's death by Ehtesham al-Saltana and his brother Ala' al-Daula, and not by Amir A'zam and Hosain Qoli Khan Navab, as the British reported.[73] Landowners and members of the intelligentsia who were well-known constitutionalists active in the movement from the start, such as Mokhber al-Saltana and the majles Speaker himself, as well as notorious reactionaries, such as Kamran Mirza and Amir Bahador, figured on its list. A week before the promulgation of the supplement, they went to the majles to swear allegiance to the constitution and pledge full support to the majles. They also sent a collective letter to the shah, urging him to follow suit and renew his support for the majles.[74] The British envoy viewed this sudden "about-face" on the part of the aristocracy as revealing their fear of the shah's weakness and inability to protect them and their interests against both the majles and the radical anjomans' violence.[75] However, here one must add that a number of the leading members of the anjoman were genuine constitutionalists, and when the shah subsequently attempted to stage a coup against the majles, they sided with its supporters, including the radicals. Mokhber al-Saltana, Ehtesham al-Saltana, and Ala' al-Daula proved to be ardent champions of the constitution and staunch allies of Taqizada, despite their mutual distrust. The Speaker's claim that his motive was to reconcile the court and members of the aristocracy with the majles seems to be genuine. The anjoman did indeed succeed in exerting pressure upon the shah to follow their example.

The shah came to the majles to express his support, despite the fact that the majles had, two days earlier, passed the budget proposed by the Financial Committee, which called for drastic tax reforms detrimental to landowners' interests and for cuts in court allowances.[76] Ehtesham al-Saltana also succeeded in pushing the shah to dismiss from the newly formed cabinet Sa'd al-Daula, who held the post of minister of foreign affairs for just two weeks. Sa'd al-Daula, by this time, was closely identified with the shah and Kamran Mirza. He was the subject of attacks by the radicals and the press. He was viewed as the chief architect of a Machiavellian plan designed to create a crisis, through riots and disruptive demonstrations, in order to "reveal" the government's and the majles' incompetence and thus convince the foreign powers that Iran was not ready for a democratic regime. He also reportedly wanted to demonstrate to the foreign governments that only he, through the shah's restored power, could safeguard the constitution from the extremists. Sa'd al-Daula was able to draw the support of the anticonstitutionalist elements in the court and among the olama—specifically Nuri, who was adamantly opposed to the supplement.[77] Thus Sa'd al-Daula, initially dubbed Abu'l milla (father of the nation) for the vital role he played in the earlier phases of the movement, and who undoubtedly favored the new laws pertaining to the educational and judiciary systems, was now, out of personal grudges and frustrated ambitions, turning his back on the cause and siding with his former opponents.

The new cabinet, headed by Naser al-Molk, an Oxford-educated Qajar prince, and including Sani' al-Daula and Mokhber al-Saltana, was not to the shah's liking. Moreover, Ehtesham al-Saltana, who was both the Speaker and the effective head of the government, used the majles as a power base and, despite his clashes with the extremists, remained loyal to the constitution, intend-

ing to execute the new laws. He also enjoyed the solid backing of the anjoman-e Adamiyat, especially in his fight against the radicals and against Behbahani and Tabataba'i.[78] Daulatabadi asserts that Ehtesham al-Saltana's "quick temper" undermined his efforts to forge a national reconciliation as the extremists, on the one hand, and the shah's entourage, on the other, exerted pressure and continuously provoked him.[79] The anjoman-e Adamiyat was then at the height of its power, despite the brief arrest of its director—or maybe because of it, depending on the sources. Mohammad Ali shah joined the anjoman, contributing a generous sum to its treasury, thus raising its status and influence high above other moderate anjomans. Other grandees sought admission as well. Abbas Qoli Khan wrote in his memoirs that he was instrumental in promoting royal conciliation with the majles, and that it was upon his suggestion that the shah renewed his oath to support the constitution.[80] Historical records document Abbas Qoli's professed loyalty to the constitution, to the secularization of the judiciary and educational system, and to the concept of freedom of the press and of opinion. However, he was also a moderate politically, and the intensified attacks of the radicals on him and his organization further pushed him into the conservative camp.

At this point the dispute was no longer over constitutional clauses; the constitution was secured, at least on paper. At stake was the political direction the new government was to follow. It involved the radicals' views and the reactionaries' secret intention to destroy the majles. Between the two extremist poles, the moderates' hands were tied. While Tabataba'i and Behbahani were turning to the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and its radical allies, Abbas Qoli was forced by inclination and force of circumstance to move to the other extreme. Ironically, and significantly, Sa'd al-Daula, one of the anjoman-e Adamiyat's founders, was conspiring against the majles, while two other members, the Qajar brothers Yahya Mirza and Solaiman Mirza, were by then defecting to join the radicals. Though their organization, the anjoman-e Hoquq, originally a branch of the anjoman-e Adamiyat, did not officially break until after the Tupkhana events of December 1907, the two brothers were already adopting a radical tone and were working in alliance with the radicals.

A clerical anjoman was also set up in this period by olama secretly supporting the shah against the majles. The anjoman-e Al-Mohammad was led by Abol Qasem Tabataba'i, the constitutionalist mojtahed's elder son, and included among its members Shaikh Mohammad Soltan al-Va'ezin, the preacher who had played a key role in the early phase of the revolution. By October 1907, he had turned his back on his former colleagues and denounced from the minbar Behbahani, Tabataba'i, and Jamal al-Din Va'ez. This anjoman enjoyed the patronage of high-ranking olama who, overtly or covertly, were working to undermine the constitution, such as Nuri, the Imam Jom'a of Tehran, and Mirza Hasan the mojtahed of Tabriz. Once allowed to return to his native town, the latter was to found a similar anjoman, the Islamiyya, with identical goals.

As the anjoman-e Azerbaijan grew increasingly radical, some deputies of Azerbaijan met with the Imam Jom'a Kho'i to set up a rival organization, the anjoman-e Fotuwwat, in November 1907. Outwardly expressing loyalty to the constitution, it aimed at discrediting the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and working with

the shah. For instance, it organized street demonstrations to protest the majles's decision to decrease government officials' salaries but was unsuccessful in influencing the legislators. It dissolved soon after the radical papers published articles discrediting the organization and revealing its true motives.

One of the most significant aspects of this anjoman was the role of Mirza Javad Nateq, the Tabrizi radical preacher who was a member of the anjoman-e Tabriz, which was affiliated with the Social Democrats of Baku. As a result of his militant activism in Maku and Khoy, Nateq was reportedly in danger of being arrested by order of some Azerbaijan high officials. Tabriz was no longer safe; he left for Tehran via the Caucasus around June 1907. He stopped in Jolfa, Erevan, Tiflis, and Baku; he was warmly received wherever he went, meeting with the established intelligentsia, giving lectures and sermons for the constitutional cause. Quoting at great length from his autobiography, Fathi asserts Nateq was far more radical in his anticlericalism and antitraditionalism than was Taqizada.[81] Nonetheless, upon his arrival in the capital, Nateq resided with a Tabriz deputy member of the Fotuwwat anjoman. He wrote in his memoirs that Taqizada, who, like many other leading politicians and officials, visited him, had warned him against his host and of the possible consequences of his association with this deputy. Rumors indeed began to spread that Nateq had joined the discredited anjoman, that he had met with the shah in a special audience, and that he was in contact with Sa'd al-Daula and Kamran Mirza.[82] And yet Nateq was also seen with well-known figures in constitutionalist circles, addressing the anjoman-e Azerbaijan members, preaching in mosques affiliated with constitutionalist olama, and even collaborating with the paper *Sur-e Israfil* and working with Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and Shaikh al-Ra'is in denouncing Nuri and fellow opponents of the constitution. In his memoirs, Nateq insists he repeatedly advised the shah to support the constitution and the majles and to pay no heed to his ill-wishers among the courtiers, who were trying to draw him to their reactionary side. Likewise, he asserted that the shah was primarily interested in having the preachers in town inform the nation that he was a sincere champion of the constitution and a promoter of national progress. Though he believed his contacts with the court would benefit the liberals' cause, Nateq finally admitted these meetings proved to be detrimental to his own interests and caused him trouble.[83] He played no part in the Tupkhana events; in fact, he remained at home, allegedly ill. He did not join the radicals, who were then struggling for the constitution against Nuri and the court. His absence, in addition to his meetings with the shah, allowed his "opponents and rivals," he wrote in his memoirs, to spread the rumor that he had defected from the constitutionalist camp and had dropped the cause.

The anjoman-e Markazi, another organization labeled nationalist and enjoying the support and leadership of the radicals, was eventually infiltrated by the reactionaries. According to Malekzada, it was founded by the "nationalists," who had felt the need to coordinate their activities through such a central anjoman representing all other anjomans. It included among its members two representatives of each existing anjoman, and it functioned as a central committee in charge of decision making and communication with majles deputies. Gradually, Malekzada wrote, it was infiltrated by "reactionaries and courtiers

wearing the garb of Constitutionalism." One such member, Ershad al-Daula, rapidly rose through its ranks as a dedicated and popular leader of the movement, until he was elected director of the anjoman. Ershad al-Daula used the influence he acquired to betray the nationalist government, becoming the most important factor in the destruction of the majles.[84]

Majd al-Islam was equally convinced that Ershad al-Daula and other courtiers were specifically instructed by the shah to report on all the anjomans' activities and to employ all means possible to prevent them from following policies that might be detrimental to royal interests. The anjoman-e Markazi proved to be a powerful tool for this end, since it functioned as the central committee where all decisions were made. Majd al-Islam added that though he was not free to reveal much of what he knew, he could state with certainty that the anjoman members who spoke loudest against the shah were, in reality, serving him. Often decisions ostensibly designed to erode the shah's power were aimed at provoking the constitutionalists into taking a radical stand that would eventually backfire, thus portraying the shah as the innocent victim of the lawless extremists, the oppressor-become-the-oppressed. Majd al-Islam categorically rejected the view that Ershad al-Daula turned anticonstitutionalist only after he was expelled from the anjoman-e Markazi by the extremists.[85] He insisted that Ershad al-Daula's prime motive was to reinstate Amir Bahador in office and rehabilitate him in the eyes of both the nation and the shah. His own good fortune depended on his patron's. He finally succeeded in promoting the latter's interests with the establishment of this anjoman. He had Amir Bahador come to the majles to swear allegiance to the constitution and to the anjoman to deliver a speech in favor of the supplement.

Nazem al-Islam's account of Ershad al-Daula's role in the anjoman confirms Majd al-Islam's: the courtier's motive was to serve Amir Bahador and thus promote his own interests through his patron's, and he used the anjoman to introduce the latter as a convert to the constitutional cause. Contrary to Majd al-Islam, however, Nazem al-Islam argued that Ershad al-Daula proved to be an essential promoter of the constitution, and that he worked indefatigably toward its promulgation, contributing funds and using his personal associates in the court for this purpose. Obviously, then, political expedience helped this Qujar member of the ruling elite shift allegiance. Political expedience similarly prompted his readiness to comply to Mohammad Ali shah's request for his support in eliminating Amin al-Soltan. Though the minister was indeed eliminated without his own intervention, Nazem al-Islam revealed, Ershad al-Daula did win the shah's good grace, which he was able to utilize for the reinstatement of Amir Bahador. Following the death of Amin al-Soltan, Amir Bahador resumed his former post as head of the royal forces. Ershad al-Daula continued to play his role as champion of the constitution, penetrating the most important anjomans together with his three brothers. His network extended everywhere and helped him reach most political circles.

Nazem al-Islam adds here that the courtier set up another secret anjoman, which he put at the shah's service, and which recruited its members from among majles deputies, government and court officials, and other anjomans' leaders. Its main function was to advise the shah in politics. Until the Tupkhana events, and the subsequent triumph of the constitutionalists, this secret anjoman was advising

the shah to comply to the majles's demands. It was only with the increased radicalism of the majles, and the political terror created by the extremist anjomans, that Ershad al-Daula, according to Nazem al-Islam's account, changed his priorities and began to serve the shah's cause directly. As Taqizada, Malek al-Motakallemin, and others, turned against Mohammad Ali shah, some even thinking of replacing him with another Qajar prince on the throne, he decided to back the reigning monarch and thus parted company with the extremist constitutionalists.[86] Daulatabadi confirms the view of Ershad al-Daula as an important supporter of the constitution in the Tupkhana events against the shah and Nuri's plot,[87] even though he was secretly working for the shah and Amir Bahador and subsequently turned openly against the majles.

The Transcaucasian activists continued to increase the number of trained mojahedin smuggled into Iran via Tabriz or Mashhad. Baku remained the headquarters of all groups of Iranian Social Democrats affiliated with the Hemmatists, and direct, although less intensive contacts were also established with the RSDWP in Batum, according to Soviet sources.[88] Within Iran the Social Democratic groups proliferated; all members called themselves mojahedin and formed separate anjomans with distinct leadership in the capital and in the provinces. By the fall 1907, the Hemmatists reportedly attempted to strengthen their control and influence among the various groups and transform them into more tightly knit, hierarchical organizations. At a large meeting held in Mashhad on September 23, 1907, a political program was promulgated and new sets of rules and regulations were adopted for all the mojahedin, also referred to as the "socialist devotees." As in 1906, Nariman Narimanov was responsible for the preparation of the new program, written specifically to fit the needs of Iranians and Iranian sociopolitical conditions. He was by then well known in Social Democratic circles in Iran, and many individuals with whom he corresponded were eager to express their gratitude for his "selfless endeavors" in the struggle for the constitution.[89]

The mojahedin program of 1907[90] closely follows the Hemmatists', but with some variations. It proclaimed that a nation's honor and independence could be best preserved only with the existence of a national consultative assembly, or majles, and a constitution; that trustworthy deputies must be elected to enable the majles to carry on its sacred duties effectively and justly. It insisted emphatically that under no circumstances could the cabinet ministers be trusted. It equally stressed the need for the creation and spread of mojahedin organizations, whose task was to defend the majles and the nation. The mojahedin, it stated, must be ready to sacrifice their lives for the sake of justice, equality, and liberty. Their goals were identified as follows: the continued existence of the majles; universal suffrage, regardless of social, national (that is, religious), or economic background; extension of the secret ballot; direct representation; and guaranteed freedom. Freedom was divided into seven categories: freedom of the press and publication; freedom of speech; freedom of assembly; freedom of opinion; personal freedom of life and property; freedom of information; freedom to stage strikes. These overlapping categories deal with political opinions and beliefs only. Freedom of religion is nowhere mentioned. In fact, in the sets of rules and regulations there is a specific clause that absolutely forbids "great treason with respect to religion, people or fatherland."[91] Mojahedin who commit

blasphemies are to be eliminated. Among the other goals mentioned in the program are the following: compulsory, universal, free education to be administered by the state; confiscation of royal lands and purchase of private lands by banks for distribution to the peasants who till it; progressive income tax and abolition of the tax-farming system; establishment of only one majles, and no other, not even a senate; compulsory universal conscription; an eight-hour workday; accountability of cabinet ministers to the majles, which selects them.

The rules regulating the mojahedin organizations restricted membership in the highly centralized, hierarchical, authoritative command to a very small group of leaders, whose identity would be known to the select few, and who were to be chosen from among the intelligent, educated, and competent members; the central committee would number fifteen. Absolute secrecy was demanded from all, from the top to the bottom echelon. The duties and obligations of each were carefully laid out. Identity cards were to be carried; but each member was allowed, even encouraged, to belong to more than one organization, provided each shared the others' goals. All letterheads were to bear an inscription: "In the name of God the Freedom-Giver." The armed mojahedin, also called feda'is, are defined as active revolutionaries, forming secret cells, some more secretive than others, depending on the nature of their tasks; those in charge of terrorism are highly secretive. The central committee was in charge of the revenues and expenditures, as well as the acquisition of weapons, manufacture of bombs, and hiring of preachers. Extortionate means to raise funds were strictly forbidden, except from the "oppressors and the wealthy reactionaries."

According to the Persian sources, the mojahedin organizations were indeed proliferating throughout the country, especially in Tehran.[92] By the fall of 1907, an attempt was under way to bring them all into a solidly controlled network under the command of a central committee, headquartered in Tehran. The social composition remained lower middle class, with a large percentage of small shopkeepers, artisans, moneychangers, low-ranking civil servants, tollab, and low-ranking mollahs. Nonetheless, lawlessness, chaos, and extortion were widespread, and, with the exception of a handful of anjomans, party discipline was nonexistent.

The press and the preachers increased their activities, adopting an even more overtly radical tone. *Habl al-Matin, Sur-e Israfil, Musavat,* and a more recently founded paper called *Roh al-Qods* were closely identified with the radical anjomans. The owner and publisher of *Sur-e Israfil,* Mirza Qasem Khan Tabrizi, was a classmate of Taqizada, upon whose recommendation Dehkhoda was hired to edit and contribute to the paper.[93] Dehkhoda shared with both Tabrizis a common ideology based on Western anticlerical liberalism mixed with the Russian-style Social Democracy of the Hemmatists. Mirza Jahangir Khan Shirazi, the other editor and contributor, came from the Azali network and collaborated with the radical anjomans. The editor and publisher of *Musavat,* Mirza Reza also of Shiraz, belonged to the same group of journalists and preachers; his paper reflected the Baku press's views. *Roh al-Qods* was founded and edited by a religious dissident who still wore the clerical garb, like Taqizada himself, and published the extremist views of the most radical anjomans.

The radical anjomans widely publicized their intention to resort to violent

means, if necessary, to secure the sovereignty of the nation and the majles. The assassination of Amin al-Soltan was deemed a glorious deed by the *Musavat, Habl al-Matin,* and *Sur-e Israfil;* the assassin was hailed as a national hero by Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez in their respective mosques. Of greater significance is the fact that by then Russian Social Democratic views were openly espoused by both the press and the radical preachers. Jamal al-Din began to introduce in his sermons socialist concepts, wrapped, as usual, in Islamic rhetoric; these contrasted sharply with his social and political conservatism, expressed in his *Sherkat-eslami* and his *Lebas-taqva,* written in 1900. The radical transformation of his ideology followed closely his involvement with the radical anjomans. He talked of the rights of the poor, of their duty to rise in self-defense against the grandees and the rich who exploited them, to claim their God-given equality, to assert it vis-à-vis kings, ministers, and wealthy members of society, since they are the "pillars" of society without whose existence and hard labor the ruling elite could not survive.[94]

Jamal al-Din couched his view of the right of the poor to demand equality in constitutional terms. The poor were oppressed, he stated, as a result of the illegitimate rule of kings who succeeded one another since the death of the Imam Ali, the sole legitimate ruler of the Moslems after the Prophet. Political tyranny, he added, was enforced by clerical tyranny, as the "bad" olama traditionally collaborated with the temporal ruler. By God's commands, the two righteous religious leaders, Mohammad Tabataba'i and Abdollah Behbahani, united their effort to lay the foundation of justice and help in promulgating the constitution. The constitution is the Law of God, the Law of the Koran, at last correctly understood. Now the authority of both the king and the mojtahed is limited by the constitution.[95]

Writers in the radical press also concentrated on publishing rebuttals to Nuri's charges of heresy. Carefully avoiding any open reference to freedom of religion, they chose to underline the political aspects of the clauses subjected to the mojtahed's onslaught. Thus, they defended the concept of freedom of opinion and the pen, lamenting that its meaning was totally distorted by the reactionaries. Not a single day passes, *Musavat* complained, without this concept being discussed in the majles, as the detractors of the constitution seek to identify it with freedom of religion, freedom from obligations and duties, freedom of action. They also distorted the meaning of equality of all before the law, *Musavat* continued, interpreting it as equality in property ownership and in opposing God. "A distorted mind, whose blessed name would pollute the columns of this journal if mentioned, had stated, 'O people, do you know the meaning of equality? Anyone who has a good woman must share her with others.' Such individuals are enemies of learning, opposed to the Moslems' awakening."[96] *Musavat* argued strongly that the writer's obligation and commitment is to truth; the power of the pen must be used freely to unmask the despotic nature of the government, which "shuts the mouth and breaks the pen." Freedom of opinion allows everybody to express their views without fear, even when opposing the interests of the "great."[97]

Reza Musavat charged the "false olama" with corrupting religion, with using their social status to enslave the wretched, ignorant, credulous masses, who thus

confuse the worshiping of God with worshiping corrupt men of religion, these "sellers of religion." The masses, he claimed, "have constructed artificial shrines, and are worshiping the gods of their creation."[98] In times of despotism, irreligion reigned supreme; but nowadays, with the national representative government in power, the true religion is prevailing. However, takfir is still used to condemn those who dare to openly express their "valid and well-founded criticism of wrongdoing and bad traditions."[99] Rising in defense of the constitutionalist preachers, Musavat wrote, "Had they not talked about the misfortunes and wretchedness of the nation, had the newspapermen not written about the defects of the country, today, for sure, Iran would have fallen into the hands of the foreigners." Directly addressing the "owners of the stick of takfir," Musavat warned that should Iran be mourned one day, then religion would be mourned, too; Russia would take over. "Look at the fate of the Caucasus."[100]

Attacks on Nuri were incessant and relentless. "Where does Shaikh Fazlollah get his money from? Whom is he working for?,"[101] *Roh al-Qods* asked bluntly. On the other hand, Tabataba'i and Behbahani were often mentioned in grateful, warm terms; their role in the national movement for freedom was praised duly and lavishly. But the encomiums were interrupted by veiled threats as news of their meetings with Nuri was publicized. The constitutionalist mojtaheds then were asked to set aside their personal differences and help the nation unite against their common enemy. The "hidden hand," according to *Musavat,* was busy destroying the nation's gains. "Do you wish to see that good name of yours change into ill-repute? . . . People shall hold you responsible for the destruction of Iranian life . . . and curse your for ever. . . . Have mercy."[102]

Musavat expressed his firm conviction that the "hidden hand" was raising religious controversies, setting mollahs against "fauxcollis" (those wearing Western garb, the *faux col*), the hat against the turban, the Westernized against the religious-minded, as a means to attain destructive ends.[103] The constitution, he said, is thirteen hundred years old; it was revealed to the Prophet through the archangel Gabriel. No one but God could abrogate it.[104]

The press also increasingly attacked potentially corruptible majles deputies and cabinet ministers. It assumed the right to judge the work of both the government and the majles. "The thieves of the pre-revolution period are now deputies and still engaging in robbing the nation."[105] The shady deals of some wealthy merchants were exposed to the public; their role in the economy was denounced. In an article entitled "To the Merchants," Musavat distinguished "national capitalism," working for the development and well-being of the entire population, from "individual capitalism," working for the personal enrichment of the entrepreneurs. He proclaimed the latter form of capitalism highly detrimental to national economic and industrial progress, serving the purposes of a mere handful of individuals. The nation is getting poorer and poorer, he stated, and less and less developed. "Who is the cause of this misfortune? What is the source of this poverty and wretchedness? Our own uneducated, merciless, unscrupulous merchants, who are willing to ruin a country and dispossess fifteen million people, reducing them to the state of beggars."[106] Musavat viciously attacked the merchants' anjoman, arguing that it only helped the members' interests.

The newspaper *Sur-e Israfil* also began to publish articles calling for agrarian

reforms. It favored the right of the peasants to own the land they tilled, and it sought an end to the feudalism still prevalent in Iran. The laws of nature and of Islam, it argued, do not condone the deprivation of the "working members of society," the laborors and the peasants, or their subjugation to rapacious landlords, the "parasites" (in transliterated French in the text) on earth. It encouraged newspapers to discuss the issue, preachers to spread the word from the minbar, and volunteers to help the peasants fight their landlords until they were liberated from their abject bondage.[107]

It was such radical views that gradually alienated the moderate constitutionalists from the radicals, pitting one anjoman against another. The anjoman-e Azerbaijan, and its allies controlled by Malek al-Motakallemin, Solaiman Maikada, Haidar Amu oghli, as well as the most important papers of Tehran, *Habl al-Matin, Sur-e Israfil, Musavat,* and *Roh al-Qods,* waged a relentless campaign to defame the anjoman-e Adamiyat, the bête noire of the radicals at the time.

It was in Tabriz, however, that Social Democratic ideas were transformed into action in a more drastic fashion than in the capital. The anjoman, still dominated by the Secret Center, continued to refuse to allow the two expelled olama back to town. The members encouraged the peasants to revolt against their landlords and seize their properties. Consequently, unrest and periodic acts of violence shook neighboring villages and Tabriz itself. Merchants and landowners were accused of hoarding wheat, of inflating prices, and of exploiting their peasants. In one violent episode witnessed by Theqat al-Islam, a wealthy merchant was mercilessly put to death by an incensed mob in broad daylight. The anjoman's mojahedin faction set up a committee of twelve members to control the transportation of grain, its distribution to the local bakeries, and the production and pricing of bread. The committee was supervised by a group of four selected inspectors to ensure proper fulfillment of its function. Theqat al-Islam reportedly had approved of the decision, as he attended the meeting. Mehdi Kuzakonani, a wealthy merchant and member of the Secret Center, had also suggested the formation of a cooperative for the provisioning of the needy and for the elimination of the "landowners' tyrannical" monopoly over this vital commodity.[108] Agitators were sent to neighboring towns and villages throughout the spring and early summer of 1907, inciting the population to form anjomans, assume power, and seize the land by force. Violence erupted in Maragha, Maku, Khoy, Salmas, and Ardabil. Javad Nateq, the radical preacher of Tabriz, was active in Maku; Shaikh Ibrahim Zanjani, another radical preacher, in Maragha; and Mirza Jaʿfar Khan, a Transcaucasian Hemmatist, in Khoy. In fact, the Transcaucasian element dominated these events, which Soviet historians labeled "class struggle" or "civil war," whereas Iranian historians referred to them as Haidari–Neʿmati factionalism.[109] The power struggle seriously divided the ranks of the anjoman-e Tabriz membership, as the radicals were by then in complete control of local politics. There were talks of establishing an independent republic or a federal government.[110] The mojahedin roamed the streets, carrying their weapons; they were receiving daily military training. Many Iranian Azerbaijanis wore the garb of fellow mojahedin from the Caucasus, thus appearing indistinguishable from the latter group.

In addition to the tension between the radical and moderate elements within the anjoman, it seems that the radicals themselves were engaged in a power struggle. Reportedly, the two radical factions that emerged in June and July 1907 represented the Transcaucasian mojahedin, on the one hand, and the local Tabriz Social Democrats, on the other.[111] Little is known about this dispute. However, the national factor could not have been the sole reason for dissension. The Transcaucasian group, after all, included Iranians dressed as their northern neighbors; moreover, Ali "Monsieur," the Tabriz radical, headed this faction. It seemed more likely that the bloody fights, fearful to those Social Democrats who had given top priority to consolidating the pragmatic gains thus far accomplished, caused a rapprochement between the latter group and the moderate constitutionalists.

Tehran was alarmed by the news coming from the northern province. The Azerbaijani deputies cabled Tabriz, expressing their anxiety over the state of turmoil prevailing back home. They demanded that the anjoman restore order immediately, stop the factional struggle, and eliminate from its midst the "undesirable, corrupt elements." Taqizada and other radical deputies also joined the moderates in rebuking Tabriz. Azerbaijan was too important a province of Iran for it to fall into the hands of the ruffians, they said in their cables. They specifically condemned the anjoman for speaking in many conflicting voices. "Who are the leaders of the anjoman? Who hold its seal?" The anjoman's response, while reassuring in its insistence that there was order within the ranks and that Azerbaijan was indeed part of Iran, abiding by the command of its sovereign and majles, was nonetheless critical of Tehran. It held Tehran responsible for the turmoil caused by the articles inserted into the constitution, likening them to poison inserted into a human body.[112]

By the end of July, the anjoman did restore order, subduing the voice of the radicals and expelling from town the Transcaucasian and Tabriz extremist elements. It staged public meetings where both the radical and allegedly reactionary preachers gave moderate and pacifying speeches about national unity; all members swore to act lawfully and pledged allegiance to the constitution. The anjoman also announced that the mojahedin's military training would henceforth take place only on Fridays, and that all weapons were to be left at home when there were no military drills. The defense of the city, however, remained in the hands of the mojahedin; the local garrison was disarmed and the government arsenal was under the anjoman's control.[113] In Maku, Khoy, Ardabil, and Maragha, order was also restored, but the radical anjomans lost bloody battles against the government forces.[114]

Peace in Tabriz was illusory. Currents and revolutionary crosscurrents kept stirring the surface. Theqat al-Islam, appalled by the turn of events in Tabriz, found himself increasingly distraught. He persisted in his defense of the constitutional movement, arguing that the "irreligious elements" had existed long before the revolution. The handful of individuals who incite the peasants to revolt against their landlords, he wrote in a letter, have great appeal among the masses, and they are not heretical. They only allow unlawful expropriation of land. These troubles are not related to the constitutional movement.[115] However, Theqat al-Islam complained to Mostashar al-Daula of Taqizada and of his evil

influence on the peasants.[116] Mostashar al-Daula himself was beginning to be alienated by the Tabriz extremists, especially Shaikh Selim, the radical preacher. He told the mojtahed in Tabriz of his frustration and demoralization resulting from the slandering rumors spread about him by the anjoman of Tabriz. He believed that the attacks were in response to his aristocratic birth and his opposition to all acts of lawlessness.[117] In the majles, though, Mostashar al-Daula continued to cooperate with Taqizada, even defending him in letters to Theqat al-Islam. Taqizada, he wrote, does not know how to intrigue; he is straightforward. He is also inexperienced in world affairs and tends to be bookish when he discusses constitutional politics.[118]

Continued opposition on the part of the reactionaries helped the constitutionalists in Tehran and elsewhere maintain a united front, regardless of their ideological differences.

The Tupkhana Events

For three months following Amin al-Soltan's death, there was a working entente between the court and the majles. However, the radicals continued to distrust the shah's motives. Taking advantage of the court's apparent acquiescence, they challenged its authority and defied it to resort to violent means to restore its absolute power. Encouraged by the extremists, the newspapers—despite occasional harassment and even temporary closure—exerted full freedom of opinion. Rather than decreasing their attacks on the opposition and the court, they intensified their hostility to individual officials and courtiers. On the occasion of the fortieth-day anniversary of Abbas Aqa's suicide following his fatal shooting of Amin al-Soltan, the *Habl al-Matin* published an article leaking a thinly disguised threat. It expressed its grateful appreciation of the murder and its support for the feda'is who sacrificed their lives for patriotic goals.[119] The shah himself was occasionally the target of such press virulence. On November 6, 1907, the *Roh al-Qods* published an article entitled "A Word from the Unseen or an Unambiguous Hint," which created a furor in court circles, even embarrassing the moderates. Citing a well-known verse by the poet Sa'di, "The sheep does not exist for [the benefit of] the shepherd/ Rather does the shepherd exist for its service," the author stated in explicit, unambiguous terms, "There is a difference between subjects and slaves: to submit to selfish ambitions is incumbent on slaves, not on subjects, who are no slaves but free men, nay, even equal to the King himself. It is for them to reward the King's claims for his guardianship only when the King fulfills the duties of such guardianship and shepherdhood." The article reviewed the long history of Iran and its monarchs from pre-Islamic times to the present; it deplored the fact that national decline, which began with the current dynasty, flourished under Mohammad Ali shah. It addressed the shah directly, asking: "Have all the kings of the world neglected their duties and proper function and turned their attention to butchery? Are all the nations of the world, like the unhappy nation of Persia, become thralls to the tyranny and selfish ambitions of their rulers? I know not why all other nations tend towards prosperity, expansion and increase in numbers, save only Persia, of which some part each year, nay,

each month, becomes the portion of others, and some souls become the food of wolves, while what remains of its prosperity is turned into desolation." Then it warned the shah that "the story of Louis the Sixteenth may be repeated in this kingdom" and that the feda'is who had been instrumental in the killing of Amin al-Soltan were prepared "for a greater task." It warned the shah against any accord with a foreign power, asserting it might end with loss of sovereignty. "If His Majesty the King and his family consider it a pride and an honour to become the attendants and servants of foreigners, we, the people, deem subjection to such dominion a shame and a disgrace."[120]

The article prompted the minister of the press to summon its author, Soltan al-Olama Khorasani, who was also the editor of the paper. Nevertheless, despite the explicit threat and the disrespectful tone, he was not punished. In the majles, Speaker Ehtesham al-Saltana passionately defended freedom of the press, even though he readily declared articles defaming religion or the government were not to be tolerated. He successfully pushed for a resolution to issue a warning to the paper but to pardon Khorasani for his offense this time.[121] Kasravi wrote that the author of this "historic article" had stubbornly refused to answer questions and had called for a jury trial. The case was dropped.[122] It was three days later that the shah came to the majles to renew his oath of support.

Nevertheless, according to most sources, Sa'd al-Daula, Amir Bahador, and Kamran Mirza were all intriguing against the majles. They hired a preacher by the name of Seyyed Ali Yazdi, who was to use his Friday sermons to denounce the constitutionalists and to proclaim the movement a Babi conspiracy to eradicate Islam. In late November, the shah wrote a letter to the majes complaining of the disturbances created by the anjomans and of its members' unlawful meddling in state affairs. He urged the majles to resort to strict measures to curb their activities, and he gave the deputies a few days to restore order in the capital. The majles's response was defiant. It reminded the shah of the law granting the anjomans freedom of action, refuted all charges of lawlessness against them, and explicitly asked him to abolish those secret societies with known ties with the court which, they alleged, were the real cause of chaos in the city.[123] While Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and the press intensified their attacks on the reactionaries, the radical anjomans were buying arms with funds contributed by Zell al-Soltan, who hoped to ascend the throne with the majles's help, and by Feridun Jahanian, a wealthy Zoroastrian merchant. Letters were sent to the shah in the name of the nation, demanding the banishment of Sa'd al-Daula and Amir Bahador. The tension in the capital was reaching its climax. On December 14, 1907, Naser al-Molk resigned, and his cabinet fell.

This cautious measure did not save the ministers from the shah's wrath. The following day, Naser al-Molk and a few other statesmen, including Ala' al-Daula, the majles Speaker's brother, who had gone to the palace to mediate with the shah on behalf of the majles, were arrested. Rumors of an imminent coup spread quickly. In fact, the crowd that had assembled at the gate of the majles to defend it was rapidly dispersed by the royal guards, and the deputies and some leading constitutionalists took bast in the majles itself, closing its gate. The anjomans were inactive, there was no fighting, and the bazaar was closed. On December 16 the British envoy cabled London: "For the present the coup d'etat seems to be

successful." Armed ruffians and anticonstitutionalist preachers set up tents in the Tupkhana square, the main thoroughfare of the capital, attracting huge crowds of idle spectators. Alcoholic beverages, according to all sources, including the British dispatches, were freely offered, and the degree of intoxication was obvious, as the assembled masses verbally abused the constitutionalists and killed three of them. Others marched toward the majles chanting "We want the Koran; we do not want the Constitution," while preachers piously called for the destruction of the heretic assembly and its heretic constitution, death to the deputies and their supporters. The court reportedly paid all the expenses and had Cossacks guard the square and the crowd assembled there. Nuri and other anticonstitutionalist olama joined them to lend legitimacy and credibility to the Islamic slogans directed against the constitution.[124] For twenty-four hours the hired ruffians, the anticonstitutionalist olama, and the shah had the upper hand.

By December 17, the situation reversed almost abruptly and, to the mind of the confused common spectator, inexplicably. The anjomans assembled their armed men in the Baharestan square, where the majles was located, and occupied the Sepahsalar mosque and school, which, a day earlier, had been barred to them by order of its director, Seyyed Zahir al-Islam, the brother of the Imam Jomʿa of Tehran.[125] Members of the aristocratic anjomans fought side by side with the radicals in defense of the constitution. Both the anjoman-e Adamiyat and the anjoman-e omara, along with the various organizations under the covert or overt leadership of Ershad al-Daula, participated on the nationalist side. In fact, Mokhber al-Saltana, Ershad al-Daula, and Abbas Qoli Khan took credit individually for having aborted the coup by persuading the shah to give up this costly folly, advising him instead to seek conciliation and save the nation from chaos.[126] The excited crowd in the Tupkhana square was restrained from assaulting the majles, since Nuri failed to receive the expected "go-ahead" signal from the court.[127] The radicals, on the other hand, assigned themselves and their anjomans all credit for the successful resistance to the coup. Indeed, the preachers, the deputies, and the newspapermen actively promoted their cause in Baharestan and eventually had the Tupkhana crowd evicted. Behind the scene, however, the more moderate constitutionalists were busy negotiating with the shah, who saw himself compelled to deny that he was planning a coup against the majles and the constitution and to state that his grudges were directed against a handful of individuals who were transgressing the limits set by the law. Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Taqizada, and the editors of the papers *Sur e-Israfil* and *Roh al-Qods* figured in the royal blacklist.[128] Once more, Mokhber al-Saltana was the chosen intermediary between the court and the majles. He skillfully maneuvered to appease both parties and have them reach a compromise, and he convinced Amir Bahador to order Nuri to disperse the crowd at the Tupkhana square. At the same time he had the anjomans dismiss their supporters in the Baharestan. Eventually he even succeeded in gently dissuading Nuri from prolonging his stay in the Maravi school, where he and the Tupkhana crowd had sought bast, and had him go home on December 31. Had Behbahani conceded to Nuri a "corner of the rug," Mokhber al-Saltana wrote in his memoirs, the disturbances would not have reached such proportions.[129]

The three olama of Najaf, in response to Behbahani's request, cabled the

takfir of Nuri and all individuals who refused to abide by the constitution or disobeyed the majles orders. Kasravi, in keeping with his general emphasis on the importance of the anjoman-e Azerbaijan in these events, claims that the anjoman's request to the provinces to cable the shah a threat to overthrow him was instrumental in frightening the shah into accepting negotiations, even though, he added, the anjomans never contemplated the possibility of crowning Zell al-Soltan shah.[130] Browne, on the other hand, quoting his correspondent in Tehran, described the events in accordance with the moderates' version, terming the shah's failure to deal "the decisive blow" a loss of nerve.[131]

In reality Anglo-Russian intervention saved the majles from destruction. British and Russian diplomats agreed on the necessity of keeping the shah on the throne as the only chance of preventing Iran from "falling still deeper into the slough of anarchy. . . . Should he be removed, there would be the prospect of a long Regency, and all disinterested Persians are agreed in looking on a Council of Regency as being unworkable as would be a Republic. Owing to personal jealousies and interested motives, an experiment of the kind would result in hopeless and helpless confusion. . . . If, then, constitutional government is to have a fair trial, the best chance of success would be under a Shah who has had his lesson severely taught to him."[132] An official Anglo-Russian Proclamation pledged full support for the reigning monarch and his chosen heir. The British and Russian envoys, upon instructions from their respective governments, jointly warned the shah against any drastic action. As early as December 16, London and Moscow had reached agreement to stop the shah from "producing serious troubles in Tehran." By the eighteenth, Marling cabled Grey that he and his Russian colleague had already seen the shah and had asked him to "remove the hooligans, as they are a danger to the Europeans." On the twenty-first, Marling again informed his minister that he and the Russian envoy had urged the shah to work with the majles for the welfare of the nation and not abolish the constitutional regime, and that they had then communicated to the majles the royal assurances of cooperation. Zell al-Soltan was explicitly told he would receive neither British nor Russian protection should he continue to intrigue against the reigning monarch.[133]

Sa'd al-Daula was banished and Amir Bahador placed under the command of the Ministry of Defense. The shah renewed his oath to observe the constitution. In return, the majles assured the shah of its support for his reign and promised not to offer the throne to any other Qajar claimant. Both sides displayed moderation, in sharp contrast to the virulence of their respective rhetoric, their proclaimed readiness to shed blood, the sheer number of their respective partisans carrying arms, and, more importantly, the high stakes at issue. Kasravi claims the nationalists never considered, or worked with, Zell al-Soltan as a better alternative to Mohammad Ali shah. Yet all sources admit that the anjomans were financed by the prince, who was cultivating his ties with the majles leaders, acting as a devoted champion of the constitution. Mostashar al-Daula, writing about the mounting tension in the capital weeks before the eruption of the crisis, had noted the political climate among the constitutionalists was such, and their hostility to the shah so intense, that a change on the throne was imminent. Daulatabadi confessed that Behbahani had secretly contacted him to negotiate

with Zell al-Soltan the price for the mojtahed's role in proclaiming the deposition of Mohammad Ali shah and his replacement by the prince. How involved Daulatabadi was in the conspiracy is hard to determine, given the self-serving nature of this, and most other, accounts. The price tag was staggering, 150,000 tomans, payable in advance. Zell al-Soltan reportedly replied that he would pay after the mission was accomplished.[134]

Just as Mohammad Ali shah missed his chance of dealing the decisive blow to the majles and restoring the old order on the night of December 15, so did the constitutionalists fail to seize the opportunity in the following days, when the tide reversed and thousands of armed supporters volunteered to fight. Kasravi declared this failure on the part of the majles to dethrone the shah and thus uproot the source of all troubles and, simultaneously, "cut short the encroaching hand of the foreigners," an "unworthy" deed. The majles had been turned into a tool in the hands of the foreigners, who "fooled" the liberals and "worked behind the scene."[135] Malekzada, in the same vein, denounced the majles deputies' reluctance to seize the opportunity and "save the Constitution forever" through the use of force, and their adoption of a weak policy of conciliation and compromise.[136] The issue, however, was not that of missed opportunities, or loss of nerve, or hidden hands of foreigners; it was political disunity. While struggling for the passage of the constitution and its supplement, the nationalist liberals and radicals, including the religious dissidents, enjoyed the full support of the moderates as well as members of the conservative ruling elite. Together they offered a united front that fought hard to lay the legal foundation for the radical social transformation of twentieth-century Iran. On the political front, however, unity crumbled. Moreover, within each group, the perceived political objectives to be obtained were hardly unilateral. Members of the anjoman-e Adamiyat, or of the omara, were determined to keep the constitution, safeguarding it from the extremists' designs, and to allow greater power to the executive. The shah and some of his inner circle would have recklessly revoked the constitution with the help of Nuri and other anticonstitutionalist olama, without conceding the religious leadership political authority. The constitutionalist ranks, on the other hand, were even more divided, torn by crosscurrents ranging from moderate English-type liberalism to Russian-inspired Social Democratic radicalism. There was no consensus as to the political structure and program envisioned by either the court or the constitutionalist side. This was to become evident in subsequent months. At this stage of the Tupkhana events, the political lines were not yet sharply delineated; the passage of the supplement was still recent, and the struggle for its implementation ongoing. It is highly significant that, regardless of his inner motives, Ershad al-Daula, Amir Bahador's protégé and the would-be instrument of the destruction of the majles in June 1908, fought together with the liberals and radicals in the turbulent mid-December days.

10

The Coup

"The difference between our nation and others," proclaimed Aqa Shaikh Mohammad Ali, a Majles deputy, "is that others first shed blood then acquired a Constitution, and thus to them the Constitution is sacred. In our country we are shedding blood, and committing acts of violence, in order to ensure the application of the Constitution."[1] Indeed, there was a general feeling among the constitutionalists that the constitution was "given" to them, that they had not earned it the hard way, and that the real struggle began only when the time came to implement it. The relative ease with which they pushed for and enacted laws that entailed far-reaching consequences to the traditional social and political order underscored the fact that a number of the participants who had acquiesced were determined to resist the execution of individual articles which they deemed detrimental to their personal interests. The constitutionalist olama, including Behbahani, supported the passage of laws whose application they subsequently obstructed. Similarly, court officials helped the passage of the supplement, only to side with the reactionary shah when the majles came to exercise its power in the political process. Any group or individual who stood to lose from the effective execution of the law attempted to undermine, covertly or openly, the work of the majles.

Continued Struggle for the Constitution

In the relative calm that followed the storm of mid-December, fear and paranoia reigned supreme in the majles and at court. Though the shah, shaken and humbled by his aborted coup, had retired to the private quarters of the palace, and the nationalists loudly proclaimed their triumph over tyranny, fear of renewed loyal hostility kept eroding further whatever trust remained among the constitutionalists' ranks. Corruption prevailed among the deputies, politicians, and members of the anjomans. Large sums collected (or rather extorted from individuals for the national bank) were appropriated with no accounts given. Bribes were freely given and taken for private causes. However, contrary to Marling's assertion that the ministers were paralyzed and the majles was showing "no aptitude whatever for its proper functions,"[2] the struggle over drafting laws concerning the press and the judiciary remained intense.

The press assumed a greater role in shaping public opinion, in disseminating news related to the political process and the debates within the majles and

without. It took to task the majles deputies and politicians, revealing and denouncing some individuals' incompetence, shady deals, betrayals. Often the newspapers indulged in publishing slanderous articles, defaming officials, deputies, or anjoman leaders. Such publications aroused fear and hostility among the targets. The issue was brought to the majles, where the press laws were still being discussed. Partisans of freedom of the press attempted to minimize the harm of such articles and defended the right of the papers to publish despite some individual writers' articles. They insisted on punishing the authors of the objectionable articles but not the newspapers. Majles deputies like Taqizada and Imam Jomʿa Khoʾi, government ministers like Mokhber al-Saltana, even Speaker Ehtesham al-Saltana, were united in their desire to ensure the survival of a free press. However, no objection was raised to the idea of establishing censorship to check any abuse of the press and to ensure the publication of articles beneficial to the public. The special committee in charge of drafting the press laws could not, however, reach consensus. The mild penalties proposed by some—imposition of fines instead of prison sentences—were opposed by others, who argued that penalty fees instead of imprisonment was contrary to sharʿ laws.[3] The press laws were finally promulgated in spring 1908. Publication of articles deemed harmful and contrary to religion was strictly forbidden; any book with religious content was to be cleared by a special committee pertaining to religious affairs at the Ministry of Education. Articles attacking the monarch, foreign governments, or foreign representatives were banned. All printing and publishing companies had to abide by the press rules and regulations. Although severe political restrictions were imposed on the publishers, there was a great measure of freedom for the publication of sociocultural works. Religious subjects were, naturally, restricted, but the censorship authority resided in the Ministry of Information and Publication, and not with an independent olama court. Clerical members of the press committee pertaining to religious affairs worked under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education.[4] Ultimately, the press laws marked another success for the secularist element.

The struggle for judiciary reform was not easily won, as serious obstacles were encountered within religious circles. In the first half of January of that year, the shah was chastized by the leader of the Qajar tribe, Azod al-Molk, who threatened to have him deposed should he not cooperate with the majles. The British envoy, too, was pressuring the monarch, warning him that "his position was already precarious," and that he should work with the majles to "avoid a disaster for himself."[5] The shah was thus compelled to give in to the majles demands for the arrest of the two leaders of the ruffians involved in the Tupkhana events, where three men had lost their lives. He also agreed to bring to trial the assassins of Feridun Jahanian, a Zoroastrian merchant siding with the constitutionalists, who had been killed a few weeks earlier. The guilty party responsible for the Tupkhana troubles received a milder sentence than the majles had requested, since Behbahani decided against a death penalty.[6] The separate trial of Feridun's case, on the other hand, became a raging battle, with the court faction opposing the majles and the olama against the secularists. At stake was the issue of judiciary reforms, and, more importantly, the implementation of article 8 of the supplement, which granted equality before the law to all Iranians.

The radical anjomans, led by Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, assumed responsibility to bring Feridun's family's case to the Ministry of Justice. It constituted the first public attempt at applying article 8, since the family demanded the accomplices, all Moslem, receive harsh sentences, not simply "blood-money" fines, the traditional sentence when the victim was a non-Moslem. The majles and the radical anjomans pressed for a death sentence. The newspapers picked up the case and gave it wide coverage. Members of the Zoroastrian community sent letters to the majles, passionately pleading for justice. The British envoy intervened with government officials to ensure that proper justice be done on behalf of the victim's family and coreligionists. The trial dragged on for weeks, as the olama resisted the use of article 8 of the supplement. The nine accomplices were finally sentenced to a thousand lashes each, and two of them were then sent to prison for fifteen years. A crowd of several thousand watched with delight the bastinado of Moslem killers of the Zoroastrian merchant. The olama were reportedly unanimously outraged by such a public demonstration of radical departure from traditional Islamic law.[7] Majd al-Islam claims members of the anjomans and of the majles, as well as Behbahani, were heavily bribed by the Zoroastrians to push for this harsh sentence.[8]

When the new cabinet was formed following the Tupkhana events, with Nezam al-Saltana as prime minister, Mokhber al-Satana held the post of minister of justice. He, together with the fiery majles Speaker, Ehtesham al-Saltana, worked vigorously to pass the laws pertaining to the Ministry of Justice in keeping with the relevant clauses in the constitution. They encountered no less vigorous attempts by Behbahani and fellow olama, be they for or against the constitution, to prevent the actual implementation of the judiciary clauses, and the ensuing battle severely delayed the enaction of the laws for the Ministry of Justice. In his memoirs, Mokhber al-Saltana wrote that his chief concern was to put an end to the time-honored practice of the informal court, very often held in the shar' judge's own house, and to the no less traditional judicial custom of accepting "gifts" from the defendants. To do so effectively, he instituted what he regarded as a far-reaching reform procedure, by revoking the law that required the minister of justice to give his official approval before the local judge's sentence was implemented. He also canceled the law that authorized the minister to refer cases to a particular olama court, which often led to widespread abuse of office. He attempted to grant individual courts full responsibility to try cases and implement sentences, with the Ministry supervising the speedy execution of the sentences. His own feud with Behbahani, Mokhber al-Saltana added, had begun when he refused to give his approval to an Isfahan court judgment upon Behbahani's recommendation. Behbahani, Mokhber al-Saltana went on, wished to maintain his control of the judiciary system, despite the new laws.

Mokhber al-Saltana changed post within a few weeks, taking over the Ministry of Press and Publications. The new minister of justice fared no better in his attempts to reform the system. Behbahani intensified his private war, enlisting the support of a number of clerical deputies and their respective clients within the majles, thus attributing a broader religious basis to his dispute. Debates were also held outside the majles, in private homes where the two sides would meet informally, in the hope of reaching a compromise and resolving the impasse. One

such meeting was organized by the anjoman-e asnaf, upon the instructions of Daulatabadi and Mokhber al-Saltana, bringing together some of the olama, including Behbahani, some deputies and government officials, and other anjoman leaders. At this meeting Malek al-Motakallemin emphatically pronounced the entire sharʿ system defective. Mokhber al-Saltana followed, raising the thorny issue of the necessity to reform the sharʿ and the orf systems. He stated his conviction that the root of the legal problems lay in the "conflicting" or "contradicting" rulings of the courts. The Ministry, he stated, needed to distinguish those laws worth preserving from those that should be abrogated. He then called on the olama to sort out the "right" laws from the "wrong" laws, to execute the former and "burn" the latter. Behbahani reportedly expressed his outrage at hearing that "God's commands should be burned." He left the meeting, followed by the other olama; the government officials "ran away." That very evening Sadr al-Olama, Behbahani's son-in-law, asked the guild leaders to close the bazaar in protest of Mokhber al-Saltana's "heretical views," but they refused, rising to his defense instead.[10]

Paradoxically, Behbahani was at the same time in league with Taqizada and the anjoman-e Azerbaijan faction against their political opponent, Ehtesham al-Saltana, whom they were accusing of working secretly for the court. On the other hand, Taqizada and other secularist anjomans sided with Ehtesham al-Saltana in his fight for the judiciary reforms opposed by Behbahani. While they advocated the establishment of modern schools and were not averse to importing foreign systems of education, the extremists tried to block the Speaker's project for expanding the German school he had helped found in the capital. It was Ehtesham al-Saltana's procedure, and not the idea of a foreign school, that Taqizada fought in the majles. In fact, the majles voted for sending students abroad and in favor of the German school in Tehran.[11] Throughout January 1908, Ehtesham al-Saltana openly attacked Behbahani in the majles, accusing the mojtahed of taking bribes and of working against constitutional interests. The radical deputies, headed by Taqizada, fueled the argument, wishing to erode the Speaker's power and force him to resign. Behbahani, according to Daulatabadi, was aware of the radicals' anticlericalism and of the fact that they were supporting him only because they wished to eliminate their common political enemy. The mojtahed reportedly feared isolation should one or the other faction, moderate or radical, triumph. Ehtesham al-Saltana eventually resigned as the radicals exerted more pressure, and his own coalition of moderate and conservative deputies led to naught. The radicals were then freed to openly express their objections to Behbahani's stubborn desire to control the judiciary.

On the day Ehtesham al-Saltana resigned, Behbahani delayed the passage of the judiciary laws and insisted on having them first reviewed by a council of mojtaheds. The debates dragged on for weeks. Behbahani renewed his call for a clerical council when the new Speaker declared the regulations for the Ministry of Justice were completed and ready for publication. Mostashar al-Daula, the Azerbaijan deputy, then informed Behbahani that the regulations consisted of two major sections, one pertaining to the administration of justice and the other pertaining to the penal code, adding that a committee should be formed to officially distinguish the one from the other and to send to the olama the penal

section for review. The rules pertaining to the administration of justice were to be reviewed by the majles. Behbahani refused to recognize the distinction, arguing that both sections had to be examined by the olama. The entire judiciary system, he maintained, was related to the execution of sharʿ laws; the Ministry's sole function was to implement the shariat. The majles had no authority to restrict the functions of the sharʿ courts; the shariat was not subject to restrictions or limitations.[12]

The debate went on, with opponents and proponents of reform passionately defending their views. Those in favor of separation of orf and sharʿ jurisdictions argued that no law contrary to religion had ever been enacted; that the constitution ensured the application of the shariat; that the majles was composed of Moslem deputies, not of foreigners. They distinguished what they termed "political rights" from "sharʿ rights," and they requested the swift passage of the rules pertaining to the administration of justice, since they were not of sharʿ concerns, while conceding to the olama the right to review the penal code. Finally, the olama were charged with deliberately delaying the formation of the necessary committee; they were warned that the anjomans were getting impatient, and rumors were already spreading that the olama were responsible for the delay because they were resisting its passage. Some deputies, resentful of the olama's reluctance to comply with the proposed legislation, brought up the issue of lack of consensus among sharʿ judges, pointing at identical cases that were treated differently, or to the same case receiving conflicting rulings from different olama. A more uniform system was needed, it was repeatedly emphasized, that would disregard the religious or social background of the defendants and would ensure equality before the law for all, rich and poor, Moslem and non-Moslems. Taqizada in this long session forcefully articulated his view that all laws and regulations should be reviewed by the majles itself, and not separately, though utmost care should be adopted to avoid passage of any law deemed contrary to the shariat. Vakil al-Ro'aya, a deputy from Hamadan, pushed the argument further by stating the Islamic law was universal and immutable, but its application was not the sole prerogative of the mojtaheds, simply because it was not possible to have *all* of them meet in one place at the same time. The power of the judiciary could not be delegated to them collectively, with no one else intervening. No good results would ensue from such a practice.

Behbahani's opinion prevailed. The deputies passed a resolution to form a committee of olama and lay deputies, and they decided that the candidates for the council of five mojtaheds should be from Tehran or any other city or province throughout the nation. The committee was set up, with a cleric deputy, Shaikh Mohammad Ali, as its chairman; a lay physician, Dr. Valiollah, as his deputy; and Aqa Shaikh Ibrahim, the radical Tabiz mollah deputy, its secretary. Two olama members, Aqa Mohammad Jaʿfar and Imam Jomʿa Kho'i, complained that the mojtaheds did not attend the meetings and declared that no deliberation could take place without the presence of at least six olama.[13]

By early June, reform of the judiciary was still at an impasse. While the olama reportedly continued to boycott the committee's meetings, forcing its chairman to complain to the majles that it existed in name only, the minister of justice incessantly complained to the majles of the chaotic state of judiciary affairs. The rules

and regulations for the Ministry were not yet promulgated; its budget was not determined. The deputies continued their arguments over whether there should be separation of orf and shar' jurisdictions, and whether shar' cases should first be referred to the Ministry or to the shar' court. As one deputy reminded his colleagues, article 71 of the supplement already stipulated that all cases had to be referred to the Supreme Court (divan-adalat-e ozma) before being passed on to shar' courts if decided appropriate.[14] But the olama's resistance delayed its application. By that time, however, the political turbulence in the capital forced all groups and individuals to postpone indefinitely the passage of the rules and regulations of the Ministry of Justice. The judiciary reforms, like the entire constitution, were to be suspended within less than two weeks.

The Anjomans

The remarkable success of the constitutionalists in their effort to legislate far-reaching reforms, the strategic skills they displayed in maneuvering to undercut the olama, including those who supported the constitution, and to gain the help of members of the court and the nobility, and, above all, the pragmatic ability they demonstrated in transcending ideological differences in order to ensure the passage of the supplement—these assets were no longer there to help them save the constitution and the majles against the political reactionaries. Throughout the spring of 1908 the political strength of the constitutionalists was rapidly eroding as their united front disintegrated, and, conversely, the court was gathering strength. Here the role of the anjomans was decisive in shattering the constitutionalists' alliances.

The first anjoman to succumb to a disintegration was the anjoman-e Adamiyat. In the wake of the Tupkhana events, its leader, Abbas Qoli Khan, was already under attack, the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and its allies among the religious dissidents—especially Malek al-Motakallemin—proving to be his most relentless opponents. Tabataba'i accused Abbas Qoli Khan of secretly working for the shah and against the constitution. In his response Abbas Qoli Khan rose in defense of the constitutional monarchy, of the majles, and of the laws it enacted; he argued that his principal objective in offering the shah membership in his anjoman was to achieve national unity and attain the court's goodwill and support. The Tupkhana events, he added, reflected the sins of the wrongdoers themselves, and no one else's. He then accused Tabataba'i directly of failing to restrain the preachers and the journalists from abusing the freedom granted the nation and to prevent the extremists from damaging the hard-won entente with the court.[15] Abbas Qoli Khan's credentials as a champion of the constitution and his well-known support for Ehtesham al-Saltana, who was then struggling for the passage of the supplement and the right to execute the new laws, were of no avail. The extremists, whose constant harassment of the majles Speaker forced him to resign, were determined to defame him and his association. Widely circulated newspaper articles, pamphlets, and shabnamas revealed the alleged extortionist nature of the anjoman's activities and the mercenary interests of its leader. People were warned not to join it; its members were invited to defect.

The anjoman-e Hoquq, founded as a branch of the Adamiyat organization, officially broke its ties with it toward the middle of January, when it joined forces with the anjoman-e Azerbaijan. The Hoquq leader, Solaiman Mirza, and his brother Yahya Mirza had already shown radical inclinations before the Tupkhana events; indeed, they had been seen demonstrating against Amin al-Soltan outside the majles shortly before the prime minister's assassination. However, they also figured prominently in the anjoman-e Adamiyat delegation that went to the palace on the occasion of the shah's initiation. Another prominent member of the Adamiyat society, Mirza Ali Khan Entezam al-Hokama, who was also a close friend of Abbas Qoli Khan and was present at the royal initiation ceremony, had defected with the Hoquq group.[16] However, unlike the Qajar brothers, he did not turn into a radical entirely devoted to the extremists' cause. Nevertheless, the bitter fight between the defectors and their former associates increased the rift that grew wider among the constitutionalists, alienating the moderates from the radicals and adding weight to the shah's secret war.

Of greater consequence to the constitutional movement was Ershad al-Daula's about-face. His activities on the side of the liberals were, as already noted, highly suspect, and his true motives were questioned. Nevertheless, his role as founder and co-sponsor of many anjomans that championed the constitution and the supplement and his part in the fateful Tupkhana events as organizer of the Baharestan resistance to counterrevolutionary assaults are recorded in the annals of the revolution. The fact that he was able to rise high in the leadership of the anjoman-e Markazi, the organization that assumed centralized power on behalf of all existing proconstitution anjomans, and that other liberal leaders trusted him enough to allow him full control, adds weight to the argument that he was in favor of the constitution but not for political radicalism. His well-known feud with Malek al-Motakallemin, who finally succeeded in having him expelled from the central organization, is no proof of his "guilt." He was no more "royalist" at that time than Ehtesham al-Saltana, or Sani' al-Daula, or many other wellborn officials who espoused the constitutionalist cause but had chosen to remain loyal to the reigning monarch. Following his expulsion, however, he actively worked for the destruction of the majles. According to Nazem al-Islam, Ershad al-Daula, appalled by the extremism of the preachers, the vitriolic nature of the press, and the arrogance of the radical deputies who dominated the majles, began to have his doubts over the legitimacy of the majles. He also feared Zell al-Soltan's ambitious drive to seize the throne with the help of the radicals, especially the Azerbaijanis, who had hated Mohammad Ali shah from the time he was crown prince in Tabriz. Zell al-Soltan was reportedly contributing cash and arms to the extremists, and Malek al-Motakallemin was known to be his agent with the constitutionalists. Some worked for Zell al-Soltan, others for Salar al-Daula, but, in defense of his role in the coup of June 1908, Ershad al-Daula argued, "I chose to protect the present shah."[17]

Malekzada attributes sole credit for the defense of the majles to the Revolutionary Committee. The Revolutionary Committee was formed as a central anjoman to coordinate the activities of all existing anjomans and assume an executive function to communicate to the press and the majles the decisions made by its members. The members, the author reported, were the leading

figures in constitutionalist circles, Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Jahangir Khan, Mohammad Reza Musavat, Hakim al-Molk, Taqizada, and others.[18] Was this committee identical to the anjoman-e Markazi, headed by Ershad al-Daula until he was expelled, which, according to most sources, acted as the central committee for all anjomans? It is difficult to know for sure; nevertheless, ambitious anjomans did proliferate, each assuming the position of centralized leadership over the others. Moreover, both Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, like many other constitutionalists, belonged to more than one anjoman, and, as noted previously, the function and activities of most anjomans overlapped.

According to Malekzada, the Revolutionary Committee was fully aware that the nationalist ranks were being infiltrated by the shah's secret agents and that many of the majles deputies were defecting to the royalist camp. They also knew of the British and Russian governments' determination to support the reign of Mohammad Ali shah and of Russia's secret intention to help the shah fight against the majles and revoke the constitution. They recognized the fact that Britain, despite its initial help and support for the constitutionalists, would "sacrifice" its liberal policy for the sake of honoring the Anglo-Russian Entente. The committee, therefore, was convinced that Mohammad Ali shah had to be deposed before he renewed his efforts to attack. It was also fully conscious of the fact that the execution of this plan was not possible without majles approval. In a secret meeting in early February, the committee decided to work for the deposition of the shah in order to save the constitution and ensure freedom and liberty for the nation. Haidar Amu oghli was entrusted with the task of staging acts of terrorism. The radical press called for the destruction of the "roots of tyranny."[19]

The Majles–Court War

The radicals thus provided the shah and his aides with one more excuse to charge the majles with incompetence and failure to restore law and order. On February 28, 1908, a bomb exploded near the royal carriage. The shah escaped unharmed, though two members of his retinue lost their lives and many others were wounded. The majles and the press unanimously expressed their joy and relief for the miraculous survival of the sovereign. No speedy attempt, however, was made to investigate and arrest the culprits. Nine days later, the shah sent an angry letter to the majles, warning that he would personally take charge to bring the criminals to justice should the deputies fail to fulfill their responsibility.

In a hastily convened special session, the majles deputies condemned the evil act, and Imam Jom'a Kho'i expressed his conviction that it was the work of foreigners wishing to alienate the shah from his nation and thus destroy the constitution. Taqizada implored the shah to continue to trust and cooperate with the nation, while Mirza Aqa Mojahed asserted there existed a "third force," aiming at no one in particular but wishing to destroy society from within. He begged the majles to give top priority to combating it before it was too late.[20] In a special editorial the *Sur-e Israfil* reminded its readers and the shah of the constitutional separation of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers and insisted

that the task of investigation and trial was not that of the majles.[21] Weeks passed, and no action was taken to arrest the suspects. In early April, the shah's police arrested four employees of the gas company, including Haidar Amu oghli.

Neither the minister of justice nor the prime minister himself was consulted—or even informed—beforehand. The radical anjomans vehemently protested such a blatant violation of the constitution, which forbade arbitrary arrest. They organized mass demonstrations at the Sepahsalar mosque and sent an official petition to the majles. According to Kasravi, the "agents of the Baku Committee of Tehran" were involved in staging this protest in order to stop the trial from taking place, and thus prevent public disclosure of its involvement.[22] The ministers were pressed by the majles to dissuade the shah from investigating further. The prisoners, brought to the Ministry of Justice, were declared not guilty of complicity and were released. The incident marked another triumph for the radical anjomans as the investigation was shelved. But it also heightened the tension between the court and the majles.

In early May, billboards attributed to the Bahais were posted on the walls of Tehran with a message: the constitutional movement was initiated by the Bahais to attain freedom, eradicate Islam, and ensure the conversion of all Iranians to their faith; moreover, the Bahais occupied most of the seats in the majles, they had complete control over it, and they were willing to cooperate with the shah to dissolve the majles, if he agreed to grant them complete freedom of worship and personal safety. Upon investigation, it was revealed that the author of this message was a lower-ranking mollah attached to the anticonstitutionalist, procourt religious circles, who conspired to discredit the majles and the constitutionalists as heretics. The mollah was arrested and brought to trial at the Ministry of Justice. Reportedly it was the first time in history that a "holy man with all his beard and turban" was brought to the secular court for trial[23] and publicly bastinadoed, despite the olama's protest. Meanwhile, the press was increasingly radical and anti-shah. The newspaper *Musavat* even published an inflammatory article attacking the shah personally.[24] When the shah asked the Ministry of Justice to bring its author to court, the anjomans blocked the trial.[25]

There was growing consensus among the moderates that some semblance of law and order had to be restored, and the extremists had to be checked. Steps were taken to achieve national reconciliation among both the lay and clerical leaders. A concerted effort was led by Tabataba'i and Behbahani, Theqat al-Islam of Tabriz, Imam Jom'a Ko'i and Mostashar al-Daula, the deputies from Azerbaijan, Mokhber al-Saltana, who had recently assumed a new post as governor-general of Azerbaijan, among others, to arrange for Mirza Hasan the mojtahed of Tabriz to return to his hometown. He was received with great honor in the majles, where Imam Jom'a Kho'i officially welcomed him and expressed his hope that the mojtahed would offer his somewhat delayed promise of support for the constitution. In response, the mojtahed assured the Assembly he had always warmly supported the constitution, that his delay was due to circumstances beyond his control, and he promised full cooperation in the future. Taqizada and other radicals showed their willingness to solve "minor differences" of the past.[26] It was a grand gesture on the part of the constitutionalists to forgive and let bygones be bygones. National unity was needed to safeguard the

constitution; the spirit of pragmatism and compromise prevailed. The Tabriz radicals, however, objected to the mojtahed's return to Tabriz; nonetheless, toward the end of May, the Imam Jom'a of Tabriz and the mojtahed were received as heroes in their hometown. Within a month, both were to resume their anticonstitutional activities.[27]

According to Daulatabadi, some of the constitutionalists' attempts to maintain "national unity" and preserve the precarious accord between the shah and the majles were undercut by persistent "troublemakers." One such attempt, which involved Daulatabadi as the mediator, reached a swift conclusion when the conciliatory meeting with the anjomans was rumored to be plotting the shah's overthrow.[28] Mokhber al-Saltana adds in his memoirs that individuals were instructed to stand at the gate of the majles and shout "long live the Republic with Zell al-Soltan as its President."[29] Such public utterances on behalf of the prince, who was known to have ties with the radicals, further alienated the shah from the majles and some of the anjomans. However, national reconciliation was still believed feasible. Force of circumstances, wrote Daulatabadi, led to the formation of an unlikely alliance of genuine constitutionalists, "adventurers," and opportunists together with the shah's secret agents. It comprised Qajar princes, government and court officials, majles deputies, anjoman leaders, proconstitution olama; and it was led by Azod al-Molk, the chief of the Qajar tribe. Meetings alternated between the homes of Azod al-Molk and Ala'al-Daula; deliberations concerned the means needed to persuade the shah to support the constitution and the majles and to dismiss from office those court officials who advised him against it. Amir Bahador and Chapshal, the Russian-born former teacher and adviser of the Shah, headed the list of officials to be dismissed. The urgent need to eliminate the extremists from the majles was also discussed. Both Azod al-Molk and the newly installed head of the cabinet, Mirza Ahmad Khan Moshir al-Saltana, acted as delegates to the court. Since the meeting attracted too large a crowd, a committee was set up to carry on the negotiations with the shah; members were Ala'al-Daula, Asef al-Daula (the notorious former governor of Khorasan), Sardar Mansur, Aqa Mirza Mohsen (Behbahani's son-in-law), Malek al-Motakallemin, Jahangir Khan, Musavat, Mirza Davud Khan, and Yahya Daulatabadi and his brother Ali Mohammad Daulatabadi. Sardar Mansur was suspected of working secretly with other "hypocrites" to promote the shah's evil designs against the majles. However, subsequent events, and his arrest by the shah's order, proved this suspicion ill-founded. In fact, the coalition was dominated by the extremists, but it included moderate constitutionalists. It was successful at first, as the shah agreed to meet its demands, and Bahador sought asylum at the Russian embassy.[30] In return, the anjomans and the press promised cooperation and moderation.[31] The honeymoon was soon over. Within a week or so, on June 7, 1908, Ala'al-Daula, Sardar Mansur, Jalal al-Daula (Zell al-Soltan's son), and Azod al-Molk were all arrested as they were arriving at the palace to resume the negotiations. On that very day, Amir Bahador left the Russian legation. Daulatabadi wrote that the shah believed the coalition was plotting to overthrow him and to replace him with Zell al-Soltan. The Russian ambassador sent a warning letter to Jalal al-Daula Mirza against any such attempt, and, together with his British colleague, visited Azod

al-Molk to inform him of the radicals' conspiracy against the shah's life. Daulatabadi concluded that the Russians were already planning an intervention to save the shah, and that the British would have to go along and honor the 1907 agreement.[32] Kasravi supported Daulatabadi's views, writing that both were eager to safeguard the shah's right to rule and were mistrustful of the radicals.[33]

Iranian accounts were correct in their assessment of the Anglo-Russian role in these fateful events. On the one hand, the British were not willing to repeat the December 1907 joint declaration pledging support to the shah. When, in early June, the Russian envoy suggested it, Marling, the British diplomat in Tehran, wrote to Grey in London,

> Such a declaration . . . would stop the agitation in Tehran . . . but it would be for a time only, and its effect would probably be merely exasperating in the provinces, and I have no faith whatever in the possibility of a permanent reconciliation between the shah and the people being brought about by it. As the Russian Minister says, however, it is more than probable that Zil-es Sultan would prove a far more formidable enemy than the present Shah to the Constitution. After explaining my views to the Russian Minister, I told him that, in my opinion, His Majesty's Government would not hold themselves pledged to support the dynasty, much less an individual Sovereign, by their action in recognizing the successive heirs to the Persian Throne.[34]

On the same day, upon receiving the cable from Tehran, Grey instructed his envoy in Russia to follow Marling's advice not to repeat the December 1907 joint declaration. He wrote,

> His Majesty's Government ardently desires to witness the restoration of order in Persia, but the only way in which this can be accomplished is by the formation of a Government to which the Persian people will give their full confidence and support. This consummation can only be attained if the situation is allowed to develop without external interference. We are of opinion that, though the situation might be momentarily relieved by a joint declaration that the Two Powers intend to maintain the present dynasty or Government, serious difficulties in the future would be thereby created both for ourselves and Russia, and that no solution could be afforded of the problem of Persian Government. Any attempt to impose on them any particular form of government will undoubtedly endanger those interests.[35]

Grey and Marling, consistently opposed to a joint Anglo-Russian declaration pledging support to the shah and his dynasty, were equally adamant in opposing his deposition or the candidacy of a rival. Grey wrote to his envoy in Russia, "We would never give support to [Zell al-Soltan] or to any other candidate for the throne."[36]

Marling, on the other hand, reported that "many of the telegrams that have so greatly impressed the shah have been dispatched by hare-brained 'patriots' calling themselves the local Anjuman. I do not mean to imply that there is no danger to the Shah in this; it is question of proportion, for those who clamour for the Shah's deposition are few in number, those who would voluntarily lift a finger to save him are fewer still." He then added that in Tehran, a few nationalist leaders were aware that they could not work with Mohammad Ali shah; the larger anjomans had

assumed power by meddling in government affairs and "they have practically usurped the representative character of the Medjliss. In fact Persia was fast drifting into a state of government by the semi-secret and wholly irresponsible political societies of Tehran." He did not fail to appreciate the anjomans' role as champions of the majles and the constitution against the reactionaries' attacks; nevertheless, he deplored their "abuse of power . . . wittingly, but most frequently out of sheer ignorance."[37] Thus, Marling and the Russian envoy warned the cabinet and the majles against the state of anarchy the country was drifting toward and strongly urged national reconciliation.[38] When Jalal al-Daula was arrested, Marling refused to intervene on his behalf, convinced as he was that the prince was conspiring to depose Mohammad Ali shah and crown his own father instead. Similarly, Marling advised the shah "in the interests of his own security . . . to abstain from acting in a manner hostile to the Constitutional party in the Medjliss, or at all events not to expect to be protected by either the Two Powers from any consequences which may ensue from such action."[39]

The Coup

The constitutionalist anjomans assembled in the Sepahsalar mosque to protest the unwarranted arrest and banishment, declaring it a flagrant violation of the constitution. As Daulatabadi reported, the constitutionalists did not wholly trust the three princes' motives, but they were willing to exploit the arrest to justify their continued opposition to the court.[40] The shah, on the other hand, had been camping in Bagh-e Shah, outside the city walls, since June 4, surrounded by his armed troops and flanked by Amir Bahador and Chapshal, determined to struggle against the majles. The Tupkhana events were being reenacted, but the fight this time was more bitter and deadly; its outcome, as we shall see, was a foregone conclusion.

In the majles, a Reform Committee was officially set up, consisting of twelve members including Behbahani, Tabataba'i, Taqizada, Mostashar al-Daula, Momtaz al-Daula (the Speaker), and Imam Jom'a Kho'i. Simultaneously, another group formed an unofficial Defense Committee acting as liaison between the majles and the Sepahsalar crowd, composed of the members of the radical anjomans and led by Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez.[41] According to Daulatabadi, who provided the most detailed account of the June 1908 events, by June 10, Taqizada had already adopted a moderate stand, and he was not to depart from it. On that day, he announced to the Defense Committee his resolution to seek peace, acknowledging the fact that the anjomans had gone too far in assuming authority, intervening in government affairs, creating chaos in the country, and thus discrediting the constitutional movement in the eyes of the people and the foreigners.[42] The Defense Committee refused to follow suit. Daulatabadi further claimed that on the next day, June 11, the Reform Committee resolved to call for the dispersal of the crowd from the mosque within two hours, to prevent the royal forces from resorting to violent means to attain their end, *before* the shah had actually sent in his ultimatum.[43] The shah had, that evening, demanded the arrest and banishment of eight radicals, including Malek

al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Musavat, Jahangir Khan, Yahya Mirza, Taqizada, and Mostashar al-Daula.[44]

The royal ultimatum came a day later, on June 12.[45] This time the Reform Committee was successful in persuading the crowd to disperse. Taqizada declared that refusal to abide by the majles commands was tantamount to collaboration with the despots, who were busy creating a crisis to justify their action against the majles. A small crowd, nevertheless, lingered, loudly accusing the deputies of selling out the national cause. Jamal al-Din Va'ez even attempted to stop people from leaving the square, but to no avail. By that evening, only a small group representing the anjomans remained on the scene. Behbahani reportedly was ambivalent, wishing to leave and yet encouraged to stay on by some militant anjoman members who went so far as to threaten him. He was eventually "rescued" by his servant, who brought him home to safety.[46] The majles then voted to have the Defense Committee abolished and to ask the eight individuals on the shah's blacklist to leave town. "A signed decree from the shah, and the sight of twenty-five Cossacks, had frightened the crowd and put them to flight," wrote Daulatabadi.[47] Malekzada deplored the majles deputies' desire to accommodate the shah, whereas Nazem al-Islam praised the "wisdom" of their action, which demonstrated to the foreign embassies that they were in full control.[48] Kasravi expressed his skepticism over the deputies', and Taqizada's, claims that their failure was in fact a diplomatic victory over their opponents, who had alleged Iran was becoming anarchistic, and disputed the view that dispersing the crowd was a successful attempt to save the constitution by nonviolent means, with "tears and cries."[49]

But the battle was not yet over. The shah continued to prepare for war, hiring more men for his forces, distributing more money to his officers to ensure their loyalty, and sending his agents provocateurs to stir up the nationalist anjomans and cause trouble to the city. Cables continued to arrive from the provinces, radical in tone and even calling for the deposition of the shah. Though some of these cables were indeed genuine, especially those coming from Tabriz, there was a widespread belief among the nationalists that the cables were forged by order of the court. Daulatabadi in fact expressed his doubt over their authenticity, arguing that the Telegraph Office was under royal control.[50]

The majles deputies were determined to continue the struggle by constitutional means. On June 14, the bazaar was closed while they drafted an official letter to be presented to the shah by a delegation of selected deputies from among themselves. The letter was respectful in tone but firm in its demands. It reminded the shah of the fact that he was to reign as a constitutional monarch, leaving all executive responsibilities to his ministers, and that his decrees were subject to their signature before execution. Finally, it lamented the fact that "opportunists" and "ill-wishers" kept him misinformed on national and majles affairs.[51] The shah delayed granting an audience to the delegation, thus displaying his contempt for the majles. He further alarmed the constitutionalists by issuing on June 15 an order for the arrest of Solaiman Khan Maikada, the leader of one of the most active radical anjomans, Baradaran-e darvaza-ya qazvin, and an official of the Ministry of Defense. Solaiman Khan was charged with smuggling arms out of the arsenal for distribution to the radicals.

Nevertheless, posters appeared on the walls of Tehran calling for national resistance to the despots, begging the "soldiers of Islam" and the Cossacks of Iranian descent not to sell out their fatherland and religion for a salary.

> Are you not Moslems? . . . Are your rights not identical to ours? O devotees of the fatherland and of Islam, have you forgotten the misery and wretched conditions inflicted upon you and your families in the era of despotism? . . . O soldiers! O Moslems! O devotees of Imam Hosain! . . . Wake up from your sleep of ignorance! Open your eyes and observe. Should you oppose the olama and the successors of the Prophet of God, you shall be declared heretical. . . . Fear the burning fire of Hell; fear God's wrath; fear the anger of the Imam of the Age. . . . Should you oppose us and use your weapons against Moslems, we shall massacre you all.[52]

Rumors were rapidly spreading that the mojahedin of Rasht and Qazvin were marching toward Tehran to rescue the constitution. The *Sur-e Israfil, Musavat,* and *Habl al-Matin* published articles on the eve of the coup, inciting the masses to rise against the despots and in defense of liberty, assuring the nation that thousands of armed freedom seekers were marching to Tehran to rescue the constitution.[53]

On June 15 the shah agreed to see the delegation, but he did not send his response until June 20. It was harsh, uncompromising, and reactionary, for he demanded what in effect was a drastic revision of some fundamental principles of the constitution: executive powers equal to the German emperor's; government ministers answerable to the shah alone; the right to maintain armed forces of ten thousand men; supreme military command, with the minister of defense responsible to the shah alone. The majles was in no position to concede these demands; it broke its communication with the court and prepared for renewed struggle.[54] The anjomans took bast once more in the Sepahsalar mosque, while the deputies remained in the majles building. The radicals on the shah's blacklist also took sanctuary in Baharestan. Tensions heightened; disaster seemed imminent. Significantly, when the British envoy was contacted by government officials and nationalist leaders from Tehran and the provinces, he refused to take action. In his dispatch to London, he reported on the telegrams he received "imploring the Legation to come to the assistance of the constitutional cause." He wrote to Grey that he did not reply to any of the messages, but "in one or two instances, when it seemed that a message from the Legation might have a soothing effect." He had instructed the local consul to say that "England, as a constitutional country, must always look with sympathy on a constitutional movement; but it was not fitting or right that she should interfere in the internal affairs of a free and independent people."[55] Daulatabadi had correctly assessed the situation when he wrote, in contrast to December 1907, "in those days the British would have nothing to do with our majles and Constitution." Russia, he explained, was supporting the shah, and the British acquiesced, viewing the policies of the extremists as detrimental to their own interests in the country, and concerned with seeing order and public safety restored.[56]

Times indeed had changed. The solid national front that so effectively challenged the shah's opposition from December 1905 through December 1907—

during all the major events leading to the constitutionalists' breakthrough, in Shahabdolazim, in Qom, in the British legation, in Baharestan—ceased to exist. In his account of the bast of June 1908, which he contrasted to earlier basts and, more specifically, to the Tupkhana events of December 1907, Daulatabadi lists the reasons why the pendulum this time swung in the shah's direction. Mohammad Ali shah was resolute, enjoying tacit Russian support and British acquiescence; in contrast, the constitutional ranks were severely split into factions, from moderate pro—Mohammad Ali shah to radical antimonarchical. Moreover, all the nationalist anjomans were heavily infiltrated by the shah's agents provocateurs, whose function was to appear more radical than the radicals, in order to further discredit the entire movement and frighten both the moderates and the foreign powers away from the cause. Other sources confirm Daulatabadi's contention. The anjoman members who spoke loudest against the shah were in reality royalists, serving the shah and his despotic cause.[57] While the court seemed to have an unlimited supply of ready cash to pay its soldiers and officers, and to bribe deputies and national leaders to side with the shah, the constitutionalists, again unlike earlier periods, suffered from lack of funds to finance their bast and pay the shopkeepers to keep the bazaar closed. A great number of the merchants, who had contributed large sums for the earlier basts, now refused to help. Some of them were secretly working for the court, such as Mohammad Ismail Tabrizi, Mortazavi, Mirza Mahmud Isfahani, Mohammad Mo'in al-Tojjar Bushehri. Amin al-Zarb remained mistrustful of the shah but turned lukewarm toward the constitutionalists. Arbab Jamshid, a Zoroastrian merchant and member of the majles who had previously given money and arms to the nationalists, was frightened for his life and aware of the majles weakness in ensuring public safety.[58] The anjoman-e asnaf, important for its influence in the bazaar, was infiltrated by the shah's agents and persuaded that the shah's intentions were not to destroy the constitution but merely to eliminate the seditious, extremist elements.[59]

Writing on the importance of keeping the bastis well-fed in order to keep them loyal and to prolong the strike, Daulatabadi explained that, from the beginning of the constitutional movement, the leaders, feeling the need to mobilize the crowd, had to assume the financial burden of providing "pots of rice." Aside from the deputies of Azerbaijan, and a very few people from Azerbaijan and other provinces who took up arms and were ready to defend the nation, no one in Tehran in December 1907 had been willing to confront the opposition—or even thought of it. There was a general belief that national duty consisted merely of getting together, talking, abusing verbally and slandering in writing, eating rice and stew offered free to them. In June 1908, he added, there was a small party in the Sepahsalar mosque, organized and ready to fight, but the majles would not grant them permission to carry arms. The mojahedin were ordered not to provoke the Cossacks.[60]

The refugees in Baharestan—Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Jahangir Khan, Musavat, Dehkhoda, and others—were demoralized, feeling the impending doom, poorly fed, and, above all, shunned by fellow constitutionalists such as Amin al-Zarb and Sani' al-Daula, who by then feared any association with the radicals. Daulatabadi himself did not spend all nights there, thus arousing Malek al-Motakallemin's suspicion; and Taqizada, the major spokesman for

the nationalists and the chief liaison betwen the majles deputies and the bastis, had conveniently left the majles to go home two days before the coup. Tabataba'i and Behbahani, fighting their last battle, were discouraged; Mirza Abol Qasem, the Imam Jom'a of Tehran, and his brother, Zahir al-Islam, were siding with the court but occasionally visited the bastis to gather information.[61] Of even greater significance was the defection of Nazem al-Islam and Majd al-Islam from the radicals' camp. In an entry in his diary dated June 18, 1908, Nazem al-Islam, assuming once more taqiyya language, rose in defense of Mohammad Ali shah, pronouncing him "moderate and forbearing," amply justified to banish Jalal al-Daula, Ala' al-Daula, and Sardar Mansur. "What can I do?" he added, "Times are bad. Today I do not fear the shah and his Court; I fear Malek al-Motakallemin and Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and other similar seditious individuals."[62] On June 22, Majd al-Islam, together with Nazem al-Islam and Shaikh Yahya, the editor of the *Majles,* visited the bastis in Baharestan to counsel moderation and tell them: "Today, the nation's weapon should not be the gun. Your weapon is the Koran, prayer, humility. You must politely beg the shah to implement the Constitution; and you must banish those few seditious individuals . . . enemies of government, nation and religion." In response the bastis shouted curses and insults, accusing the three visitors of "having taken money from the despots to speak like this," forcing them to flee.[63]

On June 23, the crowd in the Sepahsalar mosque was reduced to a mere 150 men, and in the majles the bastis were there together with a total of 80 armed mojahedin. The mojahedin were instructed not to shoot first; they could not assume responsibility for starting the civil war. However, when Jamal al-Din Afja'i came to join the bastis in the majles, and the Cossacks blocked his passage, some mojahedin ran to his rescue. The Cossacks fired at them and, according to Nazem al-Islam, in return, one threw a hand grenade to frighten the horses. "The die was cast," wrote Nazem al-Islam, "it is all over for the nation. The seditious individuals have accomplished their deed."[64] The shah's officials asserted that the mojahedin, not the Cossacks, had fired the first shot.[65] Marling had cabled on June 25 that the shah had "reasonable ground for taking strong measures as the attack was made by the popular party on the troops," only to retract this a few weeks later. On July 15, in a monthly Summary of Events, he expressed his doubts that the Cossacks were fired on. "Had they been killed, I think it unquestionable that the struggle would have ended quite differently; but they owed their lives to the general conviction that their death would bring about Russian intervention."[66]

The battle scenes were restricted to the Baharestan and Sepahsalar area and its immediate neighborhood; nowhere else was there a fight. Only in the Shah Cheragh square was there a brief melee in a coffee shop frequented by some radicals; there, on that day, Soltan al-Olama Roh al-Qods, publisher of the radical paper by the same name, was found and arrested.[67] The provinces failed to send the promised reinforcements; from among an estimated 30,000 members of some 180 anjomans, only a handful fought the Cossacks.[68] Nuri's son, Shaikh Mehdi, had turned mojahed and tried to recruit the tollab of the Sadr school, with no success. Sadr al-Olama refused to join the bastis, remaining in his mosque.[69]

The majles was bombed, then looted. Most of the bastis there, including Behbahani and Tabataba'i, were arrested. Taqizada, Mostashar al-Daula, the editors of *Habl al-Matin,* and, later, Yahya Daulatabadi sought refuge in the British legation; their comrades Malek al-Motakallemin, Jahangir Khan, and others, were enchained and brought to the shah's camp, to be executed the following day. Soltan al-Olama, the editor of *Roh al-Qods,* died in prison. Well-known constitutionalists went into hiding along with their lesser known colleagues. On that day, Nazem al-Islam wrote in his diary, "Lucky is he who dies for his fatherland. I wish I were with them to die a glorious death."[70]

11

The Lesser Despotism

The period from the coup d'état of June 23, 1908, and the destruction of the first majles until the deposition of Mohammad Ali shah on July 16, 1909, is referred to in the Persian annals as the "Lesser Despotism." The shah ruled by decree, repeatedly postponing the elections he had promised to the nation and the foreign envoys, on the grounds that heresy and sedition had first to be entirely eliminated.

Even before the coup, Mohammad Ali shah had informed Najaf of his intention to wage war against the Babis and other heretics. Despite the fact that the supplement to the constitution had declared Twelver Shi'ism the official religion of Iran, he wrote to them, the heretics were determined to undermine the faith through such means as newspaper articles deriding the "worshiping of the ancient" and "superstitious beliefs." Their evil influence on the masses was so effective, he insisted, that the olama could no longer restrain the heretics; they were about to shake the foundations of the six thousand-year-old monarchy. It was thus his duty to obstruct the heretics' designs in order to safeguard religion and preserve the monarchy. He assured the ayatollahs of his continued support for the constitution and of his intention to reconvene the majles, once the corrupt elements were eliminated. The mojtaheds Khorasani, Mazandarani, and Tehrani responded by affirming the religious legitimacy of the constitution and urging the shah to work with the majles in protecting Islam and in defending the nation against foreign intervention.[1] The three ranking olama of Najaf continued to support the constitutional movement throughout the year, encouraging the national resistance.

The uneasy alliance of Russia and Britain, however, further aggravated the constitutionalists' predicament. Whereas the Foreign Office in London generally favored constitutional government as the best means to preserve order in Iran, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs vacillated between a desire to accommodate British policy and go along with the Anglo-Russian Entente and the impulse to follow an independent course of action aimed at restoring the old autocratic regime. In his analysis of the British and Russian role in Iranian politics of this period, Firuz Kazemzadeh argued that Izvolski, the Russian minister of foreign affairs, was prepared to follow British policy of nonintervention in exchange for British backing in the Balkans, the tsar and the military establishment opted for unilateral action. Thus, though the Ministry decided against open intervention, "secret intervention was not barred." Hartwig, the Russian envoy in Tehran, acted independently from his superior in St. Petersburg, enjoying the approval of

the court and the military. Weeks before the coup he had urged the shah to destroy "all the democratic trappings that both he and the shah ardently hated,"[2] while appearing to be in agreement with his English colleague's public support for the constitution. On the eve of the coup, Marling reported to Grey that the Russian minister had gone to court to advise the shah to "adopt a conciliatory attitude" and that the latter assured the Russian envoy that he had no hostile feeling toward the majles and was concerned only with his own safety against the press and the anjomans.[3] On the day of the coup the Russian and the British ministers sent their respective dragomans to the shah with the instruction to "recall to the Shah's memory the assurances which His Majesty gave us in December 1907, and to suggest that a Proclamation declaring that he has no desire to abolish the Constitution should be issued by His Majesty."[4] London pressed its representative in Tehran to insist the shah call for elections without delay. Though the British were reluctant to back the shah officially, they did not allow his deposition and, in fact, cooperated with the Russians "to discountenance intrigues" against him.[5] Thus, Hartwig's double game of masterminding the counterrevolution while publicly urging the shah to restore the constitution, and the British desire to safeguard the Anglo-Russian agreement at all costs, allowed the reactionaries the freedom of movement that had been denied them in December 1907. From June to November 1908, the Russian-officered Cossacks controlled Tehran, its commander Liakhov receiving orders directly from Hartwig.

Tehran During the Lesser Despotism

Judging from the *Tarikh-e Bidari* and other sources, Tehran remained calm in the wake of the coup. The bazaar carried on business as usual, as hundreds of majles representatives, members of the constitutionalist anjomans, orators and writers who had denounced the court and its officials, and known supporters of the constitutional movement in general, were forced to flee the capital or hide from the Cossack troops ordered to arrest them. Qolhaq, the resort village north of Tehran where the British envoy had his official summer residence, turned into a refugee camp. Constitutionalists sought bast in what was then commonly viewed as a British zone.[6] Nazem al-Islam revealed in his diary the sudden shift in the mood of the capital. Everyone is attacking the constitution, he wrote, even those who had sworn allegiance to it; they now curse it openly. Those shameful individuals who today are looting the majles building and the anjomans' headquarters are the same who yesterday had hailed the constitution and were devout members of the majles and the anjomans; "they are people who recognize no Constitution, no religion, no God, no Prophet."[7] Commenting on leaflets circulated clandestinely in the capital which pleaded with the people to carry on the struggle for the constitution, Nazem al-Islam remarked bitterly that the Tehran population derived its livelihood from trade or from the state treasury; in both cases autocracy suited them better than constitutional government. In fact, he added, the rule of the majles proved to be detrimental to most.[8]

The capital remained peaceful, its inhabitants content on the whole with the

shah's ruthless rule, since food was plentiful and cheap, and life was resuming its normal pace. The news of the civil strife and of the staunch resistance put up by the constitutionalists in Tabriz was simply ignored. Nazem al-Islam noted the Tehranis' alleged cowardice, explaining that they would not kill or assault unless specifically ordered to do so by higher authorities, who would then grant them immunity from prosecution.[9] At times he likened them to the "people of Kufa and Syria," who had betrayed the righteous Imam in the seventh century.[10]

In his account of the aftermath of the coup, Nazem al-Islam never failed to show his utter contempt for the "hypocrites" who had so easily switched sides. Bahr al-Olum Kermani, a member of the original Azali network, joined the ranks of the "despots," behaving in a most obsequious manner.[11] Mirza Abol Qasem Tabataba'i, the mojtahed's elder son, was busy holding meetings with other olama, praising the shah and cursing the constitutionalists.[12] Shaikh Mohammad Va'ez, whose arrest in July 1906 led to street riots and precipitated the olama's second exodus, and who had secretly joined the royalists prior to the coup, was then openly cursing the constitutionalists.[13] Shaikh Mohammad Reza, the mojtahed of Kerman whose conflicts with the local authorities had earned him such a prominent place in Nazem al-Islam's account of the early phases of the revolution, likewise is depicted as a defector to the royalist camp.[14] Mirza Yahya of Kerman, Nazem al-Islam's former student and devoted friend who had also belonged to the Azali network, figured among the group of "turbaned" deputies of the majles invited by the Imam Jomʿa of Tehran to meet with the shah. In this meeting the shah justified his action, claiming he was not ready to go down in the historical annals as having been responsible for the eradication of Islam in Iran. The handful of "corrupt individuals" had to be eliminated, he told them, before thanking them for their support in his fight against the majles.[15] Aqa Najafi, who had belatedly accepted the constitution, wasted no time in cabling the shah his full support. Of the two constitutionalist mojtaheds, Behbahani was the more abused verbally, and the more vehemently denounced as a power-hungry, corrupt religious leader. Mohammed Sadeq Tabataba'i, the editor of the *Majles,* expressed his anger and resentment against Behbahani, alleging the latter had "ruined" his father, Mohammad Tabataba'i, betrayed the nation that had vested so much hope in him, and undermined the constitutional movement, which he had used to promote his personal interests.[16]

Nazem al-Islam himself, by his own admission, resorted to *taqiyya* to escape arrest. Together with his brother, a Kerman deputy to the majles, and Majd al-Islam he wrote a letter to the shah, which he sent with Saʿd al-Daula's help. The shah's response was positive, in consideration for rendered services, which Nazem al-Islam was quick to deny in his diary, writing "we never did."[17] A week later, he petitioned for safe passage from Ershad al-Daula, who, in Nazem al-Islam's own words, "had waged war against the nation, mollahs, seyyeds, bazaaris, as no honorable man would have."[18] Nazem al-Islam explained that he had to adopt a "flattering, obsequious" tone in his letter of appeal, and in the audience Ershad al-Daula had granted him, his brother, and Zol'Riyasatin. They were received cordially and given the safe passage. Nazem al-Islam and his companions were in dire need of protection, as Nuri reportedly denounced their anjoman and paper *Kaukab al-Darri* as heretical. "Forty years spent pursuing

religious studies and serving Islam," he lamented, "and then have a person like Nuri, whose deeds were often contrary to Islamic principles, declare us heretical."[19] He felt the need to affirm the oneness of God, the prophethood of Mohammad, and the Imamate of his twelve descendants, and to curse Babism, which he blamed for providing justification for the "pseudo-olama's" acts of injustice.

Once more, newly formed secret societies gathered together men of diverse ideological inclinations to restore, or to sabotage, the constitution. Fear of informers and infiltrators poisoned the atmosphere and forced the constitutionalists to be cautious when formulating their views and plans. Once more Nazem al-Islam became involved in a secret anjoman, which included lay and clerical members, court and government officials, merchants, low- and high-ranking olama. It received financial support from Abol Qasem Tabataba'i and from Jalal al-Mamalek, a politician who was briefly imprisoned following the coup, and whom Nazem al-Islam viewed as a "genuine Constitutionalist."[20] The anjoman's task was essentially to work for the restoration of the constitution and for new elections, while avoiding at all costs the state of chaos and lawlessness that characterized the first majles. Abol Qasem Tabataba'i reportedly emphasized their willingness, even obligation, to support the constitution, provided it was "beneficial to both the court and the nation."[21] The anjoman pledged to wait to see whether the shah would fulfill his promise to authorize national elections; if the shah reneged, the anjoman would organize a bast at the Ottoman embassy and at Shahabdolazim in protest. It officially expressed its conviction that national sovereignty depended on national support of the shah, and his deposition could only lead to chaos and inevitable foreign domination.[22]

Outwardly Nazem al-Islam went along with this policy; in private, however, he displayed a mixed feeling of disillusionment, hopelessness, and bitterness with the constitutional movement in general. He believed that opportunists and ignorant masses had wasted the chances offered by the constitution and failed to appreciate its real worth. He accused Behbahani of taking bribes and of "stealing the people's rights." He also attacked the newspapers for publishing slanderous articles and for "intervening in Islamic affairs."[23] He held corrupt deputies and orators, including Malek al-Motakallemin, responsible for the downfall of the majles and the constitution. People are expecting new elections to take place soon, he wrote, or else they threaten to seek bast. "But we must not be fooled by them. Whether the Constitution is decreed or not, it has nothing to do with us. Enough. . . . The shah is the proprietor; the sovereign knows what is best for the nation. We had sworn allegiance to a correct mashruʿa constitution, but not to support sedition and chaos. Till now we had feared the seditious; but we fear them no longer. . . . The shah imprisons and kills; the seditious slander. One can tolerate slandering, but one cannot endanger one's life."[24] He received the news of the promulgation of the Ottoman constitution with equal bitterness, resenting the fact that the Turks were now ahead of the Iranians, and praying for divine intervention to "reform the shah."[25] Rare were the occasions when he allowed himself to report any radical statement. Only once did he repeat a friend's private pronouncement on the need for "a man like Mirza Reza," Naser al-Din shah's assassin.[26]

Copies of the British envoy's letter to the shah asking him to permit elections to take place were read in Nazem al-Islam's group's meetings.[27] Shabnamas circulated in town, addressing the Tehranis and the royal soldiers, informing them of their religious obligation to protect the constitution, serve the Moslems, and safeguard Islam.[28] Cables from Najaf bearing the signatures of the three constitutionalist mojtaheds were posted, urging the faithful to support the constitution as the best means to guard Islam from the onslaught of its enemies. "Verily we state to all: it is contrary to Islam to support and obey and collaborate with the killers of the Constitutionalists, it would be tantamount to obeying Yazid b. Moʿawiyya [the Sunni ruler responsible for the massacre of Kerbala]."[29] However, as Nazem al-Islam noted, the authenticity of some of the cables sent in the name of the Najaf mojtaheds "needed verification."[30] One such cable reportedly blamed the Qajars for the loss of Moslem lands to the Infidels.[31]

Some shabnamas were more radical in tone, claiming that the abject inertia of the capital's inhabitants gave "a bad name to Iranians," exhorting them to awaken from their slumber, to rise against the despotic government that was reenacting the tragedy of Kerbala, and handing the government of the Moslems to Christian officers and Jewish advisers. A general massacre of all foreign diplomats was threatened as a means to force the nation into action.[32] But the mood in Tehran continued to be subdued, and the members of the secret anjomans assumed a moderate constitutionalist stand.

Tabriz

For four months following the coup, Tabriz stood alone in defense of the constitution. The day the majles was bombed, fighting broke out rapidly spreading from isolated quarters through the entire town. What might have passed as typical local skirmishes between street gangs struggling to establish their territorial authority turned into a civil war with decisive impact on the fate of the nation and its political future. In the Shotorban quarter a gang was led by Mir Hashem Shotorbani, one of the constitutionalists responsible for staging the bast in the British consulate in September 1906. He had turned anticonstitutionalist and, together with the mojtahed Mirza Hasan, the Imam Jomʿa of Tabriz, and other olama equally hostile to the constitutionalists, had founded the anjoman-e Islamiyya in Tabriz. In Amir-Khiz, a Shaikhi quarter, Sattar Khan, a horse dealer with a luti (ruffian) past, led a rival gang which, in alliance with another gang led by Baqer Khan of the Khiyaban quarter, ignited the first fire. Rapidly the street fighting acquired a religiopolitical dimension. The anjoman-e Islamiyya officially proclaimed the constitutionalists to be Babis conspiring to eradicate Islam in the name of the constitution. It called on all Moslems to rise in defense of their religion and wage holy war against the heretics. It held a special meeting at its headquarters, where Mirza Hasan the mojtahed and other leading olama of Tabriz—with the exception of Theqat al-Islam—made an appearance surrounded by armed men under the command of Mir Hashem. Reportedly the latter and Mirza Hasan were acting upon the shah's instructions.[33] The constitutionalists, on the other hand, claimed they were following the rulings of Najaf,

and thus fulfilling their religious obligation to defend the constitution and the nation against its opponents.

Amir-Khiz and the Armenian quarters of Tabriz turned into the main centers of resistance, where the mojahedin, or holy warriors fighting for the constitution, had their headquarters. The mosque near the Armenian quarter became the mojahedins' base, where constitutionalist preachers defended the constitution and urged the masses to support the holy cause. The Social Democratic Moslem branch of Transcaucasia sent volunteers, arms, and funds to Tabriz. Haidar Amu oghli, who had fled to Baku on the eve of the coup, returned to Tabriz. Reportedly he was able to exert great influence upon the mojahedin and Sattar Khan himself. The anjoman of Tabriz was then in disarray, with most of its leaders fleeing or seeking refuge in foreign legations. Nonetheless, men of the old Social Democrats' group, like Ali Monsieur, Hasan Sharifzada, and Ismail Nobari, figured prominently in the struggle for the constitution.

According to his biographer, Theqat al-Islam was more than ever compelled to practice taqiyya, as the anjoman he was still associated with, despite his frequent denials, prepared for the resistance.[34] He wrote to his brothers in Najaf, explaining how he had always opposed the anjoman's violence and ideological extremism, and complaining that the constitutionalists had destroyed the constitution.[35] In his diary he openly accused Taqizada, the newspaper *Musavat,* and Shaikh Selim in Tabriz of sedition.[36] Four days after the coup, he had received a stern letter from the shah's new minister, ordering him to help restore law and order in Tabriz and to distance himself from the "troublemakers." Otherwise, he was warned, the honor of his respected old family would be tarnished forever.[37] Theqat al-Islam's reply was respectful in tone, defensive, and self-righteous. He assured Tehran of his longstanding loyalty to the central government, the nation, and Islam. He related his own misgivings and apprehensions regarding the constitutional movement, and told of his awareness that experiments with this system had to follow a moderate, prudent course, in order to prevent the "commoners" from taking affairs of state into their hands, and lest there be "confusion." He had consistently declared revolutionism contrary to religious law and to reason, he went on, and he had repeatedly attempted to safeguard the "true rights" of both government and nation, trying to keep the two united, but to no avail. He ended his letter by expressing his bitter conviction that he would get no praise from anyone but God for "fulfilling my religious and rational obligations."[38]

When the civil war broke out, Theqat al-Islam declared his noninvolvement and, he said, shut himself inside his home while the battle was raging.[39] However, subsequent events and his own private correspondence reveal the active part he continued to play in Tabriz politics, mostly as a mediator between the constitutionalists and the newly appointed governor of Azerbaijan, Ain al-Daula, who replaced the constitutionalist Mokhbar al-Saltana, who resigned and went to Europe.

The civil war lasted four months. The battles were bloody; the toll on both sides was high. The anjoman leaders and the commanders of the constitutionalist forces were anxious to appear as religious and as loyal to the monarchy as their opponents. By the middle of July, they sent cables to the shah, expressing their desire to keep Tabriz an integral part of Iran and pledging full support for the

central government. They complained of the savage treatment they were subjected to at the hands of the forces fighting on the government side. The cables remained unanswered. Nonetheless, the view was still upheld among the mojahedin that the shah was kept in the dark on purpose, that some evil individuals were responsible for the violence and for preventing him from fulfilling his promise to the nation to establish justice and equality. "These were the real traitors to the shariat and the nation," wrote an eyewitness to the war in his diary.[40]

Both sides claimed they were defending religion, and that they were enjoying the Imam of the Age's special protection in accomplishing their sacred duty. Both sides used a common war cry: Allah-akbar (God is great), Ya Saheb al-Zaman (Oh Lord of the Age), Ya Ali. Each accused the other of heresy, of conspiring to destroy the holy law and eradicate Islam. Each pointed to the religious pronouncements of their respective mojtaheds as proof of the religious authenticity of their cause; the mojahedin referred to the fatwas of Najaf, the anticonstitutionalists to the Islamiyya proclamations. The constitutionalist preachers relentlessly lectured on the legitimate Islamic basis of the constitution and strove to unmask the "bad olama's" selfish motives for opposing it. They insisted that the Islamiyya group had turned against the movement because it lowered the price of wheat and they reduced drastically the hoarders' profit; because it curtailed the olama's functions; and because it granted equality to all.[41]

Mirza Hosain Va'ez, the constitutionalist preacher and member of the anjoman of Tabriz, proved once more to be the most eloquent orator of the revolution, blending his religious sermons with social and political issues. In one of his sermons, he addressed the shah as "our crowned father," pleading with him to intervene, to put an end to his officials' tyranny and to check the local elite's exploitation of the masses. He begged the sovereign to promote economic development; to grant the peasants their rights; to ensure the soldiers proper clothing, equipment, and payment of salaries; to provide for the well-being of the poor and the orphans; to encourage industry, commerce, and agriculture. He insisted the nation wanted a constitution to enforce the implementation of reforms needed for national progress.[42]

Vijuya wrote in his eyewitness account that some "well-informed individuals" occasionally lectured on the causes of the civil war. The lay and clerical ruling elite, they told their audience, wished to maintain its power over the nation, keeping the masses oppressed and weak. The oppressed constituted four different groups. The merchants, who worked hard in carrying on domestic and foreign trade, lacked the wealth, security, social status, and respect their counterparts all over the world enjoyed; the workers and wage earners; the peasants, who were never allowed to enjoy the fruits of their labor; and the soldiers, who sacrificed their lives in defense of the nation. The speakers accused politicians, government officials, and "some" olama of taking and offering bribes, of exploiting the masses, of amassing fortunes at the expense of the poor. They called on the soldiers and the deprived masses to wake from their slumber and demand their rights.[43]

With Ain al-Daula's appointment as governor of Azerbaijan, negotiations for peace between the resistance leaders and the government officials began, with

both sides expressing a willingness to put an end to the bloodshed. Ain al-Daula informed the insurgents that Tehran had not abrogated the constitution but had only waged war against the majles, which had fallen prey to the seditious elements among the deputies. He promised general amnesty if a cease-fire was enforced, and if the insurgents surrendered their weapons. His envoy attempted to convince the anjoman's leaders and Sattar Khan that he was truly dedicated to respecting and defending the constitution, and that reconciliation was possible if law and order were restored in Tabriz. Ain al-Daula, by no means a liberal, conducted the campaign against Tabriz in a halfhearted way, chiefly to further undercut Mohammed Ali shah's authority in Azerbaijan.[44] The anjoman, dominated by the Social Democrats, insisted on a royal proclamation restoring the constitution and calling for elections before agreeing to a cease-fire. Moreover, they demanded Tehran's recognition of the anjoman as the official local authority. The talks between the two parties reached a stalemate, and the fighting in Tabriz continued unabated.

Ain al-Daula then attempted to recruit Theqat al-Islam's services as an intermediary to convince the anjoman to lay down arms. The mojtahed made his first public appearance since the start of the war, at the mosque of the Armenian quarter. In a long and eloquent sermon, he attempted to convince the mojahedin and the anjoman leaders to adopt a policy of moderation. Stressing the importance of national unity, he recalled its effective impact in the earlier phases of the constitutional movement. The nation, he argued, depended on the existence of both country and religion; the two were mutually dependent. Islam could survive only with the existence of an independent monarchy; the Iranian monarchy, in turn, depended on national strength and unity. Should the country and its monarchy be destroyed, Islam would also perish. The present fate of Zoroastrianism and Judaism, he went on, illustrated the point. Both faiths lack glory because they lack sovereigns, whereas Buddhism flourishes because it is protected by powerful monarchs. The two forces of monarchy and religion are needed for the preservation of Iran, he proclaimed emphatically. The "other subjects of Iran" (the religious minorities) he declared to be "children of the same fatherland," sharing in the task of protecting the nation and enjoying their own due rights. All must unite; all must work together to ensure the nation's progress and wealth. Conscious of the modernist outlook of the anjoman leaders, he readily admitted that "today, the Iranians are deprived of knowledge," and he called for the adoption and promotion of "beneficial sciences" achieved by the "human species," no matter where or by whom. He ended his message pleading for unity and cooperation of all parties concerned for national survival and prosperity, and he asked his audience to set aside differences of opinion.[45]

In his effort to stage a reconciliation, Theqat al-Islam urged the anjoman to trust Ain al-Daula's motives, assuring them of the governor's sincerity and trustworthiness. He advised them to adopt the meek attitude of the oppressed in presenting their case to government officials: "Our Imams command us to display meekness."[46] Fathi explains that Theqat al-Islam's fear of possible Russian invasion, which would occur should the situation in Tabriz deteriorate, accounted for the mojtahed's willingness to work with the governor to achieve peace.[47] However, serious ideological differences had set Theqat al-Islam apart

from the anjoman's leaders even before the coup and lay behind his efforts on Ain al-Daula's side. In his diary, he wrote about his differences with them. He believed in giving top priority to helping the poor and the weak, showing compassion, and establishing justice; renewing the call for the constitution had to wait until peace was restored and the royal forces evacuated Tabriz. But his audience in the mosque threatened to "destroy the monarchy" if the constitution was not restored; "the two must be linked" in compliance with Mozaffar al-Din shah's last will, he was told.[48]

The negotiations led nowhere, for the insurgents continued to mistrust Ain al-Daula's motives and intentions. The people of Tabriz, Vijuya remarked in his journal of the civil war, realized that the new governor's attitude would be identical to the Islamiyya's—treacherous and despotic.[49] Sattar Khan asserted that he was reluctant to cause bloodshed and denied he was rebelling against the central government. He was merely fulfilling his religious obligation by obeying the commands of the mojtaheds, who, in times of ghaibat, were the Imam's representatives. To refuse to obey their command, he emphatically declared, would be tantamount to disobeying the Imam.[50] As Theqat al-Islam had observed in his private correspondence, the resistance leaders were clinging to the fatwa of the Najaf olama as evidence of the holiness of their cause.[51]

As the war intensified, the royalist forces were weakening. Ain al-Daula, however, refrained from sending reinforcements to Tabriz and continued to postpone his regiment's assault on the city. Meanwhile, the commander of his forces, Mohammad Vali Khan Nasr al-Saltana the Sepahdar, pressed the shah to follow the foreign consuls' advice and allow elections to take place, thus safeguarding his dynastic interests.[52] The shah refused to accede to Tabriz demands, insisting that law and order be restored and the "Babis and ruffians" punished. When Mirza Hasan the mojtahed, the Imam Jom'a of Tabriz, and other members of the Islamiyya, saw themselves compelled to leave the city, which was about to fall into the hands of the insurgents, they sent a last desperate message to the shah, accusing Ain al-Daula of failing to accomplish his military mission. The shah sent a warning note to his governor, demanding that he carry on the fight against the heretics and to help the olama return to town. When Ain-Daula offered to resign, the shah retreated; the olama remained outside Tabriz.[53]

The mojahedin won the war by the middle of October 1908. The Islamiyya disintegrated, and Mir Hashem and his armed gangs fled the scene together with the Shahseven tribesmen. Tabriz was then in the hands of the anjoman. Its leaders adopted a policy of moderation, assuring both the shah and the foreign powers of their political loyalty to the Qajar monarch—the "affectionate father"—who had been deceived by a handful of evildoers now defeated by the valiant mojahedin of Tabriz. They expressed their willingness to serve the nation and their sovereign, and they looked forward to the opening of the majles and the enforcement of the constitution. They assured the foreign consuls that public safety was restored. Sattar Khan ordered the mojahedin to protect foreign lives and property.[54] As Kasravi noted, fear of a Russian invasion and a consequent loss of national independence compelled the anjoman to avoid providing its northern neighbor with any pretext for aggression.[55] The shah, however, missed

this opportunity, determined as he was to crush the resistance, which he continued to underestimate.

Fazlpollah Nuri and his clerical allies in the capital, including the Imam Jomʿa, backed the shah with their public pronouncements against the constitution and the majles. At a meeting held on November 7, 1908, at the shah's palace, some leading merchants, olama, and officials of Tehran discussed the need for new elections. Subsequently the olama officially declared: "All Moslems of this country do not accept the establishment of a Consultative Assembly; it would bring about the destruction of religion . . . and of the Islamic law."[56] The shah used this pronouncement to justify his refusal to allow the new elections that he had promised and which were to be held on November 14, 1908. Events in Tabriz provided him with excuses for his stubborn decision against the constitution.

Despite the moderate rhetoric adopted by the anjoman and the mojahedin leaders, Tabriz, in the wake of the victory over the reactionary forces, began to extend its authority over other towns in Azerbaijan. Marand, Khoy, Salmas, and Urumiyya soon fell to the anjoman's forces and were entrusted to local members of the Social Democrats' cells. Haidar Khan Amu oghli was highly visible in organizing the attacks, mobilizing the population, and setting up new administrations to carry out the instructions of Tabriz and, indirectly, of Baku where the Moslem Social Democratic faction continued to send volunteers, arms, and funds. The Transcaucasian connection turned out to be vital for the constitutionalists's struggle against Mohammad Ali shah.

An estimated 800 Transcaucasian mojahedin reportedly crossed the frontier to join Sattar Khan's forces in Tabriz; another 350 volunteers went to the province of Gilan.[57] The sheer number, in addition to the great store of firearms smuggled into northern Iran by the Russian revolutionaries, alarmed the tsar's envoy in Tehran. In his dispatches to St. Petersburg, Hartwig expressed his conviction that "the Sattar Khan's camp would have laid down arms a long time ago had our Transcaucasians not assisted him."[58] He urged the imperial government to resort to the "most energetic means" to break the Transcaucasian–Iranian revolutionary link.[59] The Russian foreign minister instructed the viceroy in the Caucasus to prevent Russian subjects from participating in the Iranian resistance, arguing that the life and property of foreigners in Iran were more vulnerable to Transcaucasian terrorists' attacks. Traditionally, Izvolski explained, the Iranians respected foreigners and thus would not threaten them with violence. Transcaucasians, lacking such traditions, would not practice restraint. It was therefore of utmost importance that "the strictest surveillance of the travellers from Baku to the Persian ports upon Taqiev's ships" be established, and all "means against the penetration of Persia by our revolutionaries" be taken.[60] Police officers on the borders did arrest many smugglers of arms, without, however, putting an end to the flow of ammunition and volunteers.[61]

The RSDWP, the Hemmatists, and other revolutionary groups, including the Armenian Dashnaks, closely monitored events in northern Iran. Lenin, who was then living in exile in western Europe, had set his hopes on Tabriz for the "rise of the East." In several of his proclamations, quoted often and at great length in Soviet studies of the Iranian revolution, he hailed Iranian resistance leaders, especially Sattar Khan, as the torchbearers of the oppressed nations fighting a

war of national liberation against the colonial powers. He believed it was the task of international social democracy to explain to the Iranians the causes of their revolution, its basic direction, and its underlying significance.[62] Then, as before, ideological purity was not prescribed; quite the contrary. Russian Social Democratic theorists were ready to accept deviations from the straight Marxist line when, and if, necessary. Responding to the queries of a group of mostly Armenian Social Democrats from Tabriz, Karl Kautsky, the prominent theorist of the time who had also watched events in Iran, conceded that socioeconomic conditions in Iran precluded a proletarian revolution. He recalled Karl Marx's experimental tactics in Germany in 1848, when no proletariat was organized enough to form its own party, as a model for emulation. Kautsky pronounced it incumbent upon Iranian socialists to participate in the ongoing "bourgeois and petit-bourgeois democratic struggle," which he viewed as only the first preliminary stage of the revolution. "The socialists," he wrote in his letter to Tabriz, "do not join in this struggle as vulgar democrats with illusions about bourgeois and petit-bourgeois democracy. . . . They know that, following the victory of democracy, the political struggle will not stop there."[63] The victory of democracy, he argued, will usher in the second phase of the political struggle, which was not possible in the period of autocracy.

The coup of June 1908, engineered with the help of imperial Russia, allowed the Russian revolutionaries to convince their Iranian comrades that they indeed shared a common enemy, the tsarist regime. Thus armed with strong evidence that the Iranian revolution was more than just a movement for constitutional reforms, Russian theorists and propagandists were able to transform, for the Iranians, a national resistance to autocracy into a war of national liberation against the colonial powers. As an Iranian-born Soviet scholar observed, Lenin was interested in Iran "as a theater of international imperialism, a drama where the Iranian revolution threatened to dislocate the European Powers' Agreement" on partitioning Iran.[64] In fact, Lenin had written a devastating critique of Russian and British imperialist policies, and he viewed national liberation movements as the best means for the underdeveloped, colonized people to destroy that power. Kautsky similarly believed that Iran had to develop its native bourgeois economy, its local industry and trade, its means of communication and transports, in order to win the struggle against European exploitation. Economic freedom was as important as political freedom; thus, the Iranians' struggle against foreign economic penetration, far from being reactionary, was strengthening the European proletariat by dealing a severe blow to the European capitalists' interests, he explained to his Tabriz disciples.[65]

At a meeting held in Tabriz in October 1908, some thirty Social Democrats voted 28–2 in favor of continuing to fight alongside the "democratic revolutionaries," to penetrate their ranks as the most radical elements, upholding the principles of Social Democracy in theory, until the time was ripe for their application in practice.[66] Russian Social Democrats, be they Bolshevists or Menshevists, the Hemmatists, and the Dashnaks all supported the insurrections in northern Iran. Rasulzada, Narimanov, Azizbekov, and Haidar Khan, to mention only a few of the Hemmatists, were the most involved allies in Transcaucasia. Other non-Marxist Moslem Azerbaijanis were equally active in supporting the resistance,

with Ahmad Agaev and Ali Mardan Topchibashev leading the list. The press in Baku, Tiflis, and in Russian cities covered extensively the events in Iran, the radical and liberal papers denouncing Russian complicity in the destruction of the majles.

A Bulgarian-born member of the RSDWP of Baku by the name of Panov worked as a correspondent for the Russian liberal paper *Rech* in Tehran, where he arrived in June 1908. His articles revealed the Russian role in the counterrevolution and incriminated the Russian commanding officer of the Cossacks regiment, Liakhov. Panov based his allegations on official secret documents he succeeded in acquiring. Russian complicity in the coup was widely publicized. The matter came to the attention of the Duma (parliament), where Social Democratic deputies attacked reactionary officials. In December 1908, the Russian legation in Tehran declared the documents were forged and instigated Panov's expulsion from Iran. He left the country, arriving soon after in St. Petersburg accompanied by a mollah named Shaikh Ali, whom he introduced as a high-ranking mojtahed representing the olama of Najaf. Shaikh Ali was in reality a former taleb by the name of Abdolali Moʿbed, or Moʿayyed, depending on the source, who had failed to complete his studies in Najaf and had instead joined the constitutionalists' ranks in Tehran. In Baku, where he had gone following the coup, the Social Democrats decided to send him to the major Russian cities together with Panov; there he would speak in the name of the ayatollahs in Iraq, denouncing Mohammad Ali shah and the reactionary Russian officials who backed him. The plan seemed to have succeeded for a while, as the "mojtahed" was received in liberal circles and interviewed by the Russian and Western press. However, an official government investigation revealed the fraudulent identity of the mollah and led to the expulsion of the shaikh and his Bulgarian accomplice in mid-February 1909. The shaikh returned to Baku, where the Social Democrats decided to send him to Istanbul. Panov joined the mojahedin fighting in Gilan.[67]

This episode in the history of the revolution, minor as it may now seem, shows how vulnerable the revolutionaries were to charges of heresy and how eager they were to lend religious respectability to their movement, resorting to fraud, forgery and imposture if needed.

The Political Exiles in Europe and the Persia Committee

In England Edward Granville Browne, with a small circle of British politicians and journalists, began an intensive campaign for the restoration of the constitution in Iran. William Smart, who was then in charge of the legation in Tehran, supplied Browne with detailed accounts of the daily events. The coup had profoundly disturbed the young English diplomat. Earlier, he had believed that the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907 had given Iran "a supreme chance of working out her salvation," as both powers guaranteed her integrity and independence. "If she can reform her administration, put her finances on a sound basis, restore order in the country," he wrote to Browne in December 1907, "then there will be no excuse for foreign intervention."[68] By July 1908, however,

Smart had radically revised his views. Having observed Russian "Machiavellian threats" and British complicity in the affair, he saw the agreement in a different light. "Today, even the honor of official secrecy is not strong enough to allow me to talk of the Anglo-Russian Entente as in no way harmful to Persia."[69] A week later, his disappointment with British policies was such that he confessed to Browne, his former teacher at Cambridge University, "I am seriously contemplating the possibility of throwing off my profession. . . . When a government turns aside from the straight path of equity and plunges into the crooked byway of pure politics, playing with the happiness of other nations, then it is time for honest men to desinterest themselves of the game and leave it to the professional politicians."[70]

Smart saw in Browne the Emile Zola of England. He urged him to write a letter similar to the famous French novelist's "J'accuse," which had roused French sympathy for Captain Alfred Dreyfus, the Alsatian Jewish officer fallen victim of the anti-Semitism rampant within the military ranks. Smart wrote to his professor, "I want you to publish the Truth in England, show England how heavy has been her responsibility for this affair."[71] Smart was particularly incensed with the British role because he was convinced that the constitutionalists and their armed mojadehin had surrendered their arms upon British officials' assurance of support. Otherwise, he contended, they would have fought. Smart also vehemently denied the Russian allegation that the constitutionalists formed "a hot bed of revolutionaries," and he pleaded with Browne to "combat these tendentious reports"[72] which *The Times of London* carried.

Browne's knowledge of Iran and Iranian society and culture was well respected in government circles, especially at the Foreign Office. Spring-Rice, who headed the legation in Tehran until the fall of 1908, widely respected his opinion, and even shared his views of the constitutional movement as a positive means for the regeneration of the country. He had kept close contact with Browne, regularly corresponding and exchanging ideas. As early as January 1908, he had suggested to Browne that he send copies of Smart's letters to Lord Grey, together with Browne's own summary and comments, hoping to influence the minister's view of events in Iran.[73] Browne had direct access to Lord Grey; but it was H. F. B. Lynch who was to play a pivotal role in influencing Foreign Office policy toward Iran. Lynch, a liberal member of Parliament well acquainted with Iran and Iranian affairs, had openly criticized the Anglo-Russian Entente from the very beginning, contending that England had "got the worst of the bargain," and that her relations with Iran were bound to worsen. "Persia is the ghost at the feast which we are celebrating with Russia in honour of this Convention," he told the House of Commons. "This small nation . . . is lying between life and death, parcelled out, almost dismembered, helpless and friendless at our feet."[74]

A self-styled "liberal imperialist,"[75] Lynch worked energetically to direct the British government, and especially Lord Grey, to a more conciliatory policy toward the constitutionalists. Together with other liberal politicians, he set up a Parliamentary Persia Committee, with Browne playing a leading role. Lynch's views, which were to dominate the policy of the committee members, including Browne, were based on his conviction that a national reconciliation was of paramount importance to bring about the restoration of the constitution in

Iran. The Qajar dynasty had to be maintained on the throne; therefore, the committee's task was to induce the constitutionalists to follow a course of moderate, loyalist opposition, selecting from among them those figures most likely to succeed as leaders of a restored constitutional monarchist regime. Extremist action and ideas were thoroughly discouraged. Thus, when the constitutionalist mojtaheds of Najaf sent to all the European governments a proclamation condemning Mohammad Ali shah as a tyrant and usurper and declaring his government's decisions and loan agreements with foreign banks null and void, Lynch strongly objected to its publication in a British paper. He feared it would lead to more radical anti-shah action and, consequently, to chaos and more foreign intervention. Nonetheless, in early January 1909, when *The Times of London* published a cable announcing the royal decision to abolish the constitution upon the olama of Tehran's advice, Lynch was finally convinced that publication of the Najaf cable was "on the whole the better course, though it is not without danger."[76] The Najaf proclamation was published in the form of a Reuters news item, and, at Lynch's request, the Persia committee was not mentioned as its source.

Dozens of constitutionalists sought refuge in Europe and set up centers for the Iranian opposition. The largest number, which included former cabinet ministers and majles deputies, such as Mokhber al-Saltana, Ehtesham al-Saltana, and Momtaz al-Daula (the last majles Speaker before the coup), had settled in Paris. So did Dehkhoda and Mirza Abol Qasem Tabrizi, the publisher of *Sur-e Israfil.* Taqizada and his fellow Tabriz deputy, Mirza Aqa Farshi, Mohammad Sadeq Tabataba'i (Mohammad Tabataba'i's liberal son), and Mo'azed al-Saltana settled in London. Taqizada and Mo'azed al-Saltana had reached their European destination via the Caucasus. Although they had told the British diplomats in Tehran, who had secured their safe passages and financed their journey into exile, that they were going directly to Europe,[77] in fact they spent some time in Tiflis and Baku. Taqizada was met by Haidar Khan's father, with whom he stayed, and who also helped search for Mohammad Reza Musavat and bring him to safety in Baku.[78] Other Social Democrats had also gathered in the Caucasus, where they joined the Hemmatists and the Russian Azerbaijani liberal intelligentsia, especially Aqaev, to establish a network to raise funds from local wealthy entrepreneurs and Iranian expatriates and to provide the Tabriz resistance with arms and volunteers. Taqizada was to play a dual role throughout the period of the Lesser Despotism. On the one hand, he was to keep close contacts with the Social Democrats in northern Iran and in Transcaucasia, writing letters to raise funds, monitoring the purchase of arms in Transcaucasia, and coordinating Transcaucasian and Iranian resistance activities.[79] In London, on the other hand, he was to work with Browne and British officials, adopting a moderate, constitutional monarchist stand, subduing his extremist views. Upon his arrival in the English capital in October 1908, he immediately denied that he, or any other majles deputy, had ever espoused a revolutionary ideology. In a letter to Browne, he expressed his bitterness over British complicity in the coup. "They have fooled us, promising that neither they nor the Russians would interfere in our internal affairs, while, in fact, they were planning it all along."[80] He felt helpless, he wrote, hopeless, unfamiliar with the English language, a total stranger. Yet he

was eager to undertake, with Browne's help, an intensive campaign to arouse public opinion in England against the Russians' treachery.

Browne had heard about Taqizada from Smart, and he was more than willing to support him and his cause. Warned by Smart that the young Tabrizi "cannot be impartial" and needed coaching,[81] Browne helped Taqizada polish his style of writing and speech; he tempered Taqizada's message to make it more suitable and appealing to the British public. Moreover, he arranged for the formation of a non–Parliamentary Persia Committee, with Taqizada and Moʿazed al-Saltana directing the initiative and course[82] while he remained the moving force behind the scenes.

In his private correspondence with British supporters, in his speeches, and in newspaper articles, Taqizada persistently denied that the constitutional movement was revolutionary in character or in goals. The majles legislative reforms, he argued, were erroneously labeled revolutionary by the hostile European press. "In England," he wrote in a letter to Browne, "they call revolutionary a nation that rises against despotism."[83] In his first published article, he explained that the majles's armed forces had laid down their arms to prevent foreign intervention. "We sacrificed liberty for the sake of [national] independence."[84] He attacked the Russian role in the coup and revealed alleged Russian harassment of the Moslem population in northern Iran and in the Caucasus. In contrast, he spared England, leaving unsaid its complicity and identifying British interests with freedom in Iran. Should despotism triumph in Iran, he warned, British influence, credibility, and commercial interests would be destroyed. The Fundamental Laws, the basis of Iranian freedom, are the "spiritual child" of England, and the Iranian freedom lovers were, once more, turning to her for help. The article was judged too moderate by some liberal-minded British diplomats in Tehran. Smart considered it "rather tame and left much unsaid," assuming that Taqizada and his co-author, Moʿazed al-Saltana, "were very anxious to display moderation."[85]

Indeed, in the Foreign Office, both Spring-Rice and Grey looked favorably at Taqizada, believing him to be "on the side of moderation."[86] However, although Grey had "a personal interest" in Taqizada, direct meetings with him, or any other political exile, were deemed unwise. Spring-Rice urged caution and discretion. "It may not be desirable," he wrote to Browne, "for members of the reform party in Persia to have direct dealings with our F.O. because, evidently, the great danger to the cause of reform in Persia . . . is that it should look for appeal, not to itself, but to some foreign power. This could weaken the reform party, for it would cease to be the patriotic party." He recommended that the political exiles "look for sympathy to England and Englishmen but not to the English government."[87]

The Persia Committee provided the political exiles in Europe with a much-needed organization and network, linking them indirectly to the British government and allowing them access to the British press. Its objectives, however, as enunciated by Lynch, aimed at long-term results. "Our Committee," he wrote to Browne, "should have as one of its objectives the looking after of young Persians coming over to study and the equipping of them for the functions of government."[88] Taqizada was encouraged to pursue his study of the English language,

but by December 1908, he was advised to go back to Tabriz clandestinely. His task was to organize the national reconciliation efforts and act as the liaison between Tabriz and the political exiles in Europe.

The political exiles, sensing their helplessness and dependence on British goodwill toward their cause, strove to achieve a semblance of ideological unity and cooperation. Judging from the private correspondence now available, this was no mean feat. Tension often arose between the moderate intelligentsia and the radicals. Moʿazed al-Saltana had left London to join Dehkhoda and resume publication of *Sur-e Israfil.*[89] When the first issue came out in Yverdon, Switzerland, its lead article created an uproar among the moderate elements and alarmed Lynch. The article was deemed too extremist in its tone. In a letter to Browne Momtaz al-Daula was apprehensive that the article might be said by the reactionaries to support their allegations that the constitutionalists were antimonarchists and revolutionaries. He asked Browne to advise Moʿazed al-Saltana to refrain from writing such inflammatory pieces. "I have written to them [*Sur-e Israfil*'s staff], to no avail. They may listen to you."[90] But Dehkhoda, Moʿazed al-Saltana, and Taqizada mistrusted Momtaz al-Daula, and they communicated their views to the English professor. Taqizada, who once more had changed his route back to Tabriz without first informing Browne, detouring to the Caucasus before reaching his final destination, warned his mentor against Momtaz al-Daula.[91]

Momtaz al-Daula and his group also parted company from the radicals over the question of the Bakhtiyaris' involvement in the concerted effort to restore the constitution. As we shall see, the tribal leaders, who were then in Paris and in direct communication with members of the Persia Parliamentary Committee, were to play an important role in the fall of Tehran. The radicals were adamantly opposed to their participation, fearing Sardar Asʿad, the dominant Bakhtiyari khan, and his ambitions for the throne. Browne himself had his doubts. Momtaz al-Daula assured him that the Bakhtiyaris were genuine supporters of the constitution and loyal to the shah.[92] Lynch, on the other hand, favored Sardar Asʿad. In early February 1909, Sardar Asʿad came to Paris to meet with the Bakhtiyaris and the political exiles.[93]

By the time, Momtaz al-Daula had emerged as the leading figure among the political exiles to have won the confidence of the Persia Parliamentary Committee. Browne even attempted to bring him to London for a secret meeting with Grey. The plan was left secret, as both Browne and Momtaz al-Daula wished to prevent a "bad interpretation" of it.[94] The meeting did not take place, for Grey, in keeping with his policy of not meeting directly with the Iranian opposition, declined Browne's suggestion.

Despite the profound feeling of distrust that divided the ranks of the political exiles, a united front was successfully achieved, and the Bakhtiyaris' assurance of selfless dedication to the constitutional cause was accepted at face value. Momtaz al-Daula even went so far as to deny there were any revolutionary elements active inside or outside Iran. "The only revolutionaries are those who try to destroy" the constitution.[95] He was particularly incensed with Grey's speech at the House of Commons where the foreign minister told the members of Parliament that the constitutionalists in Europe preferred a "European type of Constitution," and that the anjoman of Tabriz refused a constitution based on

the religious laws. Grey and the Europeans in general, Momtaz al-Daula wrote to Browne, fail to understand the constitutionalists' objectives. Our constitution, he asserted, is based on the shariat; it was written down with the approval of a number of mojtaheds in Iran and Najaf. Tabriz wishes the restoration of that constitution and nothing else, he added.[96] The illusion of an existing united national front was maintained, and ideological differences were set aside for a short-term goal, the restoration of the constitution.

Concerted Efforts for the Restoration of the Constitution

By December 1908, Taqizada, Mohammad Reza Musavat, Hasan Roshdiyya, and many other members of the anjoman-e Azerbaijan and other radical organizations active in Tehran until the coup, returned to Tabriz from their respective exiles in Baku and Europe. They resumed publication of their papers and shabnamas and worked with the anjoman-e Tabriz. Their cause was then espoused by some individual members of the ruling elite. Chief among the latter group was Mohammad Vali Khan Nasr al-Saltana, the commander of the royal forces, who had defected to the constitutionalists' camp. All declared themselves nationalists and constitutionalists, struggling to prevent foreign occupation of their country and to combat royal despotism. All claimed to be obeying the commands of the olama in Najaf. Moreover, they maintained regular contacts with Baku, Istanbul, and the political exiles in Europe.

The Persia Committee, dissatisfied with the hostile press coverage of the constitutional movement, decided to select their own reporter and send him to Tabriz as special correspondent to the *Daily News, Daily Chronicle,* and *Manchester Guardian.* W. A. Moore was dispatched to Tabriz in mid-January 1909. Covering the siege until April 1909, Moore began by sending the desired articles sympathetic to the constitutionalists' cause. But he succumbed to the temptation to join in the armed struggle of Sattar Khan's forces, and thus forfeited his journalistic objectivity, causing his editors to angrily dismiss him. Lynch was highly displeased with the outcome, not only because of Moore's breach of contract but also because, by the spring of 1909, Moore was increasingly disillusioned with the Tabriz fighters, and with Sattar Khan himself. Upon his dismissal, Moore began to publish more negative reports in the *Times.* Lynch expressed his disappointment to Browne: "What a pity Moore has failed us. . . . A clever man would have altered the course of events."[97]

Privately, Moore had reached the conclusion that Taqizada, whom he did respect, had overestimated the strength of the resistance.[98] Sattar Khan, in his opinion, was a "scoundrel," "drunk and oversmoked," "utterly ignorant and weak," who "would do anything in the world for money." Moore regretted the fact that, though chosen by the committee to "draw an attractive image of the movement," he turned out to be so negative and pessimistic. He warned Browne against having any "high hope." Of greater significance was Moore's observation that the Russian officers and the consul had been "absolutely scrupulous [in their] correctness and restraint." Sattar Khan, he asserted, was never arrested; neither he nor any other Tabriz leader had been threatened in any fashion. The

Russians saved Tabriz and the Constitution, Moore insisted, even though they might destroy it later.[99]

Most sources acknowledge that Taqizada, Musavat, the Tarbiyyat brothers, and Haidar Amu oghli began to show increasing impatience with Sattar Khan and Baqer Khan, whom they held responsible for acts of brigandry and lawlessness damaging to the cause and unnecessarily alienating the population of Tabriz.[100] Within the anjoman itself, on the other hand, dissension over tactics and policies prevailed.

Theqat al-Islam's opinion on the anjoman remained ambiguous even when he began to resume negotiations with government authorities on behalf of the constitutionalists. He felt the urgent need to "reform" the organization by purging the extremists from its membership, but he was painfully aware of his own lack of influence, which he contrasted to those he still referred to as "the markaz-e ghaibi group." He envisioned five possible courses for the anjoman: constitutionalism, absolute despotism, constitutional despotism, Azerbaijan secession, or surrender to Russian occupation. He believed the first alternative was the only viable possibility.[101] Thus, he saw no difference between royal despotism and what he termed "constitutional despotism," in reference to the intransigent constitutionalists. It was precisely because of his professed moderation that Ain al-Daula renewed their association, primarily through one of his aids, Mirza Hasan Khan Meshkat al-Mamalek, a brother-in-law of Theqat al-Islam, who, like Nasr al-Saltana the Sepahdar, was in favor of restoring the constitution. The mojtahed informed the authorities that his influence with the mojahedin was minimal and that the old Shaikhi affiliations of Sattar Khan and other prominent insurgents were no longer relevant. Nevertheless, he refused to be frightened by Ain al-Daula's warning against possible Russian intervention should the war continue, arguing that Najaf, Istanbul, and London were promising support for the people of Tabriz.[102]

Theqat al-Islam was indeed encouraged by Najaf olama by take part in the official effort to bring an end to the war and stage a national reconciliation. Mollah Mohammad Kazem Khorasani, one of the three constitutionalist mojtaheds of Najaf, wrote him a personal letter commending his effort to preserve religion and advise the nation on its national obligations, insisting that top priority should be given to the prevention of foreign intervention by maintaining unity between the nation and its leaders, and by obstructing the path of the seditious.[103]

In a lengthy cable to the shah dated February 1909, Theqat al-Islam implored him to restore the constitution and reconvene the majles and, thus, bring to an end the senseless bloodshed, which, he stressed, would cause the destruction of religion, nation, and monarchy.[104] Thus began the mojtahed's historic mission, which, after weeks of intense communication with the capital and Ain al-Daula's headquarters in Basmanj, a few miles outside Tabriz, proved to be futile. From the start, it was obvious that the negotiations led by Ain al-Daula and the government officials in Tehran had no chance of success, for Taqizada and the leaders of the anjoman in Tabriz had resorted to other channels of communication to negotiate peace with the shah.

The British and Russian consuls in Tabriz, upon specific instructions from their embassies in Tehran and from their respective governments, were already

acting as effective mediators, suggesting the terms and conditions for a cease-fire. The foreign envoys were ostensibly acting to protect the foreign residents of the besieged town, where the shortage of food was felt acutely, and the population, in desperation, was believed ready to attack European homes and properties. However, concerns with the European balance of power in the Balkans lay behind a reversal in Russian attitude toward the shah. Izvolski, eager to gain British support for his Balkan strategy, was then prepared to sacrifice Mohammad Ali shah and go along with the British desire to restore the constitution. In November of that year, Hartwig was finally recalled from his post in Tehran, replaced by a more cooperative, pro-agreement official. Sablin, the new Russian envoy, was able to work closely with his British colleague, George Barclay, who also had arrived recently in Tehran. Friendly relations between the two legations permitted them to reach an accord over the situation in Tabriz in the spring of 1909, facilitating the rescue of the constitution.[105]

The British and Russian governments used the shah's pressing need for cash as an effective means to implement their plans to restore the constitution. In early April 1909, they presented the shah with the terms for a fresh joint loan. Five demands were listed as preconditions. The shah had to (1) dismiss two reactionary officials, Amir Bahador and Moshir al-Saltana; (2) restore the constitution; (3) appoint a cabinet composed of individuals to be approved by the two legations; (4) grant amnesty to all his opponents; and (5) fix a date for new elections.[106] In addition to exerting pressure on the shah to restore the constitution, British and Russian officials agreed to actively participate in arranging a cease-fire in Tabriz and, if need be, to allow Russian forces to cross the northern border and advance to Tabriz to lift the siege.

In Basmanj, Theqat al-Islam and two lower ranking mollahs, members of the anjoman, believed they were involved in a decisive diplomatic battle to save Tabriz—and the nation—from destructive civil war. Theqat al-Islam, in his communications with the shah, accused the "handful of evil-doers" of deliberately keeping the sovereign in the dark and assured him of the religious legitimacy of the constitution. He told the shah the function of the majles was not to abrogate religious laws or to revoke religious obligations and reminded him that the constitution stipulated the appointment of five mojtaheds to review all laws before passage. He vouched for the nation's loyalty, asserting, "The nation is not rebellious, and considers the independence and preservation of the Twelver [Shia] monarchy as obligatory as praying and fasting. They have often stated kings are the shadow of Truth, and are to be protected. I swear by God, no one is in favor of autonomy or desires a republic."[107] In another cable to the shah he emphatically pronounced "opposition to the Twelver monarchy is tantamount to destruction of the House of God."[108]

In the meantime, the anjoman in Tabriz accepted the British and Russian diplomats' terms for a cease-fire. A last bloody mojahedin attempt to break through the Julfa–Tabriz roadblock, in which a young American schoolteacher, Howard C. Baseville, lost his life, had ended in defeat; news rapidly spread of an imminent approach of Russian forces sent to lift the siege. Most Persian sources state the Taqizada and the anjoman leaders, faced with foreign occupation, cabled the shah a last-hour desperate message, offering total surrender in ex-

change for his order to lift the siege.[109] Royal despotism was more tolerable than foreign occupation, they argued. At this point, finally, the shah reportedly succumbed to foreign pressure and ordered Ain al-Daula to agree to a cease-fire. But the latter failed to comply. Russian troops entered Tabriz on April 29 to put an end to the siege. Tabriz's heroic resistance ended with foreign occupation. The Russian arrival stunned Theqat al-Islam, who was still in Basmanj and believed his negotiations were about to reach a successful conclusion. He bitterly complained that the anjoman had failed to inform him of recent developments in the city, and he expressed his resentment of the successful role of the foreign powers in exerting pressure on the shah to concede to the nation its constitutional rights.[110] Sattar Khan, however, welcomed the Russian troops and expressed his gratitude to the British consul.[111]

Gilan

While the mojahedin were fighting royalist forces outside Tabriz and elsewhere in Azerbaijan, several revolutionary Social Democratic cells were set up secretly in Rasht and Enzali. They were led by local revolutionists who had ties with Baku and Tiflis. In fact it was Gilan, rather than Azerbaijan, that actually succeeded in establishing a revolutionist local government entirely dominated by Social Democrats.

Practically the entire olama establishment of Gilan had joined forces with Nuri following the shah's coup of 1908.[112] Clerical members who participated in the struggle for the restoration of the constitution were lower ranking mollahs and preachers who were members of, and received their instructions from, the Social Democratic factions in Gilan and Transcaucasia. Hosain Kasma'i had studied in Najaf and belonged to the olama circle in Rasht before he joined a secret Social Democratic cell and exchanged his turban and long garb for the mojahedins' Caucasian outfit.[113] Mirza Mohsen Najmabadi, a grandson of Shaikh Hadi Najmabadi (the Tehran activist and alleged Babi), was closely associated with Malek al-Motakallemin and his Revolutionary Committee. Following the coup, he had fled to Baku before returning to join the resistance in Gilan by order of the party leaders there.[114] Mirza Kuchek Khan was another preacher active in the Social Democratic underground cell, as was Shaikh Mehdi Nuri, the constitutionalist son of Fazlollah.[115]

Among the lay leaders of the cells were Abdol Hosain Mo'ezz al-Soltan, a prominent revolutionist who participated in all fights for Rasht, Qazvin, and Tehran, and who, following the Russian Revolution of 1917, was to join the Transcaucasian revolutionary ranks. His younger brother, Karim Khan, was another revolutionist who had spent time in Transcaucasia before returning to Rasht to lead the resistance. Mirza Ali Mohammad Tarbiyyat, who was then in Tabriz together with Taqizada and fellow Constitutionalists, had also fled to Baku before returning to Gilan. Many other Gilani and Azerbaijani expatriates from Baku and Tiflis returned to Gilan, accompanied by Transcaucasian volunteers, including Eprem Khan, the Armenian revolutionist who was to play a prominent part in the battles for the constitution in Rasht, Qazvin, and Tehran.

Funds, weapons, and expertise never ceased to flow from Transcaucasia to Gilan. Reportedly, Grigorii Ordzhonikidze, a Social Democratic party leader who was to head the North Caucasus Revolutionary Committee responsible for the "sovietization" of Transcaucasia, visited Gilan secretly to explore the revolutionary climate and assess the needs of the local leaders and participated in the battles of Qazvin and Tehran.[116]

The Rasht battle of February 8, 1909 lasted barely three hours, and the resistance leaders were able to seize total control of the provincial capital after the governor was killed and the royalist officers fled the scene, leaving behind their weapons and uniforms. Nonetheless, the revolutionaries, once in power, decided to choose a new governor from among the local ruling elite rather than from among their own leadership ranks. Nasr al-Saltana the Sepahdar, who had defected during the battle of Tabriz and had secretly written to the mojahedin in Baku expressing his support for the constitutional cause, was a convenient choice. He was a wealthy landowner from Gilan, having withdrawn to his estate after his defection, and was known to have considerable influence over the local Gilani elite. The Sepahdar had not taken part in the brief battle of Rasht; upon his arrival in town to assume the post offered to him, he promised to fulfill and respect the decisions of the Social Democratic–run committee. Mohsen Najmabadi was appointed the liaison between the new governor and the committee. Surprising as it may appear, the revolutionaries' selection for the post upheld the traditional constitutionalists tactics of coopting members of the old elite, sacrificing ideological uniformity for pragmatic political gains. As Abdol Hosain Nava'i wrote, the mojahedin needed Nasr al-Saltana to play the symbolic leader, rallying behind him all nationalist forces.[117]

Inevitably, once the revolutionists established themselves and began to run the daily administration of the city, tensions arose among the leaders and between the mojahedin and the local population. The wealthy merchants and the landed aristocracy were blackmailed and forced to donate cash; some saw their businesses and properties confiscated. Members of the committee began to sense the unruliness of the mojahedin. They solicited guidance and support from Baku to restore a semblance of order within their ranks. Baku sent the young Bulgarian revolutionist Panov, who had joined the Transcaucasian party ranks and had come to play some role in informing the Russian liberal press and the West on the Russian government's involvement in the coup of 1908.[118] Nava'i wrote that Panov's arrival in Rasht only fueled the existing fire, and Eprem Khan refused to acknowledge his authority. The quarrels spilled into the streets, as two major rival factions set up headquarters in two different sections of town. Finally Panov was compelled to leave Iran. Other sources, however, attribute to Panov a leading role in the battle of Rasht, depicting him as a brave fighter who "breathed military fire into his nondescript followers."[119] In fact, Panov's controversial role in introducing a fraudulent "mojtahed" in Russian liberal circles and rumors of embezzlement of funds raised for the Iranian resistance tarnished his reputation among the more moderate elements in Transcaucasian circles.[120] His presence in Rasht caused friction and added tension to the already existing rivalry between groups. Panov remained in the city, nonetheless, and the influx of Transcaucasians continued unabated. Mohammed Amin Rasulzada, a rising

leader of the Baku Moslem Social Democratic faction and friend of Narimonov, visited Gilan at about this time.[121]

The Olama and the Restoration of the Constitution

Following the coup of June 1908, the olama who had taken an active part in the constitutional movement either were banished from the capital or resumed the traditional quiescent, apolitical attitude. Fazlollah Nuri reigned supreme in Tehran's religious circles. Nonetheless, by December 1908, moderate attempts were made to recreate the momentum of the constitutional movement. Sadr al-Olama organized a bast on the premises of the Ottoman legation to protest the shah's refusal to restore the constitution. However, unlike the earlier bast in the British legation, this crowd never exceeded three hundred people, and it decreased as the weeks passed, bringing no tangible results. Moreover, the shortage of funds was acute, and the bazaar remained open, carrying on business as usual. Another bast at the Shahabdolazim shrine was led by Jamal al-Din Afja'i, the old and respected constitutionalist mojtahed, and, surprisingly, by Seyyed Ali Aqa Yazdi, the notorious mollah who had instigated the anticonstitution riots in the Tupkhana events of December 1907. Neither bast played a significant role in restoring the constitution. In fact, at this stage, Najaf acquired a more dominant position in providing the constitutionalists with the much-needed religious sanctioning.

Following the coup, and in retaliation for the constitutionalist olama's continued support for the majles, Mohammed Ali shah had cut off all lines of communication between Tehran and Najaf, including the telegraph. As the British official in Baghdad reported, the ayatollahs found themselves "helpless" and disarmed. On August 4, 1908, a son-in-law of Khorasani by the name of Shaikh Ismail paid a visit to Major Ramsey in the consulate. Claiming he came on behalf of the mojtaheds of Najaf, he asked the envoy whether the British government still supported the constitution it had helped establish in Iran, and whether Ramsey would kindly advise the olama on the course to follow to combat Russian intervention. Ramsey refused to commit himself or his government, insisting that he did not wish to intervene in Iranian domestic affairs. Obviously skeptical of his visitor's credentials, he asked Shaikh Ismail to return some other time with proper documentation.[122] The envoy's skepticism reflected a general tendency among both Moslems and foreigners to doubt the authenticity of statements attributed to the high-ranking religious leaders. Forged fatwas and false attributions were common practice in Iran as well as in the holy cities of Iraq.

At the time of the Constitutional Revolution, Najaf was torn between two major factions centered around the two leading mojtaheds, Khorasani and Yazdi. As stated in the previous chapter, Yazdi sided with Nuri and his circle, while Khorasani backed the constitutionalists. Khorasani's active participation in the fierce political debate attracted the attention of many groups involved in the Iranian struggle. Just as Mohammad Tabataba'i in Tehran was surrounded by the religious and political extremists who sought to draw him to their side, Khorasani's circle was equally penetrated by identical groups.

The position and motives of the three olama of Najaf who supported the constitution from the beginning need further investigation. One has to note that at this point, the olama and the mojahedin shared a profound distaste for the Russian imperial government. Whereas the religious leaders feared military intervention, the mojahedin and their Transcaucasian comrades-in-arms fiercely fought to undermine the tsar's regime in the empire and in Iran. The need to prevent Russian intervention coincided with the Russian Social Democrats' revolutionary objectives. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Iranian constitutionalists and the Social Democratic affiliates of the Baku faction sought support from Najaf, despite their general secularist views.

The secret activities of the faction in the Shia centers of learning also need investigation. Scattered references to the presence of Transcaucasian students in the religious schools of Najaf and Kerbala, and to the formation of secret societies by the more "progressive-minded" and "well-informed" tollab from among them, indicate a certain measure of underground activism prior to the revolution. Copies of Persian newspapers published abroad, especially the *Habl al-Matin* of Calcutta, circulated freely. Paid for by the Baku millionaire Taqiev, they were distributed to the tollab and the olama, in order to arouse their national consciousness and to awaken them from their "long sleep of ignorance." However, it was after the coup that one could detect the presence of a strong and highly efficient Social Democratic connection in Najaf. Tabriz and Istanbul provided networks and liaisons linking Najaf to Baku.

The Tabriz revolutionaries kept in constant touch with the three constitutionalist olama of Najaf, primarily through the anjoman-e Saʿadat, which was then set up in Istanbul. Shaikh Selim, the constitutionalist preacher and member of the Secret Center group, who had fled Tabriz shortly after the coup, was then in Najaf acting as the chief liaison for the Tabriz insurgents. He often traveled to Istanbul, where he conferred with members of the anjoman-e Saʿadat.[123] The anjoman was active in keeping the world informed of the plight of Tabriz and in advising the Shia mojtaheds in Najaf on the moves and pronouncements needed to promote the constitutional cause. Most of the cables to and from Najaf were sent via Istanbul, where the anjoman-e Saʿadat printed thousands of copies and had them circulated in Iran, Turkey, Transcaucasia, and Europe. Shortly after the coup, the constitutionalist mojtahed Khorasani appointed a young mollah by the name of Asadollah Mamaqani, a native of Azerbaijan and friend of Shaikh Selim, to represent Najaf in the anjoman of Istanbul. In a brief account of his own role in the constitutional movement, Mamaqani acknowledged his membership in a secret society founded in Najaf prior to the revolution.[124] This society, composed of young tollab "enlightened and well informed in world affairs," used its own printing press to publish proclamations favoring new schools with modern curricula. It increased its publications after the promulgation of the constitution, but it was forced by the local authorities and the Iranian consul in Baghdad to cease its activities after the coup. The new liberal government that came to power in Istanbul in August 1908 allowed the society to resume its activities and established friendly rapport with members of the anjoman-e Saʿadat. The leaders of the Turkish Party of Union and Progress reportedly encouraged the formation of a communication channel between Najaf and Istanbul. Mamaqani was one of

its chief links, until he was sent to Istanbul as the official Najaf representative. His presence, according to Amir-Khizi, conferred religious respectability on the anjoman frequented mostly by secularists.[125] Apparently the young mollah quickly adapted to his new, more modern environment, enrolling in French language classes and taking secular law courses at the Dar al-Fonun. He subsequently acquired a law degree, gave up his clerical garb, and practiced in secular courts of justice in Iran before being elected a member of the Senate.

By this time many of the leading Iranian intellectuals and former members of the radical anjomans of Tehran before the coup, including Mirza Qasem Khan, publisher of *Sur-e Israfil,* and Ali Akbar Dehkhoda, its most important contributor, arrived in the Ottoman capital from Europe and joined the anjoman-e Sa'adat. Yahya Daulatabadi, the Azali nationalist, was also included in the group. Again according to Mamaqani, the anjoman-e Sa'adat had established close ties with the Social Democrats of Transcaucasia. At an international meeting held at Avignon, France, which the anjoman organized, "freedom seekers of the East"—Turks, Arabs, Iranians, Moslem and Christian Transcaucasians, including members of the Dashnak Armenian revolutionary group—met to denounce Russian imperialism and to promote the cause of the Moslems subjected to its rule.[126]

Some of the fatwas and long cables attributed to Khorasani, Mazandarani, and Tehrani, which indeed called for jehad against the shah and urged the faithful to combat his un-Islamic rule, may have been written by younger members of the religious institutions who served the ayatollahs. Nazem al-Islam on several occasions seriously doubted the authenticity of the more radically worded fatwas and cables. There was precedence for the forging of fatwas, as in the case of Shirazi's banning tobacco consumption in 1891 and the subsequent declaration of holy war against Naser al-Din shah, also attributed to Shirazi. The tradition of clerical extremists infiltrating and manipulating intimate circles of ranking mojtaheds for their own ends is amply documented. The genuine concern of the three mojtaheds of Najaf with the Russian role in the shah's counterrevolution, and their no less genuine desire to have political tyranny checked in Iran, served the purpose of many groups whose views and objectives did not coincide with those of the religious leaders.

One of the telegrams bearing the three mojtaheds' signatures was addressed to an Ottoman official, appealing to the Sunni Soltan for Ottoman help.[127] It was most probably forged. In it, the Ottoman soltan is referred to as the Amir al-Mo'menin, a title the Imami Shia reserve for the Imam alone. The ayatollahs of Najaf were not likely to commit what amounts to blasphemy. Nor can one seriously believe they ever contemplated pan-Islamism and an Ottoman caliphate as an alternative to the Iranian monarchy. As already stated, most of their pronouncements deemed authentic favored national reconciliation. In this respect, Theqat al-Islam's views were in perfect harmony with those of his colleagues and fellow constitutionalists in Najaf. Moreover, pan-Islamism, as conceived by Jamal al-Din Asadabadi, proved once more to be an expedient umbrella, lending the Iranian political activists respectability for their worldly, secularist goals. There is no reason to believe that the Iranian expatriates living in Istanbul during the period of the Lesser Despotism were more religious-minded than their predecessors. The

story of Panov and his traveling companion, Shaikh Mirza Ali, is another case illustrating the point.

The olama of Najaf were not concerned with democratic principles, and they were not fully informed on the nature and the basis of the Fundamental Laws enacted in 1907. Nor were they aiming at overthrowing the monarchy. On the contrary, among the fatwas attributed to them, those that are most likely to be authentic were carefully worded, urging the believers to safeguard Islam and the Moslems and to undercut the efforts of the seditious to sow division between the people and the government. They never failed to call for national reconciliation when they addressed the constitutionalists or to insist on the reconvening of the majles when they wrote to the shah. They conceived the constitution and the majles to be the best institutional means to check tyranny and abuse of power by the ruler. It is significant that opponents of the constitution had attempted to discredit the majles by charging the deputies and their backers with heretical usurpation of the Hidden Imam's political function. As already stated, Theqat al-Islam had vehemently denied these charges, reassuring the olama of Najaf that the constitutionalists had no intention of conferring shar'i status to their government.

The frequently quoted work of Mohammad Hosain Na'ini must be studied within the context of the current clerical debate in Najaf and in light of the political circumstances that led its author to publish an expurgated version of his original manuscript.[128] It was written at a time when Na'ini, though already holding the license to practice ejtehad, did not yet rank high enough to have his own circle of tollab and disciples. He had neither the reputation nor the means to attract a sizable following and thus take a stand independent from more established olama. He was a close aide to Khorasani and reportedly composed all the latter's cables and public pronouncements to which Mazandarani and Tehrani attached their signatures.[129] It is important to note there that neither of the standard sources on the revolution, and not even the *Tarikh Bidari,* mention Na'ini or his work. Of even greater significance is the fact that Na'ini, by the time he attained higher status, had already destroyed most of the existing copies of his work. He was directly responsible for the elimination of a rare treatise dealing with the issue of constitutionalism and Shi'ism, written in one of the holiest centers of Shia learning. On the other hand, none of the three constitutionalist ayatollahs had left a work concerning the debate that preoccupied them so intensely for months.

Tanbih al-Omma wa Tanzih al-Milla, written by Na'ini in 1909 in response to Nuri's attacks on the Constitution, was not an authentic Shia political theory of government. As Abdul Hadi Hairi demonstrated, it was based on the Egyptian work *Taba'i' al-Istibdad* by Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi, which itself was based on Vittorio Alfieri's *Of Tyranny.*[130] More importantly, Na'ini's arguments were merely echoing those of other Iranian constitutionalists who had promoted the concept of constitutional government as being based on Islamic Shia principles. Na'ini may indeed have been influenced by al-Kawakibi, Alfieri, Yusuf Khan Mostashar al-Daula, Malkom Khan, and other earlier champions of political freedom, as Hairi correctly contended. However, it was Theqat al-Islam of Tabriz, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, and Malek al-Motakallemin, members of the majles,

orators, preachers, newspapermen, who directly provided Na'ini with most of his arguments proving the Islamic Shia basis of the constitution. By the time he came to write his essay, Iranians were already familiar with its ideas, its references to the Koran and holy texts, its analogies, its symbols, and its rethoric.

Like Theqat al-Islam, Na'ini insisted that in the time of *ghaibat,* when a shar'i government was not possible, a constitutional government provided the best possible alternative. He denied as vehemently as the Tabrizi mojtahed that the constitutionalists and their deputies in the majles were usurping the function of the Imam. Both stressed the fact that in the absence of the Imam, any ruler, regardless of his regime, is inherently "unjust," and that a constitutional government helped alleviate this necessary political condition of the community of believers deprived of the "sinless" and perfect leadership of the Imam. Both accepted the necessary existence of a ruler to defend Islam, protect the Moslems against its enemies from within and without, and run its worldly—orfi—affairs. Both backed the traditional separation of orfi matters from shar'i jurisdiction. However, Theqat al-Islam, who was directly involved in the constitutional movement at the time when article 2 of the supplement (which granted a council of five mojtaheds the right to approve laws before passage in the majles) was fiercely debated, had carefully declared all majles legislation to fall under orfi jurisdiction. Writing after the coup, Na'ini had to grant the olama greater political authority. Thus, he argued that the olama, as custodians of the holy law and supervisors of public morality, had the right to assume the function of supervising the state in fulfilling its obligations "to promote the good and forbid the bad" properly. Na'ini may have wished to formulate more clearly a new concept of the faqih as, ultimately, the supreme source of political authority, but he refrained from doing it in this essay. In fact, he specifically informed his readers that he had withdrawn from circulation two important sections dealing with the political functions of the foqaha, upon the advice of the late ayatollah Tehrani, who had died in December 1908, and whom he "saw in his dreams."[131] Instead, he insisted on conferring on the individual the right to assume the task of ensuring public morality and supervising the proper functioning of the government, be he authorized by the mojtaheds or not. Article 2, Na'ini wrote, already provides legitimacy to the majles. The deputyship of the nation's representatives does not in any way usurp the Imam's political function. As a deputy of the people, not the Imam, he does not need shar'i status in order to be legitimate. Thus Na'ini, again like Theqat al-Islam, responded to Nuri and fellow anticonstitutionalist olama's attacks by drawing a distinction between worldly government and the ideal shar'i government, without denying the legitimacy of the former.[132] He also justified in religious terms the concept of majority rule. Finally, Nai'ini shared Theqat al-Islam's view of the extremist anjomans as destructive means of a handful of seditious individuals who, in the name of the nation, wished to accomplish their evil ends. He equally deplored their "shameful deeds" and vehemently denied that they truly represented the constitutionalists. These anjomans were as representative of the nation and of the constitutional movement as the "tyrannical olama" were of Islam and the religious laws, he declared emphatically. Both types constituted the most destructive, corrupt, and divisive forces currently working to erode religious and national strength and unity.[133]

Na'ini's angry denunciation of the anticonstitutionalist olama was identical to that of Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Malek al-Motakallemin, and most other preachers and lay writers who rose in defense of the constitution and the majles. Like them, he saw ignorance as the root of tyranny and oppression. He devoted large sections of his treatise to defining and condemning religious tyranny, which he declared to be a greater evil than political tyranny. His defense of the concept of freedom of the pen and of opinion, equality of Iranians regardless of their religious affiliation, separation of powers (executive, legislative, and judicial), equality of the ruler and the ruled, the monarch's accountability and responsibility toward his subjects, and the subjects' right to share power by direct participation in government affairs is reminiscent of the stand taken by majles deputies, orators, and newspaper columnists. Na'ini also appropriated the reference to the shah as the shepherd guarding his flock from an article that appeared in *Roh al-Qods* and had caused turmoil in the capital and angered Mohammad Ali shah. Na'ini's allegation that the original democratic precepts of Islam were suppressed by the Caliph Mo'awiyya and subsequent usurpers of power echoes not only al-Kawakibi but also the majles deputies who took great pains to deny charges of emulating the Infidels. Like the deputies, Na'ini denied that granting equal rights to the religious minorities was tantamount to abrogating the shariat laws concerning the dhimmi, and, like them, he argued that the religious minorities were to be treated as equals before the law. Finally, it is interesting to note here that Na'ini, enjoying the sanctity of Najaf, which was outside Iranian government jurisdiction, and writing when Mohammad Ali shah was no longer receiving unconditional backing from England or even Russia, denounced the despotic regime in unequivocal terms. His tone and rhetoric were thus much closer to those of the radical preachers and press than to Theqat al-Islam, who was, at that time, eager to stage a national reconciliation.

The March on Tehran

Eprem Khan and the mojahedin under his command were determined, at this point, to march to Tehran and force the shah to restore the constitution. The battle of Qazvin of May 4, 1909, and the mojahedin conquest of the town were conceived and executed as the first step leading to the capital. The battle lasted a few hours, marking another easy victory for the mojahedin and Eprem Khan. It was a week later that the Sepahdar, the appointed governor of Gilan and the titular leader of the constitutionalist forces of the north, reached Qazvin with the rest of the mojahedin forces.[134] However, he was reluctant to continue the advance toward Tehran, preferring to confer with the foreign authorities and with the Bakhtiyar tribal leaders, who were simultaneously contemplating a march from Isfahan.[135] On the other hand, some of the Rasht committee leaders were receiving urgent messages from Taqizada asking them to halt their advance on the capital.[136] Taqizada, as noted previously, feared the political implications of a Russian presence on Iranian soil.

The Bakhtiyar tribal leaders' decision to join the constitutional movement was motivated primarily by their interest in acquiring a broader power base

through active participation in national affairs. As Gene Garthwaite has argued, by 1909 the khans (tribal leaders) had consolidated their dominant position within the tribal confederation and were enjoying increased revenues as a result of their agreements with British commercial firms, including the d'Arcy Oil Company, and with the British consuls.[137] Abbas Qoli Khan Sardar Asʿad, the chief architect of the Bakhtiyari involvement in the constitutional cause, was a young member of the ruling tribal family. He saw in the movement the best possible means to attain a dominant tribal position. While in Europe in 1908–1909, he had met many constitutionalists in exile and had spoken extensively with British officials. In January 1909, one of his older brothers, Samsam al-Saltana, had seized Isfahan, deposing the governor. In March, Sardar Asʿad returned from Europe to prepare a march on Tehran. British authorities in London and Isfahan apparently were informed of his plans and, according to the Bakhtiyar version, secretly encouraged it.[138] As Garthwaite indicated, a remarkable and unprecedented unity of action was then achieved by all the Bakhtiyar khans (with the exception of two) during this later phase of the revolution. All were aspiring to expanded roles in national affairs; all were seeking new sources of income.

However, the presence of Russian forces in Tabriz, along with news of the revolutionists' successes in Qazvin and of the imminent Bakhtiyar march from the south, forced the shah to capitulate to the two powers' demands. On May 4 he announced his readiness to comply, and on May 10 he officially restored the old constitution in its entirety. On May 18 he responded to the Sepahdar's demands, assuring him that the constitution was restored without alterations. Sablin telegraphed his government, "Anglo-Russian representations took effect. The cabinet suggested by the Legations is making a serious impression."[139] The new cabinet was headed by Naser al-Molk, the Oxford-educated Qajar prince who had long supported the constitution and the majles. The Foreign Ministry was given to Saʿd al-Daula, the constitutionalist leader who had defected to the shah's camp in the spring of 1907. Barclay then instructed British consuls in the provinces to point out to the constitutionalist leaders that "it was now their duty to do everything in their power to secure a reconciliation between the Popular Party and the Shah."[140] The "Popular Party," in British terminology, referred to the moderate reformers and excluded the mojahedin-type revolutionists. Indeed, British authorities had repeatedly cautioned Nasr al-Saltana the Sepahdar against the armed forces he nominally headed. Similarly, both the Russians and the British mistrusted the Bakhtiyars' ambitious khans. They feared the destabilizing effects on the capital, and the nation in general, of the unruly tribesmen's and the mojahedins' combined forces. Attempts were made by officials of the two legations to halt the march on Tehran and to counsel moderation to Sardar Asʿad and the Sepahdar. Russia threatened military intervention—and even ordered more forces to prepare to advance on the capital.

London was, nevertheless, prepared for any eventuality. Grey had in fact telegraphed Barclay his instruction that "if the Nationalists are not now satisfied with the tardy surrender of the shah, we cannot be responsible in any way," and that "in such a case your attitude should be one of strict neutrality, and any action which might be interpreted as an intervention should be avoided."[141]

Eprem Khan and his small group of mojahedin attempted to assault Karaj, where the royalist forces were stationed. The attack failed drastically. The fall of Tehran was not accomplished till the Bakhtiyar leaders were ready to push for the final battle. Without the Bakhtiyars, the Sepahdar would not have ventured alone to seize Tehran; the mojahedin forces would have had even less chance of success. The militant Social Democratic revolutionaries, carrying the banner of Western liberalism and constitutionalism, marched to Tehran, led by a former official of the Qajars and by tribal khans. The restoration of the constitution was accomplished as a result of the coalition of disparate social groups temporarily setting aside serious ideological differences and enjoying the blessings of the two powers—however short-lived.[142]

Conclusion

Although the Constitutional Revolution is generally viewed as indicative of the olama's increased opposition to the Qajar state and the influence of foreign powers, the role of religion in the politics of the time must be reassessed. The participation of individual olama in the major events of the turn of the century was not motivated by doctrinal or religionational considerations. The sources clearly reveal that the olama were neither the leaders nor the initiators of the movements of revolt; they were the agitators rather than the instigators. Religion provided the opposition with a respectable and legitimate aura, with symbols and rhetoric, a banner rather than an ideology. However, here one must emphasize the fact that the state, too, enjoyed religious sanction and received equal support from individual olama. Personal motives and professional rivalry determined which side individual religious leaders would take. Similarly, non-religious factors decided the outcome of the conflicts; the power and resources of groups and individuals involved, and foreign interests, determined which way the pendulum would swing.

The high-ranking olama who supported the majles perceived it as an assembly of wise men, where they themselves would have a dominant role. Their religious pronouncements sanctioned its functions. The majles would set limits to oppression, making it tolerable in this long period of ghaibat, in the absence of the lawful ruler, and ensuring the protection of the right religion and the holy law. Observing the traditional Islamic distinction of orf from shar' jurisdiction, they conceded to the majles the power to legislate laws pertaining to public affairs and establish reforms salutary to the nation's material well-being. Indeed, they viewed the majles as a means to institutionalize the orfi system.

The constitution was often defended as compatible with the spirit of the shariat, and some preachers expediently attempted to equate mashruta with mashru'a, thus confusing the issues in the mind of the uninformed public. However, the constitution was never identified with the shariat. It was Nuri who had prematurely believed that the majles would officially proclaim the rule of the shariat, before finally turning against the constitutionalists. He was eventually declared heretical by the olama of Najaf who had supported the constitution. Disputes arose when the time came to legislate reforms affecting the social and cultural institutions traditionally under olama control. An unlikely alliance was then formed between the constitutionalists and royalists, moderates and radicals, reformers and revolutionists. It was an alliance based solely on a common desire to see the olama's social influence decisively curtailed. It was the shah and his aides

who had at first refused to endorse the terms mashruta and melli, insisting on mashruʿa and islami instead. The latter words were symbolic of the traditional order where clerical power was de facto dependent on temporal power. The shah finally accepted the constitutionalists' choice when warned that the term mashruʿa implied greater authority to the olama in political affairs. Conversely, the anticonstitutionalist olama, like Nuri—who rose in defense of Islam and the shariat and denounced the constitution as a tool in the hand of the enemies of Islam scheming to eradicate religion—were fully supportive of the monarch's right to rule and opposed to the majles decision to have him simply reign like his British counterpart.

Of even greater significance to the understanding of the nature of the constitutional movement is the political process that preceded the adoption of the supplement to the constitution in October 1907. Article 2 of the supplement is invariably seen as evidence of the olama's power in their struggle to assert their authority against both the monarchy and the state. It calls for the formation of a permanent council of five mojtaheds to review all laws before their passage. In fact this clause was adopted by all parties, with very few individual exceptions, as a means to pacify Nuri, a compromise reached after weeks of secret negotiations between the latter, who had proposed it, and Tabataba'i and Behbahani, who originally opposed it. It was a gesture of conciliation at the bargaining table, displaying the constitutionalists' position of strength in contrast to the sulking Nuri's. It symbolized Behbahani and Tabataba'i's final willingness to concede to their hated rival a share in the glory. The inclusion of this clause, which theoretically grants veto power in legislative matters to the clerical council, dubbed the sena-ye ruhani (Ecclesiastical Senate) by the anticlericals, may have marked a decisive victory for the champions of the shariat. However, its implementation was never contemplated, as subsequent events show. The lay politicians who were to dominate the majles, then and later, be they liberal or conservative, would not allow it; moreover, the high-ranking olama were never united enough to defend their newly acquired, historically unprecedented, political power.

Article 8 granted all people, regardless of their religious affiliation, equal rights before the law. This, in addition to the 1906 constitutional law granting the religious minorities the right of representation in the majles, marked a radical departure from Islamic tradition of treating the dhimmis as protected but unequal subjects. Nuri and fellow conservative olama, including some clerical members of the majles, had violently opposed it. But their objections were overruled, as wealthy Zoroastrians and Parsees from Bombay, engaged in lucrative business in Iran, skillfully campaigned for the clause, ensuring the full support of their Moslem partners, the powerful merchants of Tehran, and distributing cash to leading clerics and newspapermen.

Article 19 established compulsory universal education and brought the national education system under control of the state. Articles 71 through 89 dealt severe blow to clerical power, giving the civil courts of justice and a court of appeal supreme authority in the judiciary, although recognizing the mojtaheds' authority in sharʿ matters. This issue had markedly divided the ranks of the constitutionalists themselves, as some olama attempted to defend their traditional rights and prerogatives. The battle was private, often secret, but fierce,

involving Behbahani as leader of the clerical opposition, on the one hand, and lay politicians and government officials, radical preachers, and men of letters, on the other. Both parties remained uncompromising and intransigent. The final triumph of the secularists is indicative of the considerable erosion of the olama's influence. Thus the supplement left no doubt of the majles's intention "to emancipate itself from the yoke of the priesthood," as the British envoy put it. Whereas Behbahani was primarily fighting for his personal, and not institutional, interests, lay opponents were stronger in their determination to legislate national reforms aiming at widespread social change. The religious dissidents and the new breed of liberal intellectuals, in alliance with the conservative ruling elite, laid the legal basis for the radical social transformation of twentieth-century Iran. The religious leadership and the traditional Islamic order suffered the consequences. Their losses were neither accidental nor unforeseen, as often stated, but already detected in some events and socioreligious trends of the second half of the nineteenth century.

The political success of the Constitutional Revolution did not match its social success. In fact, the consensus among historians and observers that it failed to achieve its original goals, an independent unified nation ruled by a constitutional monarch and a national assembly, is well documented. Though the role of the two big powers involved in Iran at the time, Russia and Great Britain, cannot be underestimated or overlooked as a serious cause, the roots of the political problems are deeply buried within the domestic scene.

All the various groups that so dramatically united in their effort to legislate the secularizing reforms pitifully failed to offer a similar united front in the political struggle. Basically there were three ideological groups active within the ranks of the constitutionalists, representing three different traditions of revolution: the Shia tradition of dissent, the Western tradition of liberalism, and the more recent but increasingly visible Russian tradition of radicalism. These three trends, first detected in action at the turn of the century, were to shape the politics of Iran down to the present, with the official religious leadership playing an ambivalent, ambiguous, often minor, role. At the turn of the century the delineation was not so clear-cut, since the three often overlapped, or the lines were deliberately blurred for political expediency. Periodically, individual alignments and alliances shifted, as happened when the battle for the constitution and the supplement was raging. More importantly, the practice of *taqiyya* rendered the task of detection almost impossible.

The religious dissidents were by no means a homogeneous group. Some were truly freethinkers; others were more orthodox in doctrinal outlook but favored broadening the intellectual horizon through the adoption of modern Western knowledge and some of its institutions. Many were former Azali Babis, but neither their objectives nor their motives lay in this direction. In fact, they represented those activists who, prior to the outbreak of the revolution, had realized the futility of any attempt at doctrinal reforms, consequently transferring their call for change from the religious to the political arena. By doing so, they were able to work within the religious circles, helping in the formation of a political network of mobilized mollahs, and in attracting, guiding, and counseling the high-ranking religious leaders to the cause, while concealing their ultimate secular ends. I refer

to them collectively as religious dissidents because they were carrying on the arguments, and using the rhetoric and tactics, of the traditional Shia dissenters. Although their views were often identical with those of the liberals or the radicals, they were not quite laymen. They maintained their mollah identity; they continued to wear the turban and the religious garb; and they preached in mosques and religious schools, always referring to Islam and the holy texts. In fact, it was the words and action of this group more than the high-ranking religious leaders that helped spread the ideas of constitutionalism and majles and created part of the myth of Shia Islam rising in defense of the nation against the despotic monarch. Neither Tabataba'i nor Theqat al-Islam, the two mojtaheds who, exceptionally, had openly espoused modernist views, represented mainstream Shia olama, be they constitutionalists or anticonstitutionalists.

The clerical spokesmen for secularism had a shadowy career, moving easily in and out of the olama's inner circles. Their goals, however, were unchanging, even though they were often entangled in the tortuous schemes of the constitutionalists' politics, and despite the dangerous rhetorical acrobatics and linguistic games of mashruta–mashru'a. Along with the laymen of the pen, they desired structural changes in the sociocultural institutions, which they deemed necessary for the implementation of broad social reforms. They took up the task of enlightening the public on the significance and objectives of their movement. They lectured in mosques and public squares, founded newspapers and circulated pamphlets to disseminate their ideas, and arranged clandestine meetings with the majles deputies to plan their course of action. Through them the public was informed almost daily on the issues and policies debated in the majles, kept up to date with events, and, when needed, mobilized to repel the counterrevolutionaries. These were the secularist intellectual leaders, a new breed in Iran, who dominated the cultural scene, imposing their novel and innovative ideas, formulating the nationalist ideology. Thus, cultural and social modernism was ushered in by low-ranking members of the religious institution and by lay Westernizers.

Similarly, it was members of these two groups, although very few indeed, who raised their voices against the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907, which, in effect, divided Iran into Russian and British spheres of influence. Judging from the minutes of the majles and from the newspapers of the time, neither the leading merchants nor the high-ranking olama grasped the issue. Indeed, it was the silence of these major influential groups that made the British envoy express his satisfaction to the Foreign Office: "On the whole the Agreement has been well received in Iran," he wrote on October 10, 1907. For the Iranians engaged in the events of the summer and fall of that year, the supplement to the constitution and not the agreement, or foreign encroachment, had top priority.

To satisfy the religious dissidents' chief purpose—the curtailment of the mojtaheds' power in society—any means, any tactics, any alliance was possible. Thus ideologically the dissidents were "fickle," easily convertible. This flexibility was not found among the liberals, who, of all three groups, were the steadiest and thus the longest lasting, capable of eventually attracting members of the other groups. They assumed the task of instructing the nation on the meaning of constitutionalism. It was they who drafted the constitution and supplement, prepared the Electoral Laws supervised the elections, and came to dominate the

majles until the radicals took over. Their objectives were identical to those of their counterparts throughout the non-Western world, to modernize following the Western model. To do so effectively, they saw the need to change the traditional autocratic shah's rule into a constitutional monarchy, with individuals like themselves assuming leadership of a parliamentary system. Despite their interests in French institutions and ideas, they viewed the French Revolution with distaste and rejected republicanism as too alien to their own political culture; they wished for Iran an English type of evolutionary process of change. Religion, they believed, was to continue as a dominant factor in the life of the citizens; the olama, however, had to gently but firmly be pushed to their mosques, stripped of their traditional prerogatives as educators and judges. Most of the liberals were pious believers but anticlerical, in keeping with the tradition of their forefathers, the educated lay ruling elite of premodern Iran.

Outwardly, the radicals were hard to distinguish from the other two groups; their objectives were basically no different, and eventually they attracted some members of the religious dissidents and, to a lesser extent, the liberals. At first, they were to be found in high concentration in Azerbaijan, especially Tabriz, where they had, prior to the revolution, contacts with the Social Democratic party of the Caucasus, mainly in Baku, where Moslem Azerbaijani subjects of Russia predominated. On the eve of the revolution, Tabriz founded its own Social Democratic branch, receiving its instructions and some of its leadership from the Baku party. Its members were not only anticlerical but also antireligious, though they often adopted a tactical tolerance of Islam in order to mobilize the olama for their cause. However, they were not averse to using threatening, slandering language at times when proconstitutional olama turned lukewarm in their support. Their retribution was swift when encountering hostility, as was the case when they expelled from Tabriz the two most powerful religious leaders. Politically, too, they tended to be radical, opposed to the monarchy, flirting with the idea of a republic for Iran, blackmailing the majles deputies with the threat of engineering Azerbaijan's secession. Tactically they emulated their Russian counterparts, using verbal and physical violence to achieve their ends. They publicly denounced corrupt deputies, revealed the shady deals of greedy merchants, referred to the olama as "traders in religion," teaching superstitions rather than true religion, and often reminded the shah of Louis XVI's fate. Some even toyed with the idea of land reforms and more equal distribution of wealth.

Current research offers no evidence that the radicals had either the means or even the serious intention of implementing some of their views. They were belligerent, aggressively self-assertive, and they came to dominate the majles by the late summer of 1907. Nonetheless, they were fully aware of their numerical disadvantage and of the strength of the opposition to their tactics. In the last analysis, they proved to be vulnerable to exposure, as reactionary forces infiltrated and manipulated their organizations. Agents provocateurs encouraged further radicalization in order to create a crisis and lay the groundwork for the coup of June 1908. By frightening the moderates, the religious establishment, and the Western power initially supportive of the constitution, the radicals provided the opposition with the means to achieve its own ends, causing a severe

setback for the entire movement. This experience was to be repeated again and again in all subsequent periods of political crisis.

Events leading to the promulgation of the constitution brought to the fore an additional element, popular participation in politics. The crowd in the streets emerged, not as an autonomous rational voting force (most of them could not meet the prerequisites), but as an important tool in the hands of political leaders, lay or clerical. The audacity and zeal of youth, which provided the politicians with a constituency and a power base, was cleverly manipulated by skillful orators, who told the crowd what they wanted to hear while maneuvering them in the desired direction. Shopkeepers and bazaar retailers, artisans and apprentices, students and idle spectators—they filled to capacity the mosques, madrasas, and galleries reserved for them in the majles. No one had any illusion as to their ability to grasp the significance of the events so rapidly unfolding under their very eyes, or to understand the meaning of novel concepts wrapped so neatly in religious rhetoric. The concerns of the crowd were immediate, pragmatic, material. Most sources assessed accurately its interests in terms of individual daily needs, price control, and adequate supply of commodities.

Perhaps typical of this new group was Ahmad Tafreshi-Hosaini, author of *Ruznama-ye Akhbar-e Mashrutiyyat.* A low-ranking employee in Mohammad Ali shah's court, he recorded his daily impressions of events, expressing both amazement and apprehension. His account displays the general sense of insecurity of his class caught in the conflict. He was candid enough to confess that since the majles was established, he had "become poor and distressed. For the job of a civil servant is nothing but theft, extortion and pressure. Within the last two years, our mouth has been shut, and the way to extortion closed."[1] His fate was that of the cautious, who attempted to tread softly in order to survive, taking no side, even though he often cheered the constitutionalists' gains. He was fully aware of the precariousness of his position, attached as he was to the court as a minor employee. "Should the constitutionalists get their way," he wrote, "poor wretched us would be defamed, gaining nothing from either side."[2] He often revealed his confusion and bewilderment over the significance of the disputes between the majles and the royal court. In a special entry marking the height of the struggle, he wrote, "Today was a day of mourning for the constitutionalists. However, in the afternoon, when the Ministers came to the majles, . . . I personally heard Sani' al-Daula tell Moshir al-Saltana things have improved according to the nation's wishes. Thus, by the evening, the constitutionalists had, once more, gained strength. It appears that the constitution is the Imam's, and, therefore, is lawful. Power is always on the Imam's side; if this time, too, God assists the constitution, then one must turn constitutionalist."[3]

This pragmatic approach to judging events, declaring the winner righteous, was to color his perception of the subsequent events. During the Tupkhana episode, he expressed his inability to take either side. "Unfortunate and uneducated as I am, I still have not understood who is right. . . . One has to be knowledgeable to understand these issues, and determine who is right. Praise be God, I am not knowledgeable. I know that much, our means to steal and do wrong are now obstructed, and we no longer have any income. May God grant

power and victory to the righteous. I know that much, both parties are Moslem and in possession of one holy book, and our shah is affectionate."[4]

Writing about the coup, Tafreshi explained that many constitutionalists were compelled to recant or lie under oath to escape execution, adding, "Our obligation is to pray. God be praised, I belonged to no anjoman to be now forced to swear a lie and, thus, run the perils of perjury. The Koran is no lie. . . . A person who takes an oath must either remain true to his commitment, or await divine punishment. I am gratified that I am free of this calamity. I have no account to settle with God; nor am I on the constitutionalist black list. After all, what are we? A tiny particle of no consequence."[5]

The Constitutional Revolution is a case study of the initial modernization process in action, involving its direct agents, the intelligentsia; its willing partners, the religious dissidents; and their respective unwitting assistants from among the members of the traditionally conservative temporal and religious centers of power—all enjoying the support of the mercantile bourgeoisie. In its course, political vendettas and intrigues, rifts of ranks, status, and theology, kept obscured behind the monolithic Shia rhetoric, were also played out. It was a drama closely watched, at times controlled, by the two powers that had a large stake in its fate. And the mobilized masses had little to say.

After the political failure of the revolution and the triumph of secularism in the social policies of the subsequent governments, politics overshadowed sociocultural issues. However, the poet, the man of letters, the new breed of intellectual, as a result of the vital role played then and the national fame acquired, was able to ensure the triumph of his word over the mojtahed's, thus displacing the latter in public opinion. But he was not able to consolidate his gains and affirm his opposition to, and rejection of, the system of religious beliefs enforced by the ayatollahs. Politics demanded pragmatism and caution in breaking loose the ties with the religious culture. The secularization, or rather the institutional change represented by the first majles, was not acknowledged as such, not in the Western sense. Official ideas were not allowed to change. On the contrary, the constitution specifically declared Twelver Shia Islam the official religion of the state, and Article 2 remained intact, on paper. Moreover, religious studies were made compulsory in all schools, and the subsequent modernization policies did not allow "a shrinkage in the character and extent of beliefs," to return finally to Bell's definition of profanation.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Browne (1910); xix.
2. Ibid., xx.
3. Ibid., 1.
4. Ibid., 23.
5. Lambton (1970); see also Lambton (1957).
6. Lambton (1970), 259.
7. Ibid., 267; see also Lambton (1987).
8. Lambton (1970), 263.
9. Algar (1969).
10. Algar (1972), 235.
11. Algar (1969), 256.
12. Keddie (1962); (1966a); (1966b).
13. Keddie (1972a), 213.
14. Ibid., 227.
15. Calder.
16. Arjomand (1984).
17. Ibid., 249; see also Arjomand (1988a), 78–79.
18. Calder, 7.
19. Arjomand (1984), chapter 10; see also Arjomand (1988b), introduction.
20. Sachedina, 5.
21. Ibid., 172.
22. Nazem al-Islam.
23. Feuvrier.
24. Malekzada (n.d.); (1948–1949).
25. Daulatabadi.
26. Yaghma'i (1978).
27. Majd al-Islam.
28. Kasravi.
29. See, for example, Enayat (1982), 122.
30. See, for example, Lambton (1987), 319–29; Keddie (1983), 579–98.
31. See, for example, Floor (1980), 501–24; Arjomand (1981), 174–90; Lahidji, 133–58; Martin.
32. Sachedina overlooks the very rich Shia theological literature other than the jurists', which dealt with the subject of supreme religious authority in greater detail and much more explicitly. In fact, a careful, sober analysis of Khomeini's theory shows that it belongs more to the nonjuridical tradition. Furthermore, the author discusses ideas of authority as ideas, out of their immediate historical context. He does not analyze how these ideas came to be discussed in the first place or who the jurists had in mind when they proposed them. Consequently, while assessing the development of the function of the mojtahed as the deputy to the Hidden Imam, he fails to note the fact that the cultural

tensions and social conflicts marring the history of premodern Iran involved various Shia schools of theology and centers of learning rather than state–olama relations.

As this study will show, the popular revolts of the late Qajar period, if studied properly by the historian who learns how to distinguish rhetorical symbols from actions and to consult sources judiciously, proved to be directed at the religious leadership as well as the absolute monarchy. Sachedina's analysis of the late Qajar period, the actual period of increased participation of the olama in politics, is the sketchiest, and thus the weakest segment of the book.

After reading *The Just Ruler* one cannot but wonder whether one can truly label these occasional, rather slender, individual opinions of some mojtaheds on the legal aspects of their authority "political jurisprudence." The book may, in fact, underscore the failure of the Imami jurists to reach consensus on this vexing problem of political authority in times of ghaibat, and to construct a viable, concrete, explicit political theory of government.

33. Bell, 331–32.

34. Bayat (1982).

35. Abrahamian.

Chapter 1

1. Some contemporary scholars have overlooked this fundamental aspect of orthodox Imami Shi'ism in premodern times; see, for example, Enayat (1982), 23, 160, 160–69. See my review of Enayat in *Iranian Studies* 17 (1984):105–10.

2. For more recent studies of the Osuli–Akhbari disputes see Arjomand (1984), 229–37; Bayat (1982), 19–25; Cole (1985),3–34; (1989), 7–34.

3. For more details on the Shaikhi school of theology see Bayat (1982), chapters 2, 3.

4. Sachedina, 159–62.

5. Ahmad Naraqi, 185–205. The Iranian Revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic have led some scholars to study Khomeini's conception of the governance of the jurisconsult as an integral feature of classical Shia juridical tradition. In fact, this concept was first developed and then elaborated upon at the time when the focus of theological debates was not state–religion relations but the definition and identification of the supreme authority within the religious institution itself. See Bayat (1983); Calder. For a different interpretation see Enayat (1984); Kazemi-Moussavi.

6. Hasan Naraqi, 247.

7. Sachedina, 210–25.

8. Calder, 16. The fact that Naraqi referred to the sixth Imam Ja'far al-Sadeq is significant, since it was al-Sadeq who postponed indefinitely the Imam's claim to political rule.

9. Ibid., 7.

10. Momen (1985), 140, 331–32n22; see also Amanat (1988), 98–102.

11. Nazem al-Islam, 1:22; see also Amin al-Daula, 147; E'temad al-Salatana, 897; Adamiyat (1981), 104. On taqlid of one mojtahed not incumbent on other mojtaheds see Arjomand (1984), 243, and Momen (1985), 204, 340n25.

12. See, for example, Hashemi-Kermani; Nazem al-Islam, 1:165–73, 2:72; Kasravi, 33–35, 64–65; Daulatabadi, 2:15–16; Kosogovski, 132–33; Lambton (1987), 140–63.

13. Fathi (1976), 8–9; Nazem al-Islam, 1:6–7; Sayyah, 478–79; Majd al-Islam (1977), 102–3; Safa'i (1965), 5.

14. See, for example, Kasravi, 33; Nazem al-Islam, 2:141; Majd al-Islam (1977), 168–71; Sayyah, 45–46, 54–55; Malekzada (1948–1949), 1:273. For a similar view on the financial position of the olama in Qajar times see Momen (1985), 206–7. Arjomand's

(1984), 230–31, discussion of the olama's financial autonomy is purely theoretical and overlooks the practical difficulties they encountered in ensuring it. For a brief analysis of the mojtahed Aqa Mohammad Baqer's financial dependence in his struggle for power, see Cole (1985), 20. On hired gangs see Floor (1979b).

15. Hardinge to Lansdowne, September 7, 1903, F.O. 416/14, no. 25; same to same, October 8, 1903; see also F.O. 416/15, no. 28, and enclosure 2 in no. 28.

16. Ra'in (1976a), 103, 369–70; Cole (1986), 461–80.

17. Arjomand (1984), 247, consistently refers to the olama as constituting an "autonomous hierocracy" yet reaches the same conclusion. "In contrast to the inability of the Shiite hierocracy to initiate institutionalized action in pursuit of its institutional and doctrinal interests, the absence of an authoritative hierarchy and of disciplinary procedures meant that the ulama could engage in politics in pursuit of personal gain with complete immunity."

18. Nazem al-Islam, 1:160.

19. See Nashat, 90–94; and Zell al-Soltan's letter to Naser al-Din shah in Safa'i (1973a), 82–84.

20. See the letter of Zell al-Soltan to the shah requesting tax exemption for the mojtahed, which was granted, Safa'i (1973a), 96–97.

21. Safa'i (1974), 16–18; Majd al-Islam, 3:171–77. According to the latter only Tabataba'i then remained loyal to Amin al-Daula.

22. See the letter of Wolff to Amin al-Soltan thanking him for his help and that of the mojtahed, Safa'i (1973b), 37–38.

23. Ibid., 80–82, 85.

24. See Naser al-Din shah's telegram to Najafi, Safa'i (1973a), 125–26; see also Wolff's July 1890 protest to Amin al-Soltan against Najafi's return to Isfahan, Safa'i (n.d.b.), 148, and the shah's reassurance, ibid., 149; see also Majd al-Islam, 3:225–26.

25. Kazemzadeh, 393; Keddie (1969b), 25.

26. Safa'i (1973a), 102–4.

27. Lambton (1965), 88.

28. Keddie (1966b), 133.

29. Adamiyat (1981), 132.

30. Taimuri (1949), 87–89.

31. Adamiyat (1981), 74–75; Nazem al-Islam, 1:19–21; Safa'i (n.d.b.), 35; Amin al-Daula, 155; Daulatabadi, 1:108–9; Lambton (1965), 145n4; Taimuri (1949), 112–18, argued that the fatwa was authentic.

32. Safa'i (n.d.b.), 28–29.

33. Lambton (1965), 149.

34. Keddie (1966b), 101–2.

35. English text in Lambton (1965), 50–52; Persian text in Nazem al-Islam, 1:22–24; see also Amin al-Soltan's letter to Ashtiani in Safa'i (1969), 82–83, and the shah's letter to Nayeb al-Saltana in Adamiyat (1981), 28–31.

36. Safa'i (n.d.b.), 41.

37. Adamiyat (1981), 72–73.

38. See the letter signed by all major olama of Tehran to Shirazi dated December 19, 1891, Nazem al-Islam, 1:36; Amin al-Soltan's report to the shah on his negotiations with the olama in Safa'i (n.d.b.), 34–39; Majd al-Islam, 3:129–33.

39. Keddie (1966b), 80–81; Lambton (1965), 135.

40. Keddie (1966b), 101; Lambton (1965), 146; Kazemzadeh, 262–63.

41. Adamiyat (1981), 96–97, and sources cited there; Daulatabadi, 1:110; Taimuri (1949), 143–44.

42. Letters in Nazem al-Islam, 1:22–29.

43. Cited in Keddie (1966b), 106–7.

44. Adamiyat (1981), 104.
45. See his letter to Amin al-Soltan, Safa'i (n.d.b.), 78–79.
46. Ashtiani's letter to Amin al-Soltan in Safa'i (n.d.a.), 142–43; letter of Amin al-Soltan to the shah, Safa'i (n.d.b.), 75–76; Ashtiani's letter to Shirazi in Lambton (1965), 156–57, and Keddie (1966b), 145–47.
47. Majd al-Islam 3:136–37; E'temad al-Saltana, 897.
48. Adamiyat (1981), 116–17.
49. Ibid., 139–41.
50. See, for example, Ashtiani's letter to the shah, Nazem al-Islam, 1:24–28.
51. Cited in Lambton (1965), 152.
52. Adamiyat (1981), 116–17.
53. Ibid., 2–9, and sources cited there; see also Adamiyat (1976), 23, 25–26; E'temad al-Saltana, 1180; Kosogovski, 63.
54. For texts of this pamphlet and others, Sayyah, 333–39.
55. Ibid., 291, 322–23; also Bayat (1982), 143–48. Keddie (1972) is the best available scholarly analysis of this controversial figure.
56. Text in Taimuri (1949), 52–58; see also letter to Shirazi in *Qanun,* no. 20.
57. Taimuri (1949), 58–63.
58. Letter dated December 24, 1892, cited in Lambton (1965), 149.
59. Keddie (1966b), 79.
60. Ibid., 118.
61. Ibid., 116–18.
62. Ibid., 116.
63. Curzon, 2:622–23; also Kazemzadeh, 291–92.
64. Curzon, 2:602.
65. Cited in Kazemzadeh, 343.
66. Hardinge, 280.
67. Ibid., 268.
68. Ibid., 270. Kazemzadeh, chapters 4, 5, has an analysis leading generally to similar conclusions.
69. Hardinge, 329–30.
70. Ibid., 278–80; Kazemzadeh, 352–85; Ferrier, 33–47.
71. Letter dated August 19, 1901, cited in Keddie (1969b), 16.
72. Taimuri (1957), 400–409.
73. Hardinge, 326–27, 329–30.
74. Ibid., 279; for a different account, see Ferrier, 39–40.
75. Ferrier, 43–44.
76. Kazemzadeh, 350–60.
77. Ibid., 375–85.
78. Hardinge to Colonel Kemball, July 17, 1903, F.O. 416/14, no. 163, enclosure 2.
79. Cited in Keddie (1967), 270, also Kazemzadeh, 390–94.
80. Keddie (1969b), 24.
81. Hardinge, 328–31.
82. Kazemzadeh, 396.
83. Keddie (1969b), 151.
84. Ibid., 158; see also Algar (1969), 236–39. He, however, insists that the olama's action was consistent with the doctrinally based opposition to the state.
85. Hardinge, 320–21; on British talks with Sharabiani see the British report cited in Keddie (1969b), 160–62, and (1967), 273–77.
86. Hardinge, 323–24.
87. Cited in Keddie (1969b), 158.
88. Algar (1969), 236.

89. Keddie (1967), 274–75.
90. Hardinge to Lansdowne, June 13, 1903, F.O. 416/12.
91. Same to same, July 9, 1903, F.O. 416/14.
92. See, for example, the text of the Najaf olama's letter to the Iranian olama in F.O. 416/14, enclosure 1 in no. 304; and Hardinge to Lansdowne, August 31, 1903, ibid.
93. Keddie (1969b), 166n41.
94. See Hardinge's report of this conversation with Amin al-Soltan dated June 10, 1903, F.O. 416/14, 33, no. 46; Adamiyat (1976), 178–87; Safa'i (1974), 40.
95. Keddie (1969b), 152.
96. Cited in Keddie (1967), 279.
97. See, for example, his statement on Omar Khayyam, the famous Persian national poet: "In Persia very little respect is felt for the Sufi philosopher and bard, whose poems have been immortalized by their brilliant translation into the English version of Fitzgerald. . . . None of the natives with whom I conversed knew anything, to speak of, about Omar." Hardinge, 346–47.
98. Ibid., 307.
99. Ibid., 309.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid., 323; Keddie (1969b), 25.
102. Nazem al-Islam, 2:32, 88, 236; Kasravi, 64; Safa'i (1976), 114. The Ottoman government was then attempting to win the Shia olama's support for the idea of pan-Islamism. In 1904 Nuri bypassed Istanbul on his way back to Iran. He reportedly expressed his sympathy verbally, Hardinge to Lansdowne, December 31, 1904, F.O. 416/32.
103. Same to same, September 6, 1901, F.O. 416/7.
104. Keddie (1969b); 152.
105. Nateq (1988) argues that Malkom Khan and his collaborators had actually called for the establishment of an Islamic state and had provided an elaborate program for it, thus laying the foundation for the current Islamic Republic. Her literalist understanding of Malkom Khan's views is misleading, as it emphasizes the rhetoric and overlooks the strategic significance of the intellectual's appeal to the mojtaheds' cooperation against the shah's government. See my discussion in chapter 3.

Chapter 2

1. Schorske, xvii.
2. Minovi, 230.
3. Sarabi, 270.
4. Adamiyat (1969), 461; Yaghma'i (1969), 143–49.
5. Cited in Adamiyat (1972) 20.
6. Ibid.
7. Adamiyat (1972), 18–19.
8. Ibid., 22.
9. Ibid., 24–26.
10. Bayat (1982), 170–75.
11. Majd al-Molk; see also Adamiyat (1972), 35–40; Adamiyat and Nateq (1977), 94–114.
12. Adamiyat (1972), 172.
13. Ibid., 173–79.
14. Hairi, 30–43, 182–89; Sachedina, 100, misunderstood the origins and significance of the term mashru'a as used by the constitutionalist olama.

15. Amin al-Daula, 165–66.
16. Mokhber al-Saltana, 21.
17. Ibid., 6.
18. Safa'i (1965), 595–609.
19. Ibid., 99–131, 459–91, 715–30.
20. Ibid., 613–22.
21. Ibid., 625–50.
22. For more details see Adamiyat (1961).
23. Dehkhoda (1982), introduction.
24. On the merchants, see Adamiyat (1972); Adamiyat and Nateq, Ashraf; Floor (1976), (1979a); Gilbar (1977), (1979); Issawi.
25. Curzon, 1:480.
26. Adamiyat and Nateq, 299–371.
27. Issawi, 45.
28. Cited in Adamiyat and Nateq, 104.

Chapter 3

1. For greater details on these movements see Bayat (1982) and sources cited there.
2. *Qanun,* no. 20.
3. Ibid., no. 22.
4. Keddie (1972), 195.
5. Cited in Adamiyat (1976), 29–31.
6. Cited in Kedourie, 44–45; see also Keddie (1972), 197–99.
7. E'temad al-Saltana, 906.
8. Adamiyat (1981), 115.
9. Nazem al-Islam, 1:21.
10. Cited in Bayat (1974), 36–59.
11. Daulatabadi 1:123–35; Sayyah, 286–94; Malekzada (n.d.), 56–57, 73.
12. Persian text in Nazem al-Islam, 1:100–124; English text in Browne (1910), 63–92.
13. Daulatabadi, 1:142–44; Amin al-Daula, 217; Ra'in (1966), 20–23.
14. Kosogovski, 34–52, 145.
15. Ibid., 75–79.
16. Nazem al-Islam, 1:7.
17. See his biographies of Naser al-Din and Mozaffar al-Din shahs, ibid., 125–33.
18. Ibid., 98.
19. Ibid., 63–64.
20. Adamiyat (1972), 68, 70, 71, and sources cited there. Martin, 66, downplaying the role of the Azali Babi networks, refers to Najmabadi as a freethinker.
21. Cited in Algar (1969), 199–200.
22. Safa'i (1965), 208.
23. Nazem al-Islam, 2:4–5.
24. Ibid., 43.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 67–68.
27. Bastani-Parizi, 9–32; see also Nazem al-Islam, 1:17–18.
28. See extracts in Malekzada (n.d.), 21–39.
29. Safa'i (1965), 5.
30. Malekzada (n.d.), 72.
31. His name was Mirza Asadollah Khan Na'ini. Safa'i (1965), 5, claims the latter

worked in the Russian consulate in Isfahan, but Malekzada (n.d.), 137, introduces him as an official in the financial department of the city; see also Yaghma'i (1978), 13.

32. Malekzada (1948–1949), 1:174–75; Majd al-Islam (n.d.), 311–15, claims he was the founder of the anjoman; see also Safa'i (1965), 342; Ashraf, 100–101.

33. See text in Yaghma'i (1978), 306–37. A copy of the original St. Petersburg edition was given to me by Dr. John Gurney of Oxford University. Yaghma'i's text closely follows the Russian edition, with the omission of a few paragraphs that do not change the substance of the essay in any way.

34. Ibid., 317.

35. Ibid., 322.

36. Ibid., 329–30.

37. Majd al-Islam, 1:313–15. The *Lebas* might have been written in 1316/1898, when the company was founded. See Va'ez, 12, 49.

38. Va'ez, 14.

39. Ibid., 31.

40. Ibid., 32.

41. Ibid., 37.

42. Ibid., 48–49.

43. Ibid., 61–65.

44. Ibid., 68.

45. Ibid., 70–74.

46. Ibid., 78.

47. Ibid., 80–85.

48. Majd al-Islam, 2:61–63.

49. Daulatabadi, 1:178–205, 213–37, 278–88; Malekzada (n.d.), 115–17.

50. Malekzada (n.d.), 111–14.

51. Ibid., 116.

52. Daulatabadi, 1:263–65.

53. Sayyah, 22. Browne (1918) stated Sayyah was a Bahai. Bahai sources, however, deny it. It seems, though, that Sayyah had contacts with Bahai leaders. See Momen (1981), 357.

54. Sayyah, 19.

55. Ibid., 86–88, 92–94.

56. Ibid., 284.

57. Ibid., 280.

58. Ibid., 64.

59. Safa'i (1965), 566.

60. Ibid., 557.

61. Ibid., 568.

62. Ibid., 575–76.

63. Safa'i (1965), 579–81. For a slight variation of the same story see Niku 3:28–33, and Momen (1981), 489–90.

64. Safa'i (1965), 587.

65. Sayyah, 489.

66. Malekzada (n.d.), 119.

67. Daulatabadi, 1:289–91; Keddie (1969b), 15–19.

68. See the long British account quoted in Keddie (1969b), 17–18.

69. Ashtiani was not arrested as stated in the British document cited in Keddie, ibid., 19.

70. Des Graz to Lansdowne, July 21, 1902, F.O. 416/10, no. 84; and same to same August 19, 1902, ibid., no. 180; see also Keddie (1969b), 151–52.

71. Hardinge to Lansdowne, August 17, 1903, F.O. 416/14, no. 241.
72. Kasravi, 32–33, attributes the fatwa to a member of the religious dissident group, Seyyed Mohammad Ali, brother of the editor of *Habl al-Matin*. For various accounts of Amin al-Soltan's fall from power in 1903, see Nazem al-Islam, 1:162–64; Safa'i (n.d.), 40–49; Daulatabadi, 1:315–17.
73. Malekzada (n.d.), 153–60.
74. Malekzada (1948–49), 2:9–24.
75. Nazem al-Islam, 2:6–7.
76. Ibid., 12.
77. Ibid., 9.
78. Ibid., 229–31.
79. Ibid., 12.
80. Ibid., 25.
81. Ibid., 29.
82. Ibid., 32.
83. Ibid., 224–25.
84. Ibid., 30.
85. Ibid., 19.
86. Ibid., 44–46.
87. Ibid., 55–57.
88. Ibid., 50.
89. Algar's (1969), 252–55 brief analysis of the secret society does take into account the ambiguity and complexity of its character and objectives; Lambton (1957) totally ignores this fundamental feature of Nazem al-Islam's society.
90. Nazem al-Islam, 2:20.
91. Ibid., 46–47.

Chapter 4

1. Swietochowski, 8–11.
2. Ibid., 13.
3. Alstadt, 350.
4. Alisova, 40; see also Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1960), 34–36; (1967), 11–18.
5. Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1960), 37.
6. Ibid., 39.
7. Ibid., 37; Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1967), 32–34.
8. Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1967), 42.
9. Suny, 7.
10. Ibid., 13–14, 16; see also Saidzada, 39.
11. See, for example, Samedov, 1:630–31; 2:58–59; and Saidzada, 5, 41–42.
12. Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1967), 40–42; Zenkovsky, 94–98.
13. Saidzada, 40, writing in 1978, readily acknowledges Taqiev's philanthropy as having had an "objective-progressive" significance.
14. On Akhundov see Samedov, 1:208–14; Adamiyat (1970); Bayat (1982), chapter 2.
15. Samedov, 1:209.
16. Kaziev (1970), 7.
17. Ibid., 21.
18. Ibid., 13.
19. Ibid., 23.

20. Narimanov (1963), 25–26.
21. Ibid., 173.
22. Ibid., 169.
23. Hajibeyli, 357; see also Ferid, 177–78.
24. See Keddie (1972) and sources cited there.
25. Cited in ibid., 190.
26. Ibid., 191; see also Bayat (1982), 143–48.
27. The series, entitled "La Société Persane," appeared in *La Nouvelle Revue* 69 (March 1891): 376–89; 70 (June 1891): 792–804; 73 (December 1891): 523–41; 79 (August 1892): 278–96; 84 (1893): 509–27.
28. Ibid., 70 (June 1891): 798.
29. Ibid., 803.
30. Ibid., 79 (August 1892): 293.
31. *Kaspi,* 87 (April 21, 1900); 7 (January 10, 1899); 12 (16 January, 1904); see also Zenkovsky, 96–97; Saidzada, 41–43; Samedov, 1:635–38; and Ibragimov, 47–48. The Soviet historians, however, wrongly labeled Aqaev's Islamic modernist thought as reactionary and feudal, advocating political unity of all Moslems under one Islamic government.
32. Daniels, 93.
33. Saidzada, 38.
34. Ibid., 44–46, 50, 58–61.
35. Ibid., 69.
36. Ibid., 50; Alisova, 44–48; Samedov, 2:121; Zenkovsky, 40–53; Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1960), 57–62; (1967), 43–45.
37. Saidzada, 43–44.
38. Zenkovsky, 43; Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1967), 41, argue that Ibragimov was a staunch admirer of Jamal al-Din and that his "hostility towards Russia, the Russians and the tzarist monarchy was so implacable as practically to preclude any prospect of co-operation." On Ibragimov and Jamal al-Din, see Kaddie (1972), 304–5.
39. Alisova, 53–56.
40. Zenkovsky, 43.
41. Efendiev, 15.
42. Ibid., 17.
43. Ibid., 28–29; see also Samedov, 1:638, 2:191; Kaziev (1970), 31–32; (1976), 19–20; (1956), 73–84.
44. Samedov, 1:659.
45. Efendiev, 13.
46. Samedov, 2:401–2, 419, 425, 591. Efendiev's (12, 25) argument is identical.
47. Samedov, 2:602.
48. Ibid., 420–22; see also Kaziev (1970), 37–39.
49. Cited in Agamirov, 149.
50. Ibid., 148–50.
51. Samedov, 2:383–89.
52. Hajibeyli, 355.
53. Samedov, 2:401–10.
54. Ibid., 406.
55. Ibid., 410.
56. Ibid., 423; Agamirov, 41–44.
57. Agamirov, 134.
58. Paraphrased in ibid., 15–16, 150–53.
59. Ibid., 21–22.
60. Ibid., 22.

61. Ibid., 152.
62. Cited in Kaziev (1970), 34; see also Samedov, 2:367–68.
63. Samedov, 2:20.
64. Agamirov, 27; Saidzada, 90; Samedov, 2:201–2.
65. Saidzada, 99–100, 120–1, 124–26, 133.
66. Kaziev (1956), 120; (1970), 44–45. Soviet historians, quoting Narimanov's own self-serving account of the incident (1925), 12, claim the Hemmatists won the battle in this meeting.
67. Saidzada, 41.
68. Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1967), 57.
69. Pipes, 32.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid., 35.
72. Ibid., 35–36.
73. Cited in Kaziev (1970), 50–51.
74. Alisova, 53.
75. Ibid., 54–55.
76. Pipes, 33.
77. Samedov, 2:568–88.
78. Ibid., 583.
79. Ibid., 587.
80. Ibid., 578.
81. Benningsen and Lemercier-Quelquejay (1964), 28–30.
82. Zenkovsky, 94–95; Suny, 16–17.
83. Swietochowski, 64–65.
84. Roshdi, 29–30.
85. Taqizada, 2:158.
86. Ibid., 385.
87. Kasravi, 150–51; see also Taherzada-Behzad, 409.
88. Fathi (1977), 10, 52–53, 131–33; Kasravi, 152; Taherzada-Behzad, 469.
89. Taqizada, 2:132.
90. Fathi (1977) is the most comprehensive biographical study of these three preachers.
91. Ibid., 51.
92. Ibid., 134–35; Taqizada, 1:357.
93. See list in Kasravi, 167; Taherzada-Behzad, 48–49; Nateq (1983), 58–59.
94. Kasravi dates its formation after the revolution; Nateq and most other historians believe it was founded before.
95. N. Hasanov (1975), 52. I am indebted to Audrey Alstadt, who graciously lent me a copy of this manuscript.
96. H. Hasanov (1967), 72–74.
97. Ibid., 76–77; see also Raevski, 177.
98. On Haider Khan see Malek; Ra'in (1973); Shamida; Rausta.
99. Bor-Ramenski (1940), 92.
100. "Obezdolennii," *Kavkazki Rabochi Listok,* November 24, 1905, cited in Arutiunyan, 30.
101. "Napustvie," *Kavkazki Rabochi Listok,* December 19, 1905, cited in Arutiunyan, 30–31; see also Samedov, 2:580–81.
102. Cited in Kaziev (1956), 205–6, and in Kaziev (1970), 35.
103. As Kaziev (1970), 50–51, noted, Narimanov first published the Azeri version of the program in *Hayat* in June 1906, in an article entitled "On Freedom." In early December 1906, the Baku police arrested eight Moslem armed revolutionaries and confiscated

some three thousand printed leaflets. The Persian version was included among them. Kaziev noted that the Persian text is the translated version of the Azeri that appeared in *Hayat;* Hasan M. Hasanov, 76, reaches the same conclusion. S. Aliev published the Persian text, without mentioning the Azeri version, in "Neizvestni Dokument ob Iranskoi Sotzyal-Demokraticheskoi Partii," Narodni Azii i Afriki 2 (1965); Aliev's article then appeared in Persian in "Sanadi Nashenakhte-ye Ferqa-ye Ejtema'iyun-Amiyun," *Donya* 7, no. 2 (1966); Khosro Shakeri reprinted the Persian text in *Sosial-Demokrasi va Enqelab: Asnad-e Tarikhi-ye Jonbesh-e Kargari, Sosial-Demokrasi va Komunisti-ye Iran,* Tehran: Antidote Publications, n.d., 145–46.

104. Aliev.

105. Beloluibski and Belova, 53.

106. Bor-Ramenski (142), 33.

107. Fathi (1977), 143–44; Kasravi, 149–53.

Chapter 5

1. Nazem al-Islam, 1:165–73.

2. Malekzada (1948–1949), 1:270–74; Kasravi, 33–35.

3. Nazem al-Islam, 2:30.

4. Ibid., 53–55; Hardinge to Lansdowne, May 12, 1905, F.O. 416/23.

5. Nazem al-Islam, 2:84–87; Kasravi, 54–58; overlooking the shady financial aspects of the event and the involvement of the olama on both sides, emphasizes the role of Behbahani and Tabataba'i in utilizing the occasion to arouse public sentiment against the government.

6. Nazem al-Islam, 2:69–84.

7. Ibid., 73.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., 80–83; Majd al-Islam, 1:153; Kasravi, 52–54; Malekzada (1948–1949), 1:176–77; Bastani-Parizi, 197.

10. See Bayat (1982), 78–80, 180–83.

11. Hashemi-Kermani, 320–66.

12. Nazem al-Islam, 2:91–93; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:39–41; Kasravi, 58–59, omits the signed note; Mohit-Mafi, 85–86, does not mention the lunch and claims that the merchants were put in prison.

13. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:41.

14. Nazem al-Islam, 2:93–94; Mohit-Mafi, 86–87.

15. Nazem al-Islam, 2:94–96; Malekzada (n.d.), 165; Safa'i (1965), 323.

16. Nazem al-Islam, 2:99–100; Kasravi, 63; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:47.

17. Nazem al-Islam, 2:98.

18. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:49–50.

19. Torkeman, 2:165.

20. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:50.

21. Nazem al-Islam, 2:105–6; Kasravi, 64; Daulatabadi, 2:15–16.

22. Daulatabadi, 2:72, refers to them as "third-rate" merchants.

23. Nazem al-Islam, 2:104–5; see also the secret report printed in ibid., 136–37, revealing some of the sources of cash contributions to the olama, especially Behbahani, Tabataba'i, and the Ashtiani brothers; see also Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:50–51.

24. Nazem al-Islam, 2:48–55.

25. Ibid., 29–33.

26. Ibid., 24–26.
27. Ibid., 109–15; Kasravi, 67; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:56–61.
28. Nazem al-Islam, 2:117; Kasravi, 73.
29. Nazem al-Islam, 2:259; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:142.
30. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:64–68.
31. Daulatabadi, 2:19, 22–24, 27–28; Nazem al-Islam, 2:117–19.
32. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:71–86; Mohit-Mafi's assertion, 89–91, that Tabataba'i called for the establishment of a house of justice before the bast is not corroborated by other sources. See also Sharif-Kashani (1977), 62.
33. Nazem al-Islam, 2:120–22; Kasravi, 68–69, accepts the view that Ain al-Daula kept them from returning to Shahabdolazim in order to sow division among the religious ranks and because he had been told they were responsible for keeping the bastis longer at the shrine. Kasravi also claims the shah, frightened by the riots, compelled the minister to agree to the bastis' demands.
34. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:86–87.
35. Nazem al-Islam, 2:126–27.
36. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:92.
37. Daulatabadi, 2:29–33.
38. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:82–85; Safa'i (1965), 348; Kasravi's account, 72–75, differs. He insists the preachers were merely denouncing government oppression in typical religious rhetoric, though he admits that such blunt criticism of government officials was historically unprecedented. He rejects the view that the olama were waging a war against the government and portrays Tabataba'i and Behbahani as reasonable leaders who had the well-being of the people in mind and who had realized the bast had come to an end once an honorable solution was reached. The modest demand for a house of justice, he added, fulfilled that purpose. Giving full credit to the two mojtaheds for this demand, Kasravi also argues that there was as yet no call for constitutionalism or representative government.
39. Nazem al-Islam, 2:124.
40. Ibid., 130–31.
41. See letters in ibid., 124–26; Kasravi, 70–71; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:88–91.
42. Nazem al-Islam, 2:140–41.
43. See Daulatabadi, 2:43; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:100.
44. Monthly Summary, April 1906, F.O. 16/27, enclosure in no. 138.
45. Great Britain (1909), 1:2.
46. Estimated from Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:101.
47. Nazem al-Islam, 2:141.
48. See Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:97–98, for the reminiscences of one recruit to the anjoman.
49. Roshdi, 87–88.
50. Nazem al-Islam, 2:147–50; see also Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:97–98, for a summary of this shabnama.
51. Nazem al-Islam, 2:142–44.
52. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:101–2; interestingly, but in keeping with his tendency to underestimate the role of the religious dissidents, Kasravi did not reprint any of these radical shabnamas, even though, as we shall presently see, he did reprint Tabataba'i's letters and speeches.
53. Nazem al-Islam, 2: 132–35; Safa'i (1965), 326–27.
54. Daulatabadi, 2:42; Nazem al-Islam, 2:151–52; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:129–35.
55. Nazem al-Islam, 2:157–58.

56. Ibid., 160.
57. Kasravi, 84.
58. Nazem al-Islam, 2:78–79, 154; Malekzada (1948–1949), 1:20–21, 2:109–10.
59. F.O. 416/26, supplement 1, no. 99.
60. Grant Duff to Lord Grey, December 30, 1905, ibid.
61. Grant Duff to Lord Grey, December 22, 1905, F.O. 416/25, no. 129.
62. Nazem al-Islam, 2:157.
63. Ibid., 155–57; see also Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:112.
64. Nazem al-Islam, 2:155.
65. Qa'em-Maqami, 30.
66. See Safa'i (n.d.b), 430; Nazem al-Islam, 2:37; Kasravi, 87; Mohit-Mafi, 70.
67. Nazem al-Islam, 2:150–51.
68. Kasravi, 81–82.

Chapter 6

1. Nazem al-Islam, 2:170–71; Daulatabadi, 2:65; see also Ref'at al-Molk, p. 530.
2. Taqizada, 1:329; see also Nazem al-Islam, 2:223.
3. Torkeman, 2:166–67; Mohit-Mafi, 92.
4. Nazem al-Islam, 2:224.
5. Ibid., 186.
6. Daulatabadi, 2:61–62; Nazem al-Islam also claimed that the general decision in favor of a royal audience was subsequently canceled because of Abol Qasem Tabataba'i's objections, yet he admitted that all the olama met secretly with Ain al-Daula. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:125–26, on the other hand, asserted Tabataba'i conferred alone with Ain al-Daula but was forced to seek collective olama action when his meeting was made public.
7. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:114–16.
8. Nazem al-Islam, 2:224.
9. Ibid., 163–65; Kasravi, 85–86.
10. Nazem al-Islam, 2:161–63.
11. Ibid., 171.
12. Ibid., 214.
13. Kasravi, 87.
14. Nazem al-Islam, 2:172.
15. Ibid., 204.
16. Ibid., 209.
17. Ibid., 213.
18. Ibid., 204.
19. Ibid., 208–9.
20. Ibid., 237; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:141–43.
21. Nazem al-Islam, 2:241; see also the letter signed by all the major olama of Tehran, including Nuri, to the shah, urging him to pay attention to the situation before it was too late, in Torkeman, 2:60–63; see also Safa'i (1976), 26–27.
22. Nazem al-Islam, 2:242.
23. Ibid., 243; these candid remarks are not included in Kasravi's account, which otherwise follows closely the *Tarikh-e Bidari* for that period.
24. Ibid., 245–46; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:150, came up with one hundred killed and hundreds wounded; Daulatabadi, 2:69, mentioned sixty killed and injured.

25. Nazem al-Islam, 2:248, briefly mentions the unsuccessful attempt to smuggle arms through a servant of Tabataba'i.

26. Ibid., 246; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:149; see also Safa'i (1976), 24.

27.Nazem al-Islam, 2:247.

28. Mohit-Mafi, 93; see also Tafreshi-Hosaini, 46–47.

29. Nazem al-Islam, 2:258–59, 260–61, 263–65.

30. Browne (1910), 126.

31. *Summary of Events for the Year 1906,* F.O. 416/30.

32. Nazem al-Islam, 2:262–63; Malekzada (n.d.), 173–74; Malekzada, (1948–1949), 2:72–73; Majd al-Islam 3:57.

33. Grant Duff to Lord Grey, June 21, 1906, F.O. 416/28, no. 20.

34. F.O. 416/27, cables between Tehran, London, and St. Petersburg, May 17, 1906, no. 154, 155, 156; May 18, no. 159; May 19, no. 164; May 23, no. 171; June 14, no. 201; June 16, no. 202. See also F.O. 416/28, cables dated June 21, 1906, no. 20; July 10, no. 30; July 11, no. 31.

35. Safa'i (1976), 28. Vakil al-Daula, however, doubts the veracity of that story.

36. Daulatabadi, 2:71.

37. Nazem al-Islam, 2:261–62.

38. Ibid., 221.

39. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:167–69.

40. Nazem al-Islam, 2:271; Tafreshi-Hosaini, 26–30; Safa'i (1974), 56.

41. Nazem al-Islam, 2:271–72, 292; Daulatabadi, 2:73; see also Safa'i (1973b), 158–60.

42. Nazem al-Islam, 2:272–73.

43. Ibid.; Kasravi, 109; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:161–66; Haidar Khan, "Taqrirat," Eqbal, p. 69; Daulatabadi, 2:74, explained that they were also carefully taking preventive measures against any British attempt to exploit the situation for their own colonial interests.

44. Mohit-Mafi, 130.

45. Ibid., 131.

46. Ibid., 118.

47. Ibid., 119; Nazem al-Islam, 2:304.

48. Mohit-Mafi, 114.

49. Ibid., 115.

50. Nazem al-Islam, 2:315, 350–51.

51. Mohit-Mafi, 115; Nazem al-Islam, 2:293; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:171–72; Daulatabadi, 2:75–76.

52. Safa'i (1976), 60; (1973b), 158–60.

53. N. Hasanov, 49–50; Ivanov, 74–75.

54. Nazem al-Islam, 2:296–96; Kasravi, 113–16; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:170–71; Daulatabadi, 2:78; Mohit-Mafi, 98. The PRO documents confirm the view that the crown prince had instructed the olama of Tabriz to send the cables. See Monthly Summary, August 16, 1906, F.O. 416/28, enclosure in no. 139.

55. Mohit-Mafi, 103–9; Torkeman, 2:170–74.

56. Ibid. The sentence "this was the first deceipt of Shaikh Nuri" by Tabataba'i and Behbahani's group in the edited version (Torkeman, 2:174) does not appear in the original text of Mohit-Mafi.

57. Torkeman, 1:132–34.

58. Kasravi, 274; Browne (1914), 61; *Tadayyon,* vol. 1, no. 11, September 10, 1907, where Fakhr al-Islam mentions his Assyrian Christian background.

59. Browne (1910), 122.
60. Nazem al-Islam, 2:306–8; Kasravi, 119; Safa'i (1973b), 159–60; Torkeman, 1:129–31.
61. Nazem al-Islam, 2:311–14.
62. Ibid., and 309; Safa'i (1976), 106; Mohit-Mafi, 132.
63. Nazem al-Islam, 2:317.
64. Safa'i (1976), 67–68.
65. Nazem al-Islam, 2:318.
66. Safa'i (1976), 119–20.
67. Nazem al-Islam, 2:318–19.
68. Ibid., 320–21.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid., 322.
71. Ibid., 326–27; Tafreshi-Hosaini, 34–36.
72. Nazem al-Islam, 2:324; see the text with melli in Tafreshi-Hosaini, 43–44.
73. *Mozakerat,* 2, 5; Kasravi, 119–20; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:176–77.
74. Nazem al-Islam, 2:329. Even Nuri's wording was left ambiguous. See, for example, his letter to a mojtahed in Kerman, announcing the promulgation of the decree for the establishment of a "national consultative assembly and Islamic house of justice." Torkeman, 2:40.
75. Nazem al-Islam, 2:327–28.
76. Ibid., 322.
77. See letter of Vakil al-Daula in Safa'i (1976), 120–21.
78. Ibid., 121.
79. Nazem al-Islam, 2:333.
80. According to Nazem al-Islam, ibid., 334.
81. According to Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:176, *Mozakerat,* 5.
82. Nazem al-Islam, 2:334–36.
83. Tafreshi-Hosaini, 32.
84. Ibid., 33; Adamiyat (1976), 165, n.3, mentions such a document signed by the leaders of the bastis at the embassy, stating their intention was the establishment of a national consultative assembly.
85. Tafreshi-Hosaini, 39–40.
86. Ibid., 32.
87. Safa'i (1976), 15.
88. Ibid., 44, 57–59.
89. Ibid., 113.
90. Ibid., 78, 106–7; see also Safa'i (1973b), 158–60; and Safa'i (n.d.b.), 376.
91. Safa'i (1976), 78–80.
92. Ibid., 44.
93. Ibid., 59; see also Tafreshi-Hosaini, 42.
94. Nazem al-Islam, 2:294; Tafreshi-Hosaini, 116.
95. Tafreshi-Hosaini, 34–35.
96. Cited in Keddie (1967), 281.
97. Safa'i (1976), 92.
98. Ibid., 68.
99. Daulatabadi, 2:66.
100. Nazem al-Islam, 2:224–25.
101. Ibid., 323.
102. Browne (1910), 120.
103. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:167–69; the Soviet historian S. M. Ivanov, 202, citing

Russian archival materials, asserts Grant Duff had awarded Behbahani and Tabataba'i with a handsome monthly stipend each.

Chapter 7

1. Nazem al-Islam, 3:136–37, in 2:43, had inserted, in esoteric fashion, his view on the necessity of a revolution.
2. Ibid., 2:338, 340.
3. Ibid., 350, 352–54; see also Daulatabadi, 2:87.
4. Browne (1910), 123–24.
5. Ibid., 128–29.
6. Daulatabadi, 2:86–87; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:187–88, merely reprints Daulatabadi's account.
7. See Bayat (1982), chapter 5, and sources cited there.
8. Ibid.
9. See, for example, the journal *Tarbiyyat,* January 19, 1905; October 4, 1906; October 18, 1906.
10. Nazem al-Islam, 2:343–44.
11. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:191–92, 188–89; Daulatabadi, 2:88.
12. Nazem al-Islam, 2:357–59; see also the exchange of cables between the Russian Moslems and Tabataba'i, 2:338–39.
13. Great Britain (1909), 1:5.
14. See text in Nazem al-Islam, 2:362–68; and *Mozakerat,* 6–7.
15. Kasravi, 228.
16. Nazem al-Islam, 2:391–92.
17. Ibid., 357, 368, 386.
18. Ibid., 396–97, reports on how the author's brother, Shams al-Hokama, was elected deputy of Kerman; see also 3:28.
19. Ibid., 2:368.
20. Mokhber al-Saltana, 190.
21. Ibid., 189; Kasravi, 169–70, also acknowledges the lack of leadership and experience of the majles deputies.
22. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:206–7.
23. Nazem al-Islam, 2:349–55.
24. Ibid., 223–24.
25. Ibid., 341.
26. Ibid., 341–43.
27. Which could also have been caused, partially at least, by the malaria from which he was suffering. Ibid., 347.
28. Ibid., 223; Daulatabadi, 2:48–49; Taqizada, 1:329.
29. See his speech addressed to the secret agents and informers, asking them to report accurately without distorting his views. Nazem al-Islam, 2:210–12.
30. Ibid., 392–99.
31. Daulatabadi, 2:130, 178–79.
32. Nazem al-Islam, 2:396.
33. See, for example, Mokhber al-Saltana, 216; Daulatabadi, 2:107–9; Torkeman, 2:176; see also Nazem al-Islam, 2:397–99, for the story of Behbahani, Nuri, and Tabataba'i's involvement in litigation ending with Nuri being offended and eliminated from a lucrative case.
34. Nazem al-Islam, 2:399–401; the majles minutes give no details concerning this

incident, referring only to Behbahani's angry outburst at Mirza Mehdi's action on behalf of two deputies; this omission is in keeping with the *Mozakerat*'s editorial policy of not recording sensitive religious disputes. *Mozakerat,* 9.

35. Daulatabadi, 2:107.
36. Ibid.,82.
37. Ibid., 91–95; Nazem al-Islam, 2:409–10, confirms the story, claiming Daulatabadi was unfairly denounced as Azali and vouching for his religious respectability. Behbahani retaliated by ordering a raid of Daulatabadi's school in mid-January 1907. Daulatabadi, 2:111–12.
38. See Nazem al-Islam, 3:66, 86–87, 90–91.
39. Ibid., 9–13.
40. Ibid., 6–7.
41. *Ershad,* October 4, 1906, cited in Nariman Hasanov, 50; Taqizada, 1:338.
42. Fathi (1977), 146–47; Kasravi, 154–55; see also Nateq (1983), 53–54.
43. Kasravi, 155; Fathi (1977), 150–51.
44. Fathi (1976), 19; (1977), 149.
45. Fathi (1976), 14–15.
46. Ibid., 15.
47. Ibid., 19.
48. Ibid., 21.
49. Ibid., 19; Fathi (1977), 157–61; Kasravi, 159–61.
50. Fathi (1976), 28; Fathi (1977), 168.
51. Cited in N. Hasanov, 54–55; see also Taqizada, 1:340–41.
52. Kasravi, 263.
53. Fathi (1976), 17–18, 29–30; (1977), 54–56; Taqizada, 1:341–43, states that Mirza Hashem's rivalry with Nateq caused his defection to the reactionary camp.
54. Kasravi, 171–73; Fathi (1977), 174–75.
55. Fathi (1976), 32–34.
56. Letter dated 14 Ramazan, 1324, in Fathi (1976), 184–85.
57. Fathi (1977), 12–13, 16–17, 176–77; (1976), 39–40; Javadi, 204, 240; Adamiyat (1975), 19–20.
58. Fathi (1976), 186–87.
59. See letter of Patrick Cowan to E. G. Browne, July 3, 1908; William Smart to same, 30 December, 1908, Browne Papers, Box 12.
60. Taqizada, 2:262.
61. Ibid., 1:381.
62. Ibid., 316.
63. Ibid., 279.
64. Nazem al-Islam, 3:33; see also Kasravi, 117; Mokhber al-Saltana, 191; Mohit-Mafi, 142–46.
65. *Mozakerat,* 53.
66. Ibid., 28–29; Nazem al-Islam, 3:32; Browne (1910), 146.
67. For example, *Mozakerat,* 56.
68. Torkeman, 2:179.
69. Ibid., 180.
70. Cited in Kasravi, 288.
71. Ibid., 289.
72. See, for example, *Mozakerat,* 40, 46, 28–29, 55.
73. *Adalat,* vol. 2, no. 21, Ramazan, 1324.
74. Ibid., no. 23; 3 Shawwal, 1324.
75. Ibid., no. 26, 24 Shawwal, 1324.

76. Ibid., no. 25.
77. Taqizada, 1:346.
78. Fathi (1976), 41; Nazem al-Islam, 3:82–84; Ivanov, 119–20; N. Hasanov, 59.
79. Ivanov, 120; N. Hasanov, 62; H. Hasanov, 78.
80. Bor-Ramenski (1940), 94; (1942), 33.
81. Cited in H. Hasanov, 77.
82. See *Mozakerat,* 49; Mohit-Mafi, 226.
83. Cited in Ivanov, 123–24; see also Taqizada, 1:349.
84. Mokhber al-Saltana, 95–97; Kasravi, 220–23; Taqizada, 1:274–79, 346–49, 389–94; Ivanov, 122; *Anjoman,* vol. 1, no. 47, 13 Moharram, 1325, and no. 48, 20 Moharram, 1325.
85. Fathi (1974), 124.
86. Spring-Rice to Grey, Tehran, February 27, 1907. F.O. 416/32, no. 38.

Chapter 8

1. Writing in the 1960s, Taqizada categorically denied his association with the Social Democrats in this period and insisted the anjoman-e Azerbaijan was not linked to the Social Democrats. He claimed he knew nothing about the terrorist activities of the revolutionary committee. He admitted he knew Haidar Khan but denied he knew of his acts of terrorism. Taqizada, 2:181, 211–13. However, Taqizada's links with Haider Khan and his family in the Caucasus, following the coup of June 1908 and during the period of the resistance, leave no doubt as to his ties with the Social Democrats. See also the recent publication of his correspondence. Afshar (1980a).
2. Eqbal, 70.
3. Ref'at al-Molk, 666–67; Mohit-Mafi, 294; for the anjoman-e Shah Abad see also article in *Tamaddon,* no. 5, 21 Moharram, 1325.
4. Ivanov, 134.
5. Cited in Nazem al-Islam, 2:368–72.
6. Cited in Adamiyat (1975), 27.
7. Taqizada, 2:113; in his subsequent account of the revolution, he was to hail the role of the Azalis in the struggle for political and religious freedom, 1:328–29; in his study of the causes of the revolution, Taqizada was also to give credit to the Babi movement in the mid-nineteenth century in awakening the nation and foreshadowing the national political movement of 1905–1909. Even before Browne began to account for the revolutionary role of the Babi movement, Transcaucasian reformers and revolutionaries had hailed the religious movement as a genuine sociopolitical revolution as well.
8. Nazem al-Islam, 2:349–50.
9. Ibid., 3:70.
10. Ibid., 73–74.
11. Ibid., 75–78.
12. Ibid., 138.
13. Daulatabadi, 2:160; Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:208–9.
14. Nazem al-Islam, 3:92, 100, 73.
15. Ibid., 80.
16. Ibid., 75.
17. *Ruznama-ye Majles,* no. 69, 27 Safar, 1325. Was this the same as the anjoman-e omara, alias akbar, alias khedmat, which officially surfaced after the death of Amin al-Soltan?
18. Nazem al-Islam, 3:112.

19. Adamiyat (1961), 245, 251.
20. Nazem al-Islam, 2:243–44.
21. Fathi (1974), 190; Adamiyat gives no dates.
22. It must be noted here that Sa'd al-Daula, who was Sani' al-Daula's brother-in-law until his divorce, had a longstanding feud with his former wife's family. See Mokhber al-Saltana, 30, 40, 45.
23. Adamiyat (1961), 233–35.
24. Kasravi, 284.
25. Adamiyat (1961), 241; see also the list in Ra'in (1976), 1:677–91.
26. In the case of Mohammad Ali shah, fear for his throne.
27. Nazem al-Islam, 2:401–3; Ra'in (1976b), 446–55; see also the letter of Vakil al-Daula to Amin al-Soltan in Safa'i (1976), 74–81, 91–92.
28. See letter of Mirza Hosain Khan Dabir al-Mamalek, a supporter of Amin al-Soltan, to the latter's son, in Safa'i (n.d.a), 232.
29. Letter of Nezam al-Saltana Mafi to Amin al-Soltan, ibid., 213, and letter of Vakil al-Daula to Amin al-Soltan, Safa'i (1976), 168.
30. Safa'i (n.d.a), 222, 230, 232.
31. Mokhber al-Saltana, 203.
32. See Safa'i (n.d.b), 372; Daulatabadi, 2:123–24.
33. Safa'i (n.d.b), 389–90; (1976), 176–80; (n.d.a), 226.
34. Daulatabadi, 2:125.
35. Adamiyat (1961), 257–58.
36. See his letter in Safa'i (n.d.b), 413–17.
37. Adamiyat (1961), 260–66; Fathi (1974), 147–48, 175; some of the British diplomats in Tehran also believed Amin al-Soltan could work effectively to reconcile the shah and the nationalist factions, otherwise "we may chant the *De Profundis* over the Kajar dynasty." Letter from William Smart to Browne, April 22, 1907, in Browne Papers, Box 11.
38. *Mozakerat,* 127.
39. Ibid., 132–33.
40. Ibid., 133; see also Mohit-Mafi, 237–38.
41. *Mozakerat,* 145; Mohit-Mafi, 239–43.
42. *Mozakerat,* 158.
43. Kasravi, 251–58.
44. Ibid., 230–31.
45. *Al-Jamal,* no. 3, 13 Safar, 1325; no. 12, 17 Rabi' al-Thani.
46. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 12, 26, Rajab 1325.
47. *Al-Jamal,* no. 17; 7 Jamadi al-Thani, 1325; 23 Jamadi al-Thani, 1325; no. 18, no. 23, 9 Ramazan, 1325.
48. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 2, 24 Rabi' al-Thani, 1325.
49. Ibid., no. 5, 15 Jamadi al-Awwal, 1325.
50. Ibid., no. 4, 8 Jamadi al-Awwal, 1325.
51. Ibid., no. 6, 22 Jamadi al-Awwal, 1325.
52. Ibid., no. 12, no. 13, 3 Sha'ban, 1325.
53. *Al-Jamal,* no. 1, 15 Moharram, 1325.
54. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 1, 17 Rabi' al-Thani, 1325; no. 3, 1 Jamadi al-Awwal, 1325, no. 5.
55, *Al-Jamal,* no. 9, 25 Rabi' al-Awwal, 1325; no. 10, 3 Rabi' al-Thani, 1325.
56. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 8, 21 Jamadi al-Thani, 1325.
57. Ibid., no. 14, 10 Sha'ban, 1325.
58. Fathi (1976), 43–44, 48–50.
59. Fathi (1974), 142, 144–45; Fathi (1976), 192–93, 193–94, 196–97.

60. Fathi (1976), 198–200.
61. Ibid., 200–203; Fathi (1974), 159–60, 164–65.
62. "Usul-e Siyasat-e Islami," Fathi (1976), 392.
63. "Balun-e Iran Koja Miravad," Ibid., 399–406.
64. "Resala-ye Lalan," ibid., 418–445.
65. For the most detailed account of this episode, see Torkeman, 2:179–91; Mohit-Mafi, 314–17, 338–39.
66. Text in Kasravi, 411–12.
67. Fathi (1974), 178–80, 174–75.
68. Ibid., 171–72.
69. Ibid., 172.
70. Daulatabadi, 2:109.
71. Letter of Mostashar al-Daula to Theqat al-Islam, Fathi (1974), 162.
72. Kasravi, 289–90, 293–94.
73. Torkeman, 1:149–51.
74. Mohit-Mafi, 339; this sentence is omitted from the otherwise identical text in Torkeman, 2:191.
75. Fathi (1976).
76. Kasravi, 317.
77. *Mozakerat,* 171; see also Nasrollah's essay on the religious legitimacy of the constitution written at the request of Mokhber al-Saltana for mass circulation in Tehran and the provinces. This essay was printed in *Tarbiyyat,* no. 421–24, 5 Shawwal through 14 Zay'l qa'da, 1324. Reprinted in Mohit-Mafi, 149–61; see also the tract written in defense of the constitution and its supplement by Seyyed Abdol Azim Emad al-Olama Khalkhali, in Arjomand (1988a), 335–53.
78. Kasravi, 224–25.
79. Ibid., 225.
80. Ibid., 261.
81. Ibid., 262.
82. Ibid., 306; see also *Anjoman,* no. 82, 5 Rabi'II, 1325.
83. See exchanges of cables in Kasravi, 296–315; *Anjoman,* no. 83, 84, 85, 7, 9, and 11 Rabi'II, 1325.
84. *Anjoman,* no. 73, 20 Rabi'I, 1325. Ismail Amir-Khizi, a member of the Social Democratic group, was sent to Ardabil, and Javad Nateq to Maku. Farzad, 60; see also N. Hasanov, 66.
85. *Anjoman,* no. 77, 78, 21 Rab'I, 1325.
86. Ibid., no. 85, 9 Rabi'II, 1325.
87. Ibid., no. 88, 15 Rabi'II, 1325.
88. Ibid.; Fathi (1976), 53, 191–92. It seems that the Transcaucasian mojahedin were ready for action in this direction, but the Tabrizi elements among the radicals were more patient, taking into consideration the local conditions, and fearing the defection of the olama and the merchants who had been supporting the movement.
89. Fathi (1976), 191–92.
90. Fathi (1974), 137–41.
91. See Fathi (1976), 56–59, account of the killing of a landowner.
92. Ibid., 46, 54–55.
93. *Mozakerat,* 171–72, 173–74.
94. Kasravi, 332–57; Fathi (1974), 168–70.
95. Kasravi, 358.
96. Cited in Browne (1910), 142–43.
97. *Mozakerat,* 178.

98. Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:33–34.
99. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 2.
100. *Mozakerat,* 179.
101. Ibid., 188.
102. Document printed in Kasravi, 371; Torkeman, 1:147.
103. *Mozakerat,* 188.
104. Kasravi, 372.
105. Ibid., 375–76; Daulatabadi, 2:129–30; Mohit-Mafi, 343; Torkeman omits this part of the text.
106. Yaghma'i (1978), 262–63; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:29–30; Malekzada (n.d.), 184–85; see also account of Spring-Rice to Lord Grey, July 10, 1907, F.D. 416/33.
107. Spring-Rice to Lord Grey, June 21, 1907, enclosure in no. 29.
108. Kasravi, 375; Mohit-Mafi, 316.
109. Secret agent report to the government, Yaghma'i (1978), 277–78.
110. Kasravi, 376.
111. Ibid., 409–11; Daulatabadi, 2:129–30.

Chapter 9

1. Mohit-Mafi, 240; the last category is omitted in Torkeman, 2:192.
2. Mohit-Mafi, 242; this sentence is omitted in Torkeman's text. In the latter, the narrator refutes the view that Nuri was carrying out the shah's order, arguing that the shah was, in fact, at that time siding with the majles, 2:229–30, 266–68.
3. *Mozakerat,* 194–95.
4. Kasravi, 378–79.
5. Spring-Rice to Lord Grey, July 10, 1907, F.O. 416/33.
6. Kasravi, 408, 412–15.
7. Browne (1910), 144–45.
8. Mohit-Mafi, 243–44.
9. For the account of this visit see Mohit-Mafi, 357–70; Torkeman, 2:200–216.
10. *Mozakerat,* 201–6.
11. Kasravi, 430–31.
12. Ibid., 379–82.
13. Ibid., 383.
14. See texts in ibid., 414–23, 432–38; Torkeman, 1:231–66.
15. *Mozakerat,* 202–3, 252; Daulatabadi, 2:130.
16. *Mozakerat,* 201–2.
17. Ibid., 204.
18. Yaghma'i (1978), 166–68.
19. Ibid., 172–73.
20. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 6, 22 Jamadi II, 1325.
21. Ibid., no. 7, 8.
22. Yaghma'i (1978), 278–84.
23. Ibid., 280.
24. Ibid., 285–86.
25. See his earlier attacks on Amin al-Soltan, ibid., 238–39, 250–51.
26. Spring-Rice to Grey, February 27, 1907, F.O. 416/32.
27. *Mozakerat,* 169, 189–90.
28. Ibid., 250–51.
29. Kasravi, 431.

30. *Mozakerat,* 216–17.
31. Ibid., 219–20, 220–23.
32. Kasravi, 291–92.
33. Mokhber al-Saltana, 205; see also Daulatabadi, 2:118–226, 131, 133–34.
34. Malekzada (n.d.), 217–20.
35. See texts of the correspondence between the majles and Najaf in *Mozakerat,* 214, 246–47.
36. Ibid., 246.
37. Malekzada (n.d.), 222–24; see also Malek, 59–67.
38. Kasravi, 438–42; see also *Mozakerat,* 229–30.
39. Kasravi, 442–45
40. Spring-Rice to Grey, September 13, 1907, F.O. 416/459; supplement 1 and 4; see also Nazem al-Islam, 3:197; Daulatabadi, 2:144. Taqizada, writing in 1965, denies the shah's involvement in the assassination and states that Haidar Khan had indeed incited Abbas Aqa to commit the murder. Taqizada, 2:210–13.
41. Adamiyat (1961), 255.
42. Ibid., 238.
43. Mokhber al-Saltana, 206–7; Daulatabadi, 2:134–35, 138.
44. Ra'in (1978), 1:649–50.
45. Mokhber al-Saltana, 207–8; Daulatabadi, 2:160; Ra'in (1976b), 1:650; Kasravi, 448–50; Malek, 70–105.
46. See Adamiyat (1961), 256–75, where the author cites an eyewitness account to clear the anjoman-e Adamiyat from charges of complicity in the murder.
47. Spring-Rice to Lord Grey, September 13, 1907, F.O. 416/33.
48. *Mozakerat,* 329–30.
49. Kasravi, 456–69; Daulatabadi, 2:146.
50. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 12, 26 Rajab, 1325.
51. Ibid., no. 14, 10 Sha'ban, 1325.
52. *Mozakerat,* 331.
53. Ibid., 332–33, 366; Browne (1910), 190–92; Kasravi, 461.
54. *Habl al-Matin,* no. 113, September 10, 1907; English text in Browne (1910), 180.
55. Ibid., no. 114, September 11, 1907; English text in Browne (1910), 182–83.
56. Ibid.
57. Browne (1910), 188.
58. Ibid.
59. *Anjoman,* vol. 2, 21 Sha'ban, 1325.
60. Ibid., no. 14, 7 Shawwal, 1325; no. 15, 9 Shawwal, 1325.
61. Ibid., no. 18, 19, 20, dated 3, 5, and 8 Zay'l-Hejja, 1325.
62. *Musavat,* vol. 1, no. 2, 19 Ramazan, 1325.
63. Ibid., no. 4, 5 Shawal, 1325.
64. Ibid., no. 8, 9 Zay'l Qa'da, 1325.
65. *Al-Jamal,* in Yaghma'i (1978), 181.
66. Monthly Summary, October 10, 1907, in Great Britain (1909).
67. Safa'i (1974), 69.
68. Fathi (1974), 221–24.
69. Browne (1910), 147.
70. Fathi (1974), 214–16.
71. Ibid., 226–28.
72. Daulatabadi, 2:154–55, 180–82, 192–94.
73. See Ettehadiya, 152–53.
74. Kasravi, 462–63.

75. Marling to Grey, October 10, 1907, in Great Britain (1909); Kasravi, 463–64; Majd al-Islam, 3:46–47.
76. Kasravi, 487–88.
77. Ibid., 499; Daulatabadi, 2:157–58.
78. Daulatabadi, 2:157–58; Adamiyat (1961), 256.
79. Daulatabadi, 2:154–56.
80. Adamiyat (1961), 227–79.
81. Fathi (1977), 251.
82. Fathi (1974), 202–3, 227, 239–40.
83. Fathi (1977), 275.
84. Malekzada (1948–1949), 2:208–9.
85. Majd al-Islam, 3:53–56.
86. Nazem al-Islam, 3:195–98.
87. Daulatabadi, 2:271.
88. H. Hasanov, 78; Bor-Ramenski (1942), 33; (1940), 92–94; Aliev, 134.
89. Cited in Kaziev (1970), 49.
90. Bor-Ramenski (1942), 53–63.
91. Ibid., 62.
92. See, for example, Mohit-Mafi, 209–12, 291, 294.
93. Taqizada, 2:112.
94. Yaghma'i (1978), 243–44, 253–54.
95. Ibid., 187–90, 191.
96. *Musavat,* 1, no. 1, 5 Ramazan, 1325.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid., no. 2, 19 Ramazan, 1325.
99. Ibid., no. 3, 26 Ramazan, 1325.
100. Ibid.
101. *Roh al-Qods,* vo. 1, no. 5, 1 Sha'ban, 1325.
102. *Musavat,* vol. 1, no. 4, 5 Shawal, 1325.
103. Ibid.
104. Ibid., no. 9, 7 Zay'l-Hejja, 1325.
105. Ibid,. no. 12.
106. Ibid., no. 2, 4; see also *Roh al-Qods,* vol. 1, no. 12, 25 Ramazan, 1325.
107. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 19, 28 Shawal, 1325; no. 18, 21 Shawal, 1325.
108. *Anjoman,* vol. 2, no. 96, 28 Rabi'al-Thani, 1325.
109. N. Hasanov, 74; Nateq (1983), 60.
110. Nateq (1983), 58.
111. Fathi (1974), 152–55; (1977), 26–27, 35; (1976), 6–65, 194–95.
112. See texts of the cables in *Anjoman,* vol. 2, no. 105, Jamadi I, 1325.
113. Ibid., no. 115, 23 Jamadi II, and no. 117, 3 Rajab; N. Hasanov, 76.
114. N. Hasanov, 78–79.
115. Fathi (1976), 206–7.
116. Ibid., 216–17.
117. Fathi (1974), 191–92; (1977), 28–29.
118. Fathi (1974), 197.
119. *Habl al-Matin,* no. 135, October 8, 1907.
120. *Roh al-Qods,* vol. 1, no. 13, 29 Ramazan, 1325; English translation in Browne (1910), 156–59.
121. *Mozakerat,* 376.
122. Kasravi, 482–83.
123. *Mozakerat,* 398–99.

124. Kasravi, 511–12.
125. Daulatabadi, 2:167.
126. Ibid.; Mokhber al-Saltana, 213; Adamiyat (1961), 292; Nazem al-Islam, 3:198.
127. Kasravi, 513.
128. Mokhber al-Saltana, 210–13.
129. Ibid., 216; Daulatabadi, 2:182, 185.
130. Kasravi, 517; Daulatabadi, 2:174–75.
131. Browne (1910), 163.
132. Great Britain (1909), 75–78.
133. Ibid., 90–95.
134. Daulatabadi, 2:178–79.
135. Kasravi, 522.
136. Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:203.

Chapter 10

1. *Mozakerat,* 504.
2. Great Britain (1909), 96.
3. *Mozakerat,* 436–37, 443.
4. See text of the press laws in *Mozakerat,* 587–89.
5. Great Britain (1909), 99–100.
6. Daulatabadi, 2:189–90; Kasravi, 529–32.
7. Daulatabadi, 2:187–88; Kasravi, 561; Mokhber al-Saltana, 218; *Mozakerat,* 443–45; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:74.
8. Majd al-Islam (1972), 288–92; Daulatabadi, 2:242–43.
9. Mokhber al-Saltana, 217.
10. Ibid., 219; see also Daulatabadi, 2:213–17.
11. *Mozakerat,* 440–41, 452–53, 456, 481.
12. Ibid., 530–32.
13. Ibid., 553.
14. Ibid., 577–78.
15. Adamiyat (1961), 294–97, 347.
16. Ibid., 299–320; Ra'in (1976b), 639–46, 656–57, 669–703; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:193.
17. Nazem al-Islam, 3:200.
18. Malekzada (n.d.), 200–201.
19. Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:203–6; *Musavat,* vol. 1, no. 11, 28 Zay'l Hejja, 1325.
20. *Mozakerat,* 469–70.
21. *Sur-e Israfil,* no. 25, 9 Safar, 1326.
22. Kasravi, 543, 550–51; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:213–14; *Habl al-Matin,* no. 254, 255, 14–15 Safar, 1326; *Musavat,* vol. 1, no. 24, 23 Rabi'II, 1326.
23. Daulatabadi, 2:230–33; Kasravi, 559–61.
24. *Musavat,* no. 18, 24 Rabi'I, 1326; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:222–27.
25. Daulatabadi, 2:225; Kasravi, 562.
26. *Mozakerat,* 485.
27. Kasravi, 557–59.
28. Daulatabadi, 2:228–30.
29. Mokhber al-Saltana, 222; Daulatbadi, 2:297–98.
30. Daulatabadi, 2:244–52; Kasravi, 562–63.

31. Daulatabadi, 2:257–58.
32. Ibid., 245–46, 260; see also Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:242.
33. Kasravi, 564–67; Browne (1910), 200–201.
34. Great Britain (1909), 124–25.
35. Ibid., 125.
36. Ibid., 126.
37. Ibid., 143.
38. Ibid., 139–42.
39. Ibid., 126.
40. Daulatabadi, 2:280.
41. Ibid., 263.
42. Ibid., 278; Kasravi, 625, claims that Taqizada sent a long cable in secret code to Tabriz to incite the mojahedin to armed struggle; Taqizada, 1:276, denied having sent this cable.
43. Daulatabadi, 285–86.
44. Daulatabadi, ibid., 283, included himself on the list and excluded the two Azerbaijan deputies; Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:9, claimed only four were on the list, Malek al-Motakallemin, Jamal al-Din Va'ez, Jahangir Khan, and Musavat; Browne (1910), 204, included Yahya Daulatabadi and his brother, but not the two Azerbaijani deputies; the British report listed the deputies, but not Daulatabadi, *Correspondence,* 141.
45. Browne (1910), 203, claimed it came on the eleventh.
46. Daulatabadi, 2:290–91; Kasravi, 587; Nazem al-Islam, 3:144; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:275.
47. Daulatabadi, 2:291.
48. Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:158–60; Nazem al-Islam, 3:149.
49. Kasravi, 587–89.
50. Daulatabadi, 2:288.
51. *Mozakerat,* 579–80; Daulatabadi, 2:293–97.
52. Nazem al-Islam, 3:145–46, 146–47, 147–49, 152–53.
53. Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:28.
54. Daulatabadi, 2:305–6.
55. Great Britain (1909), 142.
56. Daulatabadi, 2:304–5.
57. Ibid., 270–71, 313, 280, 283–84; Majd al-Islam, 3:53–56; Malekzada (1948–1949), 3:286–88; 4:160–62, 198; Mokhber al-Saltana, 209.
58. Daulatabadi, 2:274–76, 303; Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:25.
59. Daulatabadi, 2:297–98; Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:16–17, however, claimed the bazaar remained closed.
60. Daulatabadi, 2:302.
61. Ibid., 308–13.
62. Nazem al-Islam, 3:154.
63. Ibid., 155.
64. Ibid., 156.
65. Daulatabadi, 2:317, 319–24.
66. Great Britain (1909), 155.
67. Daulatabadi, 2:329–30.
68. Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:50.
69. Ibid., 83–84; Nazem al-Islam, 3:156–57.
70. Nazem al-Islam, 3:158.

Chapter 11

1. Daulatabadi, 2:358–59; Malekzada (1948–1949), 4:29–30; Kasravi, 614–16.
2. Kazemzadeh, 512.
3. Marling to Grey, Great Britain (1909), 127
4. Ibid.
5. Grey to O'Beirne, ibid., 132.
6. Daulatabadi, 2:378–81.
7. Nazem al-Islam, 3:163.
8. Ibid., 203–6.
9. Ibid., 287.
10. Ibid., 168, 184.
11. Ibid., 171.
12. Ibid., 158–59, 173.
13. Ibid., 189.
14. Ibid., 174.
15. Ibid., 166.
16. Ibid., 165–68.
17. Ibid., 161.
18. Ibid., 159.
19. Ibid., 169–70.
20. Ibid., 179.
21. Ibid., 194.
22. Ibid., 206, 218.
23. Ibid., 237–38.
24. Ibid., 202.
25. Ibid., 178.
26. Ibid., 179.
27. Ibid., 202–3.
28. Ibid., 208–11, 211–13.
29. Ibid., 214–15; see also Daulatabadi, 2:367–68.
30. Nazem al-Islam, 3:315.
31. Ibid., 229–31.
32. Ibid., 222–25, 245–48.
33. Kasravi, 676; Amir-Khizi, 93–94; Fathi (1974), 350; see also Vijuya, 20–23.
34. Fathi (1974), 359–60.
35. Ibid., 350.
36. Ibid., 356.
37. Ibid., 352.
38. Ibid., 354.
39. See his letters in Fathi (1976), 250–51, 251–53.
40. Vijuya, 37–38.
41. Ibid., 77.
42. Ibid., 88–90.
43. Ibid., 164–68.
44. Ain al-Daula's hostility to the shah goes back to the times when the latter was still crown prince.
45. See text of the sermon in Fathi (1976), 260–63.
46. Ibid., 263–64.
47. Fathi (1974), 371–72.

48. Ibid., 381–83.
49. Vijuya, 99.
50. Ibid., 102.
51. Fathi (1976), 259–60; see also Kasravi, 730.
52. Vijuya, 150–51; Kasravi, 757–59; Amir-Khizi, 179–80.
53. Kasravi, 789–91; Fathi (1974), 383–85; Amir-Khizi, 212.
54. Kasravi, 796–99; Amir-Khizi, 214–16.
55. Kasravi, 798.
56. Nazem al-Islam, 3:241–42; Kasravi, 826–27; see also Nuri's tract in Arjomand (1988b), 354–68.
57. Bor-Ramenski (1942), 33.
58. Bor-Ramenski (1940), 65.
59. Bor-Ramenski (1942), 65.
60. Ibid., 66.
61. Bor-Ramenski (1940), 92–96.
62. Bor-Ramenski (1942), 37.
63. Beloluibski and Belova, 47.
64. Shamida (1973), 12.
65. Beloluibski and Belova, 46–47; see also Shakeri, 19:91–99, and 6:36–40, 50–53.
66. Beloluibski and Belova, 48.
67. Nicholson to Grey, November 29, 1908, F.O. 416/38, no. 550; Browne (1910), 213–19; Kasravi, 830–34; Malekzada (1948–1949), 5:122–25.
68. Smart to Browne, December 5, 1907, Browne Papers, Box 12.
69. Same to same, July 16, 1908, ibid.
70. Same to same, July 22, 1908, ibid.
71. Same to same, July 16, 1908, ibid.
72. Ibid.
73. Spring-Rice to Browne, January 31, 1908, ibid.
74. Cited in Browne (1910), 173.
75. Lynch to Browne, February 20, 1909, Browne Papers, Box 9.
76. Lynch to Gratton, January 8, 1909, ibid.; see also copy of Najaf proclamation, ibid.
77. Smart to Browne, September 10, 1908, Browne Papers, Box 12.
78. See Taqizada, 2:382; see also Reza Musavat's own account in *Musavat,* vol. 2, no. 27, 7 Moharram, 1327/January 30, 1909, published in Tabriz.
79. See letters published in Afshar (1980a).
80. Taqizada to Browne, October 19, 1908, Pembroke Papers, Box 1.
81. Smart to Browne, September 10, 1908, Browne Papers, Box 12.
82. See Browne (1910), 264.
83. Taqizada to Browne, October 22, 1908, Pembroke Papers, Box 1.
84. See copy, ibid.
85. Smart to Browne, November 5, 1908, Browne Papers, Box 12; see also Patrick Cowan's letter to Browne, December 4, 1908, ibid.
86. Spring-Rice to Mrs. Browne, November 1, 1908, Browne Papers, Box 9.
87. Ibid.
88. Lynch to Browne, June 29, 1908, ibid.
89. See the correspondence in Afshar (1979, 1980b).
90. Momtaz al-Daula to Browne, February 6, 1909, Pembroke Papers, Box 1.
91. Taqizada to Browne, December 20, 1908, ibid.
92. Momtaz al-Daula to Browne, January 10, 1909, ibid.
93. Same to same, February 6, 1909, ibid.

94. Same to same, March 2, 1909, ibid.
95. Same to same, March 15, 1909, ibid.
96. Same to same, May 5 and 24, 1909, ibid
97. Lynch to Browne, June 3, 1909, Pembroke Papers, Box 9.
98. Moore to Browne, May 26, 1909, ibid.
99. Same to same, May 31 and June 19, 1909, ibid.
100. Only Kasravi, 806–9, rose in his defense; see also Amir-Khizi, 508–9.
101. Fathi (1974), 406–7.
102. Ibid., 393–402.
103. Ibid., 413–14.
104. Ibid., 424–26.
105. Kazemzahdeh, 530–40.
106. Ibid., 539; see also Browne (1910), 294.
107. Fathi (1974), 438.
108. Ibid., 440.
109. Kasravi, 901–4; Amir-Khizi, 343–49; Nava'i, 49; Barclay to Gray, April 25, 1909, F.O. 416/40, no. 241.
110. Fathi (1974), 456–64.
111. Browne (1910), 274–75. Sattar Khan was also to cable the shah his gratitude for finally restoring the constitution, Amir-Khizi, 368.
112. Fakhra'i, 94–101.
113. Nava'i, 39.
114. Ibid., 28–29.
115. Ibid., 33, 47.
116. Fakhra'i, 115–16.
117. Nava'i, 10.
118. Ibid., 43–46; Browne (1910), 213–28; Kazemzadeh, 521–22.
119. Cited in Browne (1910), 219; see also information Browne received on Panov from H. W. Williams, the British correspondent to the *Morning Post* in St. Petersburg, in Browne Papers, Box 9.
120. Williams to Browne, March 3, 1909, Browne Papers, Box 9.
121. Nava'i, 46.
122. Major Ramsey to the Government of India, August 7 and 17, 1908, F.O. 416/37, enclosures no. 1 and 2 in no. 548.
123. Amir-Khizi, 198.
124. Malekzada (1948–1949), 5:105–9; in his brief reference to Mamaqani, Arjomand (1988b), 183–84, fails to note his connection with the radical constitutionalists' networks.
125. Amir-Khizi, 199–201.
126. Malekzada (1948–1949), 5:107.
127. See text in Nazem al-Islam, 3:232–33; see also F.O. 416/37, enclosure 3 in no. 548; see also Hairi, 89–90.
128. *Tanbih al-Omma wa Tanzih al-Milla,* Edited by Mahmud Taleqani (Tehran, 1955).
129. Hairi, 112.
130. Ibid., 159–64. On al-Kawakibi's and Alfieri's, see Sylvia Haim, "Alfieri and al-Kawakibi." *Oriente Moderno* 34 (1973), 116–28.
131. *Tanbih al-Omma,* 139–42.
132. Ibid., 78–83.
133. Ibid., 134–35. Hairi, 113, misunderstood Na'ini's reference to the extremist anjomans and wrongly explained that Na'ini was attacking the religious and political reactionary anjomans such as Nuri's.

134. Nava'i, 12.
135. See Amir-Khizi, 379; Fakhra'i, 151–63.
136. Nava'i, 49; Fakhra'i, 128; Amir-Khizi, 380.
137. Garthwaite, 112–20.
138. Ibid., 118.
139. Cited in Kazemzadeh, 540.
140. Cited in Browne (1910), 295.
141. Ibid.
142. Russian documents of the period reveal the tsarist government's intention, by the early spring of 1909, to help in restoring law and order and the constitution. The new Russian ambassador to Tehran had written to the viceroy in the Caucasus, "It would be desirable that our authorities in Transcaucasia take no kind of disciplinary means to prevent the [Transcaucasian] volunteers from returning to their country. For our interests, all these expatriates will undoubtedly be less harmful in the Caucasus then in Persia." In the same letter, Sablin announced to the viceroy that the situation in Qazvin had taken a good turn. The Sepahdar, upon Russian advice, took over the governorship of Rasht. He was also given Mazandaran in order to ensure his cooperation. In Qazvin, on the other hand, a former deputy from Tabriz was installed in power, and he was, according to the Russian ambassador, "agreeable." Sablin to the viceroy, May 23, 1909, cited in Bor-Ramenski (1942), 67.

Conclusion

1. Tafreshi-Hasaini, 137.
2. Ibid., 136.
3. Ibid., 96–97.
4. Ibid., 55.
5. Ibid., 116–17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Documents

Great Britain. FO 416 Confidential Print, Public Record Office, Foreign Office Archives. 1902–1908.

Browne, E. G. Letters and Papers. Cambridge University Library, Cambridge.

Great Britain. 1909. *Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Persia,* 2 vols. London: Government Printing Office.

Iranian Government 1909. National Assembly, *Mozakerat-e Majles.*

Newspapers and Periodicals

Adalat
Anjoman
Habl al-Matin
al-Jamal
Mozakerat-e Majles
Musavat
Qanun
Roh al-Qods
Sur-e Israfil
Tadayyon
Tarbiyyat

Books and Articles

Abrahamian, E. 1982. *Iran Between Two Revolutions.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Adamiyat, Feridun. 1961. *Fekr-e Azadi dar Iran.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

———. 1969. *Amir Kabir va Iran.* Tehran: Khvarazmi Press.

———. 1970. *Andishaha-ye Mirza Fathali Akhundzada.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

———. 1972. *Andisha-ye Taraqi va Hokumat-e Qanun: Asr-e Sephahsalar.* Tehran: Khvarazmi Press.

———. 1975. *Fekr-e Demokrasi Ejtema'i dar Nehzat-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Payam.

———. 1976. *Ideologi-ye Nehzat-e Mahrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Payam.

———. 1981. *Shuresh bar Emtiyaznama-ye Regi: Tahlil-e Siyasi.* Tehran: Payam.

Adamiyat, F., and Nateq, H. 1977. *Afkar-e Ejtema'i va Siyasi va Eqtesadi dar Asar-e Montashernashoda-ye Dauran-e Qajar.* Tehran: Agah Press.

Afshar, I., ed. 1979. *Namaha-ye Siyasi-ye Dehkhoda.* Tehran: Ruzbehan.

———, ed. 1980a. *Auraq-e Tazayab-e Mashrutiyyat va Naqsh-e Taqizada.* Tehran: Javidan.

———, ed. 1980b. *Asnadi az Fa'aliyatha-ye Azadikhan-e Iran dar Urupa va Istanbul.* Tehran: Tuman.

Agamirov, M. 1971. *Iz Istorii Bor'bi za Marksitko–Leninskoe Uchenie v Azerbaidzhane.* Baku: Azernashr.

Algar, H. 1969. *Religion and State in Iran, 1785–1906.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

———. 1972. "The Oppositional Role of the Ulama in Twentieth Century Iran." In *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500,* ed. N. R. Keddie. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Aliev, S. 1965. "Neizvestni Dokument ob Iranskoi Sotzyal-Demokraticheskoi Partii." *Narodni Azii i Afriki,* vol. 2.

Alisova, G. 1909. "Musulmanski Vopros v Rossii." *Ruskaya Misl,* vol. 30.

Alstadt, A. 1986. "The Forgotten Factor: The Shi'i Mullahs of Pre-Revolutionary Baku." In *Passé Turco-Tatar, Presént Sovietique,* ed. Ch. Lemercier-Quelquejay, G. Veinstein, and S. E. Wimbush. Paris: Editions Peeters.

Amanat, A. 1988. "In Between the Madrasa and the Marketplace: The Designation of Clerical Leadership in Modern Shi'ism." In *Authority and Political Culture in Shi'ism,* ed. S. A. Arjomand. Albany: SUNY Press.

Amin al-Daula, Ali Khan. 1962. *Khaterat-e Siyasi-ye Mirza Ali Khan Amin al-Daula. Tehran: Tehran University Press.*

Amir-Khizi. 1960. *Qeyam-e Azerbaijan va Sattar Kahn.* Tabriz: n.p.

Ardekani, H. M. 1978. 'Seyyed Mohammad Tabataba'i." *Rahnama-ye Ketab,* vol. 21.

Arjomand, S. A. 1981. "The Ulama's Traditionalist Opposition to Parliamentarianism, 1907–1909." *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 17.

———. 1984. *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order, and Social Change in Shi'ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1988a. *The Turban for the Crown: The Islamic Revolution of Iran.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 1988b. *Authority and Political Culture in Shi'ism.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Arutiunyan, G. S. 1956. *Iranskaya Revoluitzia 1905–1911gg i Bol'sheviki Zakavkaz'ya.* Erevan: n.p.

Ashraf, Ahmad. 1980. *Mavane'e Tarikhi-ye Roshd-e Sarmayedari dar Iran: Dāura-ye Qajariyya.* Tehran: n.p.

Bastani-Parizi, Mohammad. 1975. *Farmandahan-e Kerman.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Bayat, M. 1974. "Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani: A Nineteenth Century Persian Revolutionary Thinker." *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 10.

———. 1982. *Mysticism and Dissent; Socioreligious Thought in Qajar Iran.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

———. 1983. "The Iranian Revolution of 1978–79: Fundamentalist or Modern?" *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 37.

Bell, D. 1980. "The Return of the Sacred? The Argument on the Future of Religion." In *The Winding Passage,* ed. D. Bell. New York: Basic Books.

Beloluibski, F. B., and Belova, N. K. 1970. "Pervie Svyazi Sotzialistov se Natzional'no Osvobozhditel'nim Dvizheniem." *Narodi Azii i Afrikii,* vol. 4.

Benningsen, A., and Lemercier-Quelquejay, Ch. 1960. *Les Mouvements Nationaux chez les Musulmans de Russie.* Paris: Mouton & Co.

———. 1964. *La Presse et le Mouvement National de Russie avant 1920.* Paris: Mouton & Co.

———. 1967. *Islam in the Soviet Union.* Pall Mall Press.

Bor-Ramenski, E. 1940. "K Vaprosu o Roli Bol'shevikov Zakavaz'ya v Iranskoi Revolutzii 1905–1911gg." *Istorik Marksist,* vol. 11.

———. 1942. "Iranskaya Revoluitzia 1905–1911gg i Bol'sheviki Zakavkaz'ya." *Krasni Arkhiv,* vol. 2.

Browne, E. G. 1910. *The Persian Revolution of 1905–1909.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1914. *The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1918. *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

Calder, N. 1982. "Accommodation and Revolution in Imami Shi'i Jurisprudence: Khomeni and the Classical Tradition." *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 18.

Cole, J. 1985. "Shi'i Clerics in Iraq and Iran, 1722–1780: The Akhbari–Usuli Conflict Reconsidered." *Iranian Studies,* vol. 18.

Cole, J. 1986. " 'Indian Money' and the Shrine Cities of Iraq, 1786–1850." *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 22.

Curzon, Sir G. 1892. *Persia and the Persian Question,* 2 vols. London: Longmans.

Daniels, R. V. 1985. *Russia: The Roots of Confrontation.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Daulatabadi, Y. 1982. *Hayat-e Yahya,* 4 vols. Tehran: Attar.

Dekhoda, Ali Akbar. 1982. *Divan-e Dekhoda.* Edited by M. D. Sayyaqi. Tehran: Mazdak.

Efendiev, S. M. 1957. *Iz Istorii Revolutzionovo Dvizhenie Azerbaidzhanskovo Proletariata.* Baku: Azerbaidzhanskoe gosizdvo.

Emad al-Olama Khalkhali, Seyyed Abdol Azim. 1988. "A Treatise on the Meaning of Constitutional Government." In *Authority and Political Culture in Shi'ism,* ed. S. A. Arjomand. Albany: SUNY Press.

Enayat, Hamid. 1982. *Modern Islamic Political Thought.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1984. "Khomayni's Conception of the Guardianship of the Jurisconsult." In *Islam in the Political Process,* ed. J. Piscatori. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

E'temad al-Saltana, Mohammad Hasan Khan. 1966. *Ruznama-ye Khaterat-e E'temad al-Saltana.* Tehran: Anmir Kabir Publications.

Ettehadiya, M. 1982. *Paydayesh va Tahavvol-e Ahzab-e Siyasi-ye Mashrutiyyat* (*Daura-ye Avval va Dovvom-e Majles-e Shaura-ye Melli*). Tehran: Nashr-e Tarikh-e Iran.

Fakhra'i, Ibrahim. 1973. *Gilan dar Jonbesh-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Ketabha-ye Jibi.

Farzad, Hosain. 1945. *Enqelab va Tahavvol-e Azerbaijan dar Daura-y Mashrutiyyat va Tarikh-e Sattar Khan Sardar Melli.* Tabriz: Danesh.

Fathi, Nosratollah. 1974. *Zendeginama-ye Shahid Theqat al-Islam.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

———. 1977. *Sokhanguyan-e Sagana-ye Azerbaijan dar Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

———, ed. 1976. *Majmu'a-ye Athar-e Qalami-ye Shadravan Theqat al-Islam Shahid-e Tabriz.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Ferid, Muslih. 1942. "The Life and Work of Agaoglu Ahmad." *Asian Review,* vol. 38.

Ferrier, R. W. 1982. *The History of the British Petroleum Company: The Developing Years, 1901–1932.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feuvrier, J-B. (1906). *Trois Ans à la Cour de Perse.* Paris: F. Juven.

Floor, W. 1976. "The Merchants (tujjar) in Qajar Iran." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* vol. 126.

———. 1979a. "The Bankers (sarraf) in Qajar Iran." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Vol. 129.

———. 1979b. "The Political Role of the Lutis in Qajar Iran." *Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients.*

———. 1980. "The Revolutionary Character of the Iranian Ulama: Wishful Thinking or Reality?" *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 12.

Garthwaite, G. 1983. *Khans and Shahs: A Documentary Analysis of the Bakhtiyaris in Iran.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gilbar, G. 1977. "The Big Merchants (tujjar) and the Persian Constitutional Revolution of 1906." *Asian and African Studies,* vol. 11.

———. 1979. "The Persian Economy in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." *Welt des Islams,* NS, vol. 19.

Gobineau, A. de. 1865. *Religions et Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale.* Paris: Didier.

Gulbun, M. 1970. "Asnadi dar Bara-ye Mashruta-ye Iran." *Barrasiha-ye Tarikhi,* vol. 3.

Hairi, Abdul-Hadi. 1977. *Shi'ism and Constitutionalism in Iran.* Leiden: Brill.

Hajibeyli, Jeyjoun Bey. 1931. "The Origins of the National Press in Azerbaijan." *Asian Review,* vol. 27.

Hardinge, Sir A. 1928. *A Diplomatist in the East.* London: J. Cape.

Hasanov, Hasan M. 1967. "Iz Istorii Internatzional'nik Svyazei Bol'shevikov Azerbaidzhana se Iranskimi Revoluitzionerami: 1905–1911gg," *Trudi,* vol. 28.

Hasanov, Nariman A. (1975). *Revolutzionnoe Dvizhenie b Tabrize b 1905–1911gg.* Abstract (ms). Baku.

Hashemi-Kermani, Mohammad. 1954–1955. "Nazari be Ekhtelaf va Entekhabat-e Kerman." *Ettehad-e Melli,* no. 11.

Ibragimov, Z. 1955. *Revolutzia 1905–1907 v Azerbaidzhane.* Baku: Azerbaidzhanskoe gos izdv.

Issawi, Ch, ed. 1971. *The Economic History of Iran, 1800–1914.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ivanov, S. M. 1957. *Iranskaya Revolutzia.* Moscow: IMO.

Javadi, H. 1980. *Namaha-yi az Tabriz.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Karimzada-Tabrizi, M. A. 1973. "Chand Sanad-e Tarikhi." *Barrasiha-ye Tarikhi,* vol. 8.

Kasravi, Ahmad. 1974. *Tarikh-e Mashruta-ye Iran,* 10th ed. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Kazemi-Moussavi, Ahmad. 1985. "The Establishment of the Position of the Marja'iyyat-i Taqlid in the Twelver Shi'i community." *Iranian Studies,* vol. 18.

Kazemiyya, I. 1972. "Yaddashtha-ye Seyyed Mohammad Tabataba'i." *Rahnama-ye Ketab,* vol. 8–9.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz. 1968. *Russia and Britain in Persia 1864–1914.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kaziev, M. 1956. *Iz Istorii Revolutzionnoi Bor'bi Babinskovo Proletariata.* Baku: Akademi Nauk Azerbaidzhanskoi SSR.

———. 1970. *Nariman Narimanov.* Baku: Azernashr.

———. 1976. *Mashadi Azizbekov: Zhizn i Deyatel'nost'.* Baku: Giandjlik.

Keddie, N. R. 1962. "Religion and Irreligion in Early Iranian Nationalism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* vol. 4.

———. 1966a. "The Origins of the Religious–Radical Alliance in Iran." *Past and Present,* vol. 34.

———. 1966b. *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Tobacco Protest of 1891–1892.* London: Frank Cass.

———1967. "British Policy and the Iranian Opposition, 1901–1907." *Journal of Modern History,* vol. 39.

———. 1969a. "The Roots of the Ulama's Power in Modern Iran." *Studia Islamica,* vol. 29. Reprinted in N. R. Keddie, ed., *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972.

———. 1969b. "Iranian Politics 1900–1905: Background to the Revolution." *Middle Eastern Studies,* vol. 5.

———. 1971. "The Assassination of Amin al-Soltan (Atabak-i Aʿzam), 31 August, 1907." in *Iran and Islam,* ed. C. Bosworth. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

———. 1972b.*Sayyid Jamal al-Din "al-Afghani": A Political Biography,* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

———. 1983. "Iranian Revolutions in Comparative Perspective." *American Historical Review,* vol. 88.

———, ed. 1972a. *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kedourie, E. 1966. *Afghani and Abduh: An Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam.* London: Frank Cass.

Kosogovski, V. A. 1976. *Khaterat.* Tehran: Simorgh Publications.

Lahidji, Abdol Karim. 1988. "Constitutionalism and Clerical Authority." In *Authority and Political Culture in Shiʿism,* ed. S. A. Arjomand. Albany: SUNY Press.

Lambton, A. 1957. "Secret Societies and the Persian Revolution of 1905–1906." *St. Antony's Papers,* vol. 4.

———. 1965. "The Tobacco Regie: Prelude to Revolution." *Studia Islamica,* vol. 23.

———. 1970. "The Persian ' Ulama and Constitutional Reform." in *Le Shiʿisme Imamite,* ed. T. Fahd. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

———. 1987. *Qajar Persia: Eleven Studies.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Majd al-Islam Kermani, Ahmad. 1972–1977. *Tarikh-e Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran* edited by Mahmud Khallipur. Vol. 1: *Safarnama-ye Kalat* (n.d.); vol. 2: *Tarikh-e Enhelal-e Majles* (1972); vol. 3: *Tarikh-e Enhetat-e Majles* (1977). Isfahan: Isfahan University Press.

Majd al-Molk, Mirza Mohammad Khan Sinaki. 1942. *Resala-ye Majdiyya.* Edited by S. Nafisi. Tehran: Bank Melli-ye Iran.

Malek, Rahim Rezazada. 1972. *Haidar Khan Amu Oghli, Chekida-ye Enqelab.* Tehran: n.p.

Malekzada, M. n.d. *Zendegani-ye Malek al-Motakallemin.* Tehran: Matbuʿat.

———. 1948–1949. *Tarikh-e Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* 6 vols. Tehran: Soqrat.

Maraghaʾi, Zain al-Abedin. 1960. "Zain al-'Abedin Imam Jomaʿ." *Yaghma,* vol. 12, no. 12.

Martin, V. 1989. *Islam and Modernism: The Iranian Revolution of 1906.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Minovi, Motjaba. 1956. "Avvalin Karavan-e Maʿrefat." *Yaghma,* vol. 6.

Mohit-Mafi, H. 1984. *Moqadamat-e Mashrutiyyat.* Tehran: Ferdausi.

Mokhber al-Saltana, Mehdi Qoli Khan Hedayat. 1950. *Khaterat va Khatarat.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Momen, Moojan. 1981. *The Babi and the Baha'i Religions, 1844–1944: Some Contemporary Western Accounts.* Oxford: G. Ronald.

———. 1985. *An Introduction to Shiʿi Islam.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Naraqi, Ahmad. 1903. *Awa'ed al-Ayyam.* Qom:n.p.

Naraqi, Hasan. 1969. *Athar-e Tarikhi-ye Kashan.* Tehran: Azadi.

Narimanov, N. 1925. *Stati i Pis'ma.* Moscow: n.p.

———. 1963. *Bahador i Sonya: Povesti i P'esi.* Moscow: Goslizdat.
Nashat, Guity. 1982. *The Origins of Modern Reform in Iran, 1870–80.* Champaign/Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Nateq, Homa. 1983. "Anjomanha-ye Shaura'i dar Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat." *Alejba,* NS, vol. 4.
———. 1988. "Ruznama-ye Qanun: Pish Daramad-e Hokumat-e Islami 1890–1903." *Dabira,* vol. 4.
Nava'i, Abdol Hosain. 1977. *Fath-e Tehran.* Tehran: Bobak.
Nazem al-Islam Kermani, M. 1967. *Tarikh-e Bidari-ye Iraniyan,* 3 vols. Tehran: Bonyad Farhang-e Iran.
Niku, Hasan. n.d. *Falsafa-ye Niku,* 2 vols. Tehran: n.p.
Qa'em-Maqami, Jahangir. 1980. *Nehzat-e Azadikhahi-ye Mardom-e Fars dar Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Elmi.
Pipes, R. 1980. *The Formation of the Soviet Union.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Raevski, A. 1930. *Bol'shevizm i Men'shevism v Baku v 1904–1905gg.* Baku: n.p.
Ra'in, Isma'il. 1966. *Anjomanha-ye Serri dar Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
———. 1973. *Haidar Khan Amu Oghli.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
———. 1976a. *Hoquqbegiran-e Engelis dar Iran.* Tehran: Hedayat.
———. 1976b. *Faramushkhana va Faramasonri dar Iran,* 2 vols. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
Rausta, Reza. 1963. "Yeki az Derakhshantarin Mardan-e Enqelabi-ye Iran." *Donya,* vol. 3.
Ref'at al-Molk. *Darya-ye Ma'refat,* MS. OR. 1905. Letters and Papers of E. G. Browne, Cambridge University Library, Cambridge.
Roshdi, Shams al-Din. 1983. *Savama-ye Omr.* Tehran: Nashr-e Tarikh.
Sachedina, A. A. 1988. *The Just Ruler in Shi'ite Islam: The Comprehensive Authority of the Jurist in Imamite Jurisprudence.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Sadiqi, G. H. 1970. "Dah Risala-ye Tablighati-ye digar." *Rahnama-ye Kitab,* vol. 3.
Saidzada, D. B. 1978. *Iz Iztorii Azerbaidzhanskoi Burzhuazii v Nachale XX Veka.* Baku.
Safa'i, Ibrahim. 1965. *Rahbaran-e Mashruta.* Tehran: Javidan-e 'Ilmi.
———, ed. n.d.a. *Asnad-e nau yafta.* Tehran: Roshdiyya.
———, ed. n.d.b. *Asnad-e, Siyasi Dauran-e Qajariyya.* Tehran: Sharq.
———, ed. 1969. *Bargha-ye Tarikhi.* Tehran: Roshdiyya.
———, ed. 1973a. *Asnad-e bar Gozide.* Tehran: Roshdiyya.
———, ed. 1973b. *Panjah nama-ye Tarikhi.* Tehran: Roshdiyya.
———, ed. 1976. *Asnad-e Mashruta-ye Dauran-e Qajariyya.* Tehran: Bobak.
———, ed. 1974. *Zaminaha-ye Ejtema'i-ye Kudeta-ye 1299.* Tehran: Bobak.
Samedov, V. 1962–1966. *Rasprostranenie Marksizma-Leninizma v Azerbaidzhane,* 2 vols. Baku.
Schorske, C. E. 1981. *Fin-de Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture.* New York: Vintage.
Shakeri, Khosro. n.d. *Sosial-Demokrasi va Enqelab: Asnad-e Tarikhi-ye Jonbesh-e Kargari, Sosial-Demokrasi va Komunisti-ye Iran.* Tehran: Antidote.
Shamida, A. I. 1973. *Haidar Amu Oghli.* Baku.
Sharif-Kashani, Shaikh Mehdi. 1977 "Tarikh-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran." *Vahid,* no. 208.
———. 1978. 'Tarikh-i Mashrutiyyat-i Iran." *Vahid,* vol. 209.
———. 1983. *Vaqe'ati Ettefaqiyya dar Ruzgar.* Tehran: n.p.
Suny, R. 1972. *The Baku Commune, 1917–1918: Class and Nationality in the Russian Revolution.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Swietochowski, T. 1985. *Russian Azerbaijan, 1905–1920: The Shaping of National Identity in a Muslim Community.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tafreshi-Hosaini, Ahmad. 1972. *Ruznama-ye Akhbar-e Mashrutiyyat va Enqelab-e Iran.* Edited by I. Afshar. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Taherzada-Behzad, Karim. 1953. *Qiyam-e Azerbaijan der Enqelab-e Mashrutiyyat-e Iran.* Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.

Taimuri, Ibrahim. 1949. *Tahrim-e Tanbaku ya Avvalin Moqavamat-e Manfi dar Iran.* Tehran: n.p.

———. 1957. *Asr-e Bikhabari ya Tarikh-e Emtiyazat dar Iran.* Tehran: n.p.

Taleqani, Mahmud, ed. 1955. *Tanbih al-Omma wa Tanzih al-Milla.* Tehran: n.p.

Taqizada, Hasan. 1983. *Maqalat-e Taqizada,* 2 vols. Edited by I. Afshar. Tehran.

Torkeman, M. 1983. *Shaikh Shahid Fazlollah Nuri,* 2 vols. Tehran: Khadamat-e, Farhangi.

Va'ez, Jamal al-Din. n.d. *Lebas-e taqva.* Shiraz: n.p.

Vijuya, Mohammad Baqer. 1976. *Tarikh-e Enqelab-e Azerbaijan va Balva-ye Tabriz.* Tehran: Simorgh.

Yaghma'i, Eqbal. 1969. "Madrasa-ye Dar al-Fonun." *Yaghma,* vol. 23.

———. 1978. *Shahid Rah-e Azadi: Seyyed Jamal Va'ez Isfahani.* Tehran: Tus Publications.

Zenkovsky, S. 1960. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia, 1905–1920.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX