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Abstract

Purpose of the study: Following the entrance of Reza Shah into Iran’s political scene, the Persian archaist and nationalist intellectuals started to support him. These intellectuals believed that only through a central government with a Persian Nationalism could establish a united national nation-state in Iran. They played a key role in paving the path for the formation of a united nation-state and tackling the existing barriers before its path, e.g. the semi-autonomous traditional tribal governments, through establishing parties, societies, and newspapers and various activities in the administrative and bureaucratic domains. This is an issue which has not been discussed almost by no one of the scholars who have conducted studies on Iran.

Methodology: The present study has been undertaken based on the method of historical sociology and through the use of the library sources.

Results: In this way, the intellectuals who were supporters of the ancient Persian nationalism persuaded Reza Shah to adopt a radical military approach against the tribes. They consecrated Reza Shah and did not miss any opportunity to humiliate the tribes in every possible form. In fact, the pro-ancient Persian nationalism intellectuals had their own personal strategies for the destruction of the semi-independent governments.

Applications of this study: This article plays a profound role in studying the history of recent Iran.

Novelty of the study: The novelty of the study is in investigating the historical sociology and using various sources.

Keywords: Tribes, Intellectuals, Resa Shah Regime, Bakhtiari, Qashqaei.

INTRODUCTION

In pre-modern era, Iran’s population had been composed of the face to face communities with their own particular structures, hierarchies, language, and dialects that lived based on their self-sufficient economies until the end of the nineteenth century. These tribes included 15 major clans, i.e. Qajar, Kurd, Turkeman, Baluch, Bakhtiari, Lor, Mamasani, Hazar, Boyer Ahamadi, Shahsavan, Afshar, Teymuri, Qashqaei and Khamseh that had semi-autonomous traditional government (Abrahamian Y. 2012).

Tribes were one of the significant social and political forces that in all three pre-modern, modern and postmodern eras have played different roles in the social life of Iran. Basically, the formation of a central government in Iran particularly since the fifth century of Hijra was possible when there was a tribal and ethnic support. Such regimes as Seljuqis, Teymurids, Aq Qoyunlu, Qara Qoyunlu, Safavid, Afsharyyah, Zandyyah, and Qajari had a tribal origin.

Within the context and procedure of the political, social, cultural and economic changes and developments that had occurred during the Qajar era in the structure of the “Guarded Domains of Iran”, the emergence of the secular and religious intellectuals is considered to be one of the most important events in the history of the “Guarded Domains” under the Qajar regime. The newly emerged intellectuals had an effective role in the change and developments of the Qajar Guarded Domains and later in the era of Reza Shah and then in the next periods. Gholamreza Goodarzi in his work entitled “Unfinished Modernity of Iranian intellectuals” has divided the evolution of the intellectual movement in Iran into six eras that from a chronological point of view, begins from three earlier decades before constitutionalism and continues right into today. He offers certain characteristics for each one of the determined eras. In the early periods, the reformist intellectuals in their theoretical approaches to the modernity simultaneously insisted on the democratic and technical aspects of the modernity in an equal scale while in the second era, following the emergence of the constitutionalism, although the political power is transited, the economic structure of the society remains the same and the constitutional institutions take form in a very hasty and imitative way. The third period is simultaneous with the absolute dominance of Reza Shah the first stage of which is proceeding in collaboration with the intellectuals who are having the idea of modernization in their head but from 1935 to 1941 the intellectuals leave Reza Shah’s company and are secluded. In this era, the number of the journals decline from 150 to 50. The fourth period is from 1941 to 1953 August 19. The fifth period begins from the August 19 coup and end in 1979 and finally, the sixth period starts in 1979 and continues up to this day (Goodarzi G. 2008).
The first generation of Iranian intellectuals believed in modernization from the top (Jahanbaglou F. 2002). The second generation of Iranian intellectuals who take form since the Constitutionalism movement includes such figures as Foroughi, Dawar, Taqizadeh, etc, who during the region of Reza Shah played the role of the ideologue of the Reza Shah regime. Some of these intellectuals played their roles through their translations, works, and lectures while the other group of intellectuals directly had an office in the court. The first generation of the intellectuals believed in the egalitarianism, liberalism, and romantic nationalism but the intellectuals of the second generation who played their role in the second period of the Reza Shah regime believed in political authoritarianism and linguistic and cultural nationalism (Nazari A. 2007).

Asghar Shirazi classifies the approaches and ideas of the intellectuals from 1921 to 1941 in three groups: 1- The approach of the intellectuals, journalists and politicians who have played their roles as the preachers and proponents of Reza Shah before his presidency of the ministers and later they all had offices and worked as the top officials of Reza Shah regime. 2- Intellectuals who were involved in the theorization, designing, advertisement, and promotion of the ideology of ancient Persian Aryanism as intended by the Reza Shah regime. 3- The dissident politicians and intellectuals who were against Reza Shah. The difference of opinions and factions between these three groups through 1921-1941 were not completely absolute rather sometimes the pro-Reza Shah intellectual would turn to his enemy or an anti-Reza Shah thinker would have been a defender of Persian nationalism and archaism which was considered to be the official ideology of Reza Shah (Shirazi A. 2016).

Following the 1920 Coup, the political and social relations of the Qajar Empire wholly changed. The activity of the remaining intellectuals of the Constitutional era changed its style during Reza Shah’s era. A huge part of them came together in the form of the Young Iran party and met Reza Shah who was then the minister of war and delivered their code of conduct to him. Reza Shah in his meeting with the Persian Nationalist intellectuals, states:

You will say the words and I’ll put them into action … I promise you that I’ll realize all these wishes and I’ll keep with your code which is also my own code of conduct until the end”.

Mehrzad Broujerdi believes that the best term that can be used for Reza Shah’s ideology is “Despotic Secular Nationalism” under the banner of which he was leading the project of modernization and development of Iran (Goodarzi G. 2008). Intellectuals of Persian Nationalism believed that the solution to the existing conditions of Iran lies in the two interrelated ways: “Persian Nationalism in theory; and the powerful central government in practice” (Entekhabi N. 2011). On the one hand, they saw the Persian archaist nationalism as a cure for the humiliations of the past problems, and on the other hand, they believed that having a powerful government with a military arm can be useful for the resolution of the past humiliation. This ideal led to the transfer of the power to Reza Shah. The Persian Nationalist Intellectuals with their abstract theorizations were struggling to tackle the existing significant barriers before a united nation-state including the semi-autonomous tribal governments, clerics as well as other impediments. They intended to implement the project of creation of a united nation-state based on the Persian archaist nationalism through different mechanisms and methods in Iran; quoted from.

In previous eras, the idea of nationalism was just discussed within the circle of the intellectuals. On the contrary, Reza Shah’s Persian archaist nationalism was turning to a trend among the urban literate people through popular writings, controversial essays, and satiric poems or sentiments the content of which was Anti-Arab and Anti-Turk (Entekhabi N. 2011).

The intellectuals of the Persian archaist nationalism were focused on preparing the ground for the creation of the foundations of the modern government, promotion of Aryan Persian nationalism, prevention from the influence of clerics, returning to the ancient fundamentalism, bureaucratic and administrative reforms and political concentration (Husam F. 2003). In this regard, the authors of the Iranshahr Magazine, in their total 236 articles, devoted 30 articles to the pre-Islamic history of Iran. The Nameh Farangestan also published articles on the historical era and proposed certain suggestions for establishing a united nation-state through tackling the existing barriers including the semi-independent traditional governments of tribes (Abrahamian Y. 2012) and (Cottam R. 1992).

Such an intellectual as Ali Dashti has referred to Reza Shah as the “Father of Nation”. As to ideological justification of the necessity of the formation of a central government, Dawar has written: “A strong will is required to undertake the management of the national affair of Iran and overcome the existing divisions by force”. He felt the need for a despotic government from the top to down to the extent that he would argue, “Iranian would never be a human on his own”. Therefore, happiness “must be imposed to Iran by force” (Goodarzi G. 2008). Now given the fact that the semi-autonomous governments of the tribes were considered to be one of the key barriers before the realization of the ideology of the united modern nation-state based on the Persian Archiast Nationalism in Iran, then it seems that the intellectuals who defended the latter ideology were forced to prepare the required discourse space for putting an end to the power of the semi-independent governments of the tribes. Accordingly, the main question of the current study is as follows: Whether the intellectuals of Persian Archiast Nationalism had any role in the crackdown and termination of the semi-autonomous traditional governments of the tribes?

In the field of intellectualism and intellectuals, such thinkers as, (Manheim D. 1995), (Entekhabi N. 2011), (Husam F. 2003), (Goodarzi G. 2008), (Shirazi A. 2016) have conducted a series of studies. Moreover, the studies of such scholars...
as (Abrahamian Y. 2012) concerning the age of enlightenment and the tradition of intellectualism in the west are considerable. In Iran, such figures as (Nazari A. 2007), (Jahanbaglou F. 2002), (Goodarzi G. 2008) have authored books and articles on intellectualism.

(Abrahamian, 1982) in “A study of the role of the intellectuals in Reza Khan’s coming to the power” have assayed the role of the intellectuals in Reza Shah’s rising to the power and his twenty years long rule.

Zahedi, Mohammad Javad; Mohammad Heydarpur in “sociology of solitude of intellectuals (criticism of the actions of intellectuals in constitutionalism until the end of the Pahlavi)” have examined the social and political role of the intellectuals in constitutionalism (late Qajar era) and Reza Shah’s reign as well as their social situation and their relation with the people and the state.

(Aron R. 2003) in “role of intellectuals and the neighboring countries in the modernization of Reza Shah era” has studied the role of the writings of the intellectuals in Iran particularly between 1920-1925 and also the pressure of the neighboring countries (the Soviet Union and Turkey) in the codification of the policies of the modernization by Reza Shah’s government.

Although almost many studies have been conducted regarding the intellectuals and their place and role in Iran, no independent and clear study has been done so far of the role of the intellectuals in the tribal policies of the regimes in Iran. Accordingly, the present essay is an effort for the study of the ideas of intellectuals in the tribal policies of Reza Shah relying on the historical evidence in relation to the influence of the ideas of the intellectuals in the domain of Reza Shah’s tribal policies of Qashqai and Bakhtiar tribe.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intellectualism is among the concepts that do not have a comprehensive and clear definition. Julien Benda in “The Treason of the Intellectuals” suggests that intellectuals are people who necessarily challenge the power. Also, Edward Saeed describes the intellectual “as an opposition in spirit who raises problematic questions and is not easily attracted to the regimes or companies. His existence is beyond every political party and represents all humans and issues that are usually marginalized and neglected” (Bahman Beigi M. 2007).

Gramsci writes, “All humans are intellectuals but do not have the function of intellectualism …” As to the role of the organic intellectuals for the governments, he believes:

“The state requires the active role of intelligence as an individual and collective organizer of private life. They perform the complex function of bringing about the consent active or passive of the population to meet the needs of production on a daily basis. In sum, the new category of organic intellectual replaces the traditional elite intellectual that was the controller of public life in pre-modern times (Gramsci A. 1971).”

Manheim D. 1995 contends that intellectuals are not a social class and do not have common sources and cannot take part in a collective action. In other words, intellectuals are the ideologues of different classes and do not constitute an independent class for themselves. Nevertheless, the existence of intellectuals is potentially capable of going beyond the class situation. In this regard, Manheim speaks of the “floating” intellectuals (Manheim D. 1995).

Jean Paul Sartre states: “Intellectual is someone who in his existence and in the society is conscious of the existing contradiction between the search for practical truth and dominant ideology”.

Julien Benda uses the religious term “clerics” for in order to understand the description of the intellectuals and he draws a line between them and the laity. The laity are in search of material interests and pleasures while the intellectuals contrary to the latter, devote themselves to the quest for higher values and do not pay any attention to the material interest. This is why the intellectual announces that “my territory is not the terrestrial” (Sartre J. 2001).

Jahanbaglou F. 2002 describes the intellectual as follows: “Intellectual is among the central figures of the modern world. Intellectualism is an essentially modern category that took form during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century and has five striking features, i.e. 1- intellectual represents the person who is conscious of himself. In other words, intellectualism is a type of self-contemplation and the difference of the intellectual with the ordinary people in the society is this self-contemplation; 2- the intellectual is featured with his alternative thinking. Said differently, the intellectual is the person who can think another way. This mode of alternative thinking is clear from the way he asks questions of the reality; 3- the intellectual is the person who both creates crisis and solves the crises; 4- intellectual is basically a pioneer of enlightenment; 5- the intellectual lives in truth and for truth but this truth is never an absolute truth presented by the intellectual. It is in this point that the intellectual must be distinguished from the ideologue. An ideologue is a person who is a heralded of an absolute truth and preaches it while the intellectual is in search of the truth and it is because of this characteristic that he can undertake a very significant role in his own society and world.

In a collective action. In other words, intellectuals are the ideologues of different classes, and they do not constitute an independent class for themselves. Nevertheless, the existence of intellectuals is potentially capable of going beyond the class situation. In this regard, Manheim speaks of the “floating” intellectuals (Manheim D. 1995).

Jean Paul Sartre states: “Intellectual is someone who in his existence and in the society is conscious of the existing contradiction between the search for practical truth and dominant ideology”.

Julien Benda uses the religious term “clerics” for in order to understand the description of the intellectuals and he draws a line between them and the laity. The laity are in search of material interests and pleasures while the intellectuals contrary to the latter, devote themselves to the quest for higher values and do not pay any attention to the material interest. This is why the intellectual announces that “my territory is not the terrestrial” (Sartre J. 2001).

Jahanbaglou F. 2002 describes the intellectual as follows: “Intellectual is among the central figures of the modern world. Intellectualism is an essentially modern category that took form during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century and has five striking features, i.e. 1- intellectual represents the person who is conscious of himself. In other words, intellectualism is a type of self-contemplation and the difference of the intellectual with the ordinary people in the society is this self-contemplation; 2- the intellectual is featured with his alternative thinking. Said differently, the intellectual is the person who can think another way. This mode of alternative thinking is clear from the way he asks questions of the reality; 3- the intellectual is the person who both creates crisis and solves the crises; 4- intellectual is basically a pioneer of enlightenment; 5- the intellectual lives in truth and for truth but this truth is never an absolute truth presented by the intellectual. It is in this point that the intellectual must be distinguished from the ideologue. An ideologue is a person who is a heralded of an absolute truth and preaches it while the intellectual is in search of the truth and it is because of this characteristic that he can undertake a very significant role in his own society and world.

Intellectuals are divided into three general groups: 1- those intellectual who play a key role in the creation and preservation of the final and unchangeable values in the field of truth, beauty and justice; 2- those intellectuals who acts as the preachers of the creeds, founders of the ideologies and the critics of the status quo; and 3- intellectuals who represent a class involved in the development and progress of the culture of society. What is intended in the present
study is the intellectuals in the sense of the second category, i.e. intellectuals as the founders of the ideology of a united nation-state on the basis of the Persian Archaist Nationalism who played a considerable role through their writings, speeches, actions and policies in the political relations between Reza Shah administration and the traditional governments of tribes?

According to Weber, causal research can move in two directions that for the sake of the simplification, we can call one the historical causality and the other sociological causality. The historical causality is what determines the unique conditions that have given rise to an event. Sociological causality suggests that there are two relative appearances. This relation is not necessarily in a form that the phenomenon A would give rise to the phenomenon B rather it can be expressed this way: “A” in a relatively strong way facilitates the “B” (Aron R. 2003). Accordingly, such a relation can be drawn between the role of the pro-Persian Archaist Nationalism intellectuals and the policies of Reza Shah as regards the tribes (in the current study the Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribe).

METHODOLOGY

Historical Sociology As a hybrid branch and interdisciplinary field, the intersection of the two sciences is history and sociology. In fact, the sociology of the former societies, based on historical documents and reports, is a relatively young member of the social science family and one of the most successful disciplines in the social sciences. In historical sociology, the study of social phenomena is based on data, information, analysis, and historical studies. It should be noted that this is a two-way stream of influence between sociology and the science of history. History also uses analyzes, approaches, models, methods, and theories of the social sciences. Thus, when a sociologist goes beyond the full attention of existing structures, "historical sociology" emerges, and when a historian avoids the mere reporting of historical events and personal affairs, "the co-operation of history and social theory" is formed. As Ibn Khaldun puts it - and sociologists now insist that the sociology of history must be descriptive and analytical; that is, it must show why and how societies formed, expanded, and changed (Ivanov Sergei J. 2016).

The present study has been conducted based on the method of historical sociology and using library sources. The central subject of this study is based on the following question: Whether the intellectuals had any role in the course of the policy making of Reza Shah’s administration for the crackdown of the semi-autonomous government of Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribes? The hypothesis is that the so called Persians’ intellectuals, in the eyes of Jalal Ale Ahmad, as one of the intellectuals of those times were involved in the theorization and political legitimization of Reza Shah’s crackdown of the semi-autonomous traditional governments of Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribe.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mahmoud Afshar

Mahmoud Afshar in his article in “Ayandeh Magazine” has considered the semi-autonomous tribes to be one of the main impediments before the realization of a united nation-state based on the Persian Archaist Nationalism. He believed that such mechanisms as the nationalization of Persian language, eradication of the semi-autonomous governments of tribes, eradication of the local clothing, languages, habits and ethical norms of different opposition tribes, nations and ethnicities within the geographical territory under the domination of the central Qajar government that later became controlled by the Reza Shah regime, including Kurd, Arab, Qashqaei, Turkman, Azerbaijani, Bichaqchi, Afshar, etc, for creation of a united nation-state in Iran. Part of the central themes of the articles of Afshar is concerning the creation of a united nation-state and putting an end to the semi-autonomous traditional governments.

Here we quote two remarks by Afshar in this regard:

“By national unity of Iran, we refer to the political, moral, and social unity of people who live within the current territory of the country. This has two implications, i.e. preservation of the political independence and territorial integrity of Iran … But the completion of national unity implies the prevalence of the Persian language throughout the country. The local differences in clothing, ethics, etc. must be uprooted and the tribal territories should be united as a nation. There should be no difference between Kurd, Lor, Qashqaei, Arab, Turk, and Turkman, etc. They should not use local clothing and dialects. I believe that national unity and political independence are in danger in view of the language, ethics, clothing, and the like (Afshar M. 1925).

“The construction and development of railways throughout the country and increase of the relations of different regions, the publication of thousands of cheap and interesting books and essays in Persian in all corners of the country specifically in Azerbaijan and Khuzestan, funding the publication of the cheap local newspapers in Persian, sedentarization of the Persian speaking tribes in non-Persian regions and likewise the sedentarization of the non-Persian tribes in Persian speaking regions, replacing the non-Persian names with Persian ones, dividing the land into provinces instead of the state and regional divisions of Khurasan, Baluchestan, Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, ban of the use of non-Persian languages in the military, offices, and courts. According to (Afshar M. 1925), the internal policy of the country should be based on the completion of a united nation-state in different ways particularly the promotion of the Persian language.
Hossein Kazemzadeh Iranshahr

Kazemzadeh Iranshahr is one of the other pioneering intellectuals of Pan-Persians’ nationalism who insisted on the dilution of the religious attachments as the only path towards the creation of a nation and national unity. In his “Religion and Nation”, he writes: “Iran can reach happiness and contribute to human prosperity as a whole if it does not lose its nationality. Nationality in this context refers to the specific Iranian civilization within which Iran can realize the manifestations of its spirit. This is why we consider nationality the only tool for the development of Iran and describe it as the final goal of Iranian youth”. Iranshahr with different examples tries to suggest that the status quo of Iran with all its ignorance, prejudices, and selfishness does not leave any room for such ambitions as the unity of humankind or Islam. According to Iranshahr, emphasis on nationality is of a particular importance in a land that is the scene of extensive ethnic, linguistic, religious, and political differences.

“In a country where every class is considered to be the enemy of the other class and alienation and ignorance have reached the point that the people of every state or even every city considers another city of the country abroad (exile) and says that “X is in exile” and most people when are asked of their homeland, answer with the name of their birthplace, and the people of South call Azerbaijan, Tabriz Turk and many Azerbaijanis just like the translators of the Trukish Embassy consider the Persian a foreign language, in this Iran where not only the ignorance and division and prejudice have made people the enemies of each other, rather different languages, habits, clothing, and rituals have rendered being a nation impossible due to the incoherence”.

Seyed Hassan Taqizadeh

One of the key ideas of Taqizadeh and his co-ideologues was the insistence on the necessity and importance of the formation of a national army and the law of national military service for building a united nation-state and putting an end to the semi-autonomous governments of tribes. Taqizadeh was the editor in chief of the Kaveh Magazine. In his numerous articles, he highlighted the significance of the military forces for the formation and development of a nation-state in Iran. Moreover, he believed that the only way for the creation of this military order is an authoritarian central government. In one of his articles, he states: “The path of Iran’s development is an enlightened dictatorship like Peter the Great and Japanese Mikado” (Kaveh D. 1921).

Furthermore, Taqizadeh believed that an unconditional imitation of the west is necessary for the creation of a united nation-state based on Persian language and putting an end to the semi-independent government of the tribes. In one of his articles in Kaveh Magazine, he has written:

“First, unconditional acceptance and promotion of European Civilization and surrender to Europe and adoption of the European habits and traditions, sciences and industries and the whole European affairs without any exception (except language) and leaving any type of selfishness and insignificant objections away that have their origin in the wrong interpretation of patriotism and can be called false patriotism; second, the sincere effort for the preservation of Persian language and literature and its development and generalization; third, circulation of the European sciences and public tendency towards the establishment of schools and generalization of the education and spending the whole material and spiritual resources of the country including the religious alms and charity sources on education, on the one hand, and encouragement of the orators, scholars, politicians and the journalists, on the other hand … Iran must be westernized in appearance, in body, in spirit, and soul. This is all”. The (Kaveh D. 1921) Magazine having Taqizadeh as its editor-in-chief designed a general plan for the creation of a united nation-state and its development in which specific mechanisms are suggested for putting an end to the semi-autonomous governments. The following are among the plans that have been mentioned in the aforementioned magazine:

“Public education of the nation, translation of western books, adoption of European civilization in an unconditional form, preservation of national unity of Iran, national language and independence of Iran, freedom of women and effort for the creation of new modes of thought among the people, immediate hiring of the western advisers, strengthening the central government and providing the means of its duration and stability, creation of public security, battle against the diseases and alcohol, opium and the ignorant prejudices, encouragement of sport and revival of the national and ancient traditions of Iran, sedentarization of the tribes and their disarmament, political freedom and equality (Democracy), implementation of a series of reforms in agricultural and economic affairs, implementation of the punishment for the criminals, battle against the moral vicious features including lying, conspiracy, and theft” (Kaveh D. 1921).

Mohammad Ali Foroughi

Mohammad Ali Foroughi played a key role in Reza Khan’s ascension to power and the establishment of the Pahlavi dynasty. Hossein Makki writes, “Foroughi always supported Reza Khan either because of his intelligence or due to his consciousness of the British policy as regards the “centralization of power”. He was a very skillful political actor and indeed he was the true leader of the scene of Iranian politics”.

Dr. Ali Mohammad Taqvi, the contemporary sociologist and scholar, states

“Foroughi the thinking brain of the regime was one of the detoxified freemasons. Foroughi was highly respected by all detoxified figures. He succeeded to reach the office of the Prime Minister and played a key role in delIslamization and
promotion of western culture. It was Foroughi who with his treasons let the Pahlavi regime keep its power after the resignation of Reza Khan. He first prepared the ground for the resignation of Ahmad Shah in order to take Reza Khan to the throne and then after the attack of the Allies he reinforced the thirteenth parliament and reinstated Mohammad Reza Khan as Reza Shah’s successor.

Foroughi’s speech in Reza Khan’s coronation expresses all elements of the ideological monopolarchial chauvinism and arcahism that were later used by the supporters and pupils of Foroughi. In his speech, he described Reza Khan Mir Panj as a “Decent King from an Iranian Origin” and the heir to the crown and throne of the country and the savior of Iran and the reviver of the ancient monarchy and so on. The name “Pahlavi” was an innovation of Foroughi and Pahlavis were forced to change their names.

In “Rise and Fall of Pahlavi Regime”, Foroughi’s intellectual ideology has been explained as follows: “Foroughi insisted on the necessity of a powerful central government in which Shah not only is not a man like other citizens rather is an “Overman” and even a “semi-divine” figure. For it is only such a Shah who can rule the laity as a totalitarian king and provide the ground for the modern colonial political and cultural domination. Foroughi personally had such a belief and considered the monarchy as the only form of ruling that was appropriate for the culture and psychology of Iranians” (Peyman H. 1968).

Ardashir Raportchi

Farzad Ardashirchi who later became known as Ardashir Raportchi was one of the other elites and intellectuals who supported Persian Nationalism during the reign of Reza Shah. In the part of the memories of Ardashirchi concerning the tribes in general and Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribes in particular, it is stated:

“For eleven years, I lived among different nomads and tribes that resided within the geographical territory of Iran. I reported Reza Shah of all the details of their language, race, lineage, hierarchy, Ilkhani and Khani classes as well as their relations with themselves and the foreign countries. His aim is that one-day Iranian tribes would consider themselves truly an Iranian and take part in social and political rights and obligations. In the present regime, there is no place for unofficial and local autonomous governments. I decisively believe that the continuation of the power of Khans in all possible forms is in contradiction with the central government and independence of Iran. These local powers should be lifted and if is necessary, to be uprooted. I have been frequently witnessing to the selfish decisions of the Khans that just sought to reach their own material and personal interests. They just pursue their own interests and it does not matter if the source of interest is national or foreign. Even I saw that they are bragging on their relations with the political foreign agents in their tribes. Experience showed me that the essential interest and potentiality for betraying Iran is very high in Qashqaei tribes and they are not faithful to any principle. Bakhtiari's contrary to their appearance, are very fragile and their loyalty is always shivering before the political developments … In 1912 I was sent to judge a controversy between the Bakhtiari Khans and Sheikh Mohamareh over Shushtar and Dezful and their territorial identity. Finally, after long negotiations with Sheikh on the one hand, and the Ilkhani Bakhtiari commander, on the other hand, a peace compact was prepared and the parties signed it in the political office of the British embassy at Mohmareh in Bushehr. There was nothing to be handled by the central Qajar government in this area!”.

In this way, the intellectuals who were supporters of the ancient Persian nationalism persuaded Reza Shah to adopt a radical military approach against the tribes. They consecrated Reza Shah and did not miss any opportunity to humiliate the tribes in every possible form. In fact, the pro-ancient Persian nationalism intellectuals had their own personal strategies for the destruction of the semi-independent governments. To create a united nation-state based on the Persian nationalism and destruction of the tribal powers and governments, they first theorized their own perspective of the tribes through the use of such labels as back warded, separatist, anti-sodality, and anti-nationalist, against the tribes. At the same time, they theorized such mechanisms and methods as disarmament of tribes, forced sedentarization of the moving nomads, forcing the tribes and nomads to leave their clothing aside and use national clothing style, dissolution of the military forces affiliated to the tribes of the central government, deploying soldiers from the tribes by force, creation of Persian speaking schools in tribal territories, forced migration of the tribes, military actions against the tribes, confiscation of the oil resources controlled by the tribes, destruction of animal husbandry based economy, creation of judicial and administrative institutions like the registration organization in each territory of the tribes, arresting the leaders and commanders f the tribes, exiling the leaders and commanders of the tribes, killing the leaders and commanders of the tribes, nationalization of the territory that was held by the tribes and so on and so forth. By propaganda and creation of ideological legitimacy and depiction of different solutions and mechanisms for the crackdown of the tribes, they paved the path for Reza Shah’s action against the tribes. According to this discourse propaganda by the pro-ancient Persian nationalism of Reza Shah Regime, which began in 1920 coup through 1925, i.e. official fall of Qajar regime, until the end of Reza Shah’s reign, provided the ground for the fall of the semi-independent governments of different tribes including Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribe.

DISCUSSION

The Extensions of Application of Political Strategy of the Pro-ancient Persian Nationalism Intellectuals in Relation to Bakhtiari and Qashqaei Tribe:
Military Policy

A military policy had been determined by the intellectuals for putting an end to the rule of tribes like Bakhtiari and Qashqaei. Before the 1920 coup, the tribes constituted the main texture of the military forces of the central government. After the coup, Reza Shah in the course of the reconstruction of the organization of the army did not allow the presence of the tribes in it. Since the arrival of Reza Khan and his collaboration in the national affairs, and after 1920 coup the central government spent more than one billion Qiran on military affairs. Almost more than 40 percent of the national budget of the central government was spent on the preparation of the army for war (Pur Bakhtiar G. 2008).

The war with the Bakhtiari tribe was just started after the 1920 coup and in 1922 (Abbasi Servak L. 2009), Sardar Zafar mentions three reasons for this attack that consist of “union of Bakhtiaris with Sheikh Khazal the leader of the Arabs of Khuzestan, the refusal of the recognition of the power of Bakhtiaris in the region, the news from Kurdistan and the war of Esmaeil Aqa Samituq with the regime”.

This action by Bakhtiaris revealed the true policy of this tribe for confrontation with the military domination of the central government of Reza Khan over the Persian Gulf and other regions that were under his control. Although after this event the traditional leaders of Bakhtiaris decisively denied all allegations of the conflict between the Bakhtiaris and the military forces of the central government, all factions and even the parliament showed the severe reaction to Bakhtiaris and the British forces. The protesters called the Bakhtiaris traitor and criminal and asked for the immediate execution of the Khans and unified military action for suppression of the Bakhtiaris. The central government and its media claimed that Britain had triggered the war in order to prevent the mobilization of the army towards the Arabia (Khuzestan) and fragment the country (Cronin, 2014). Nevertheless, the main and final military confrontation between the Bakhtiaris forces and the Reza Shah administration occurred in 1929 during the Bakhtiari uprising. The leadership of Bakhtiaris was in the hand of Ali Mardan Bakhtiari. The rebels consisted of a union of two Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani houses and all leaders of Haft Lang and Chahar Lang were of a Bakhtiari origin. Ali Mardan Bakhtiari arranged a group called “Heyat Ejtemayah Bakhtiari” including twelve Bakhtiari commanders and sheriffs and the main goal of the “Heyat Ejtemayah Bakhtiari” movement was the revival of the lost rights of the Bakhtiari people. This uprising was defeated in the final war between the Bakhtiari and Reza Shah.

The suppression of Qashqaei tribe was almost part of the suppression of the semi-independent traditional governments that were handled by Reza Shah. The military confrontation between the semi-autonomous traditional government of Qashqaei tribe and Reza Shah took place three times from 1928 to 1932. Finally, Reza Shah’s government succeeded to suppress these uprisings in a decisive way and killed hundreds of them. Foran claims that the suppression of the tribes caused many of the tribes to reach political consciousness and search for their identity in relation to the migration route, culture, rituals and traditions, and language. The ethnic minorities in one sense established a true coalition before the process of “Persianization” of Reza Shah Regime (Foran J. 2015).

Forced Recruitment

In 1925 the law of the mandatory military service was adopted by Reza Shah Regime. In 1930, Reza Shah Regime succeeded to implement the plan of military service in regions outside the domination of the traditional tribal governments. After the military suppression of the traditional governments of southern tribes in 1929, the conditions were provided for implementation of this plan in relation to the tribes including the Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribe. As a result, since the mid 1931, under the support of the pro-Persian archaist nationalism intellectuals, this plan was also operationalized for the tribes including the Qashqaei and Bakhtiari tribe (Cronin J. 2014).

Mandatory Sedentarization

The law and regulations of the plan of “Timber Door” (Mandatory Sedentarization) of the nomads were operationalized in eleven articles in 1933. The law of sedentarization of the nomads was notified in 1933 to Mahmoud Khan Ghaffari the deputy of Bakhtiari construction so that it is taken into consideration towards the sedentarization of the Bakhtiaris. In 1934, Reza Shah Government allocated 50 thousand Rials for construction affairs of the plan of sedentarization of the Bakhtiari nomads and gave this budget to the ministry of interior affairs.

In 1934, upon the order of Reza Shah Regime, the head of villages and the elders of different Bakhtiari tribes were sedentized in Sardsir and the families of the related tribes were sedentarized in newly constructed villages based on Reza Shah’s order. The policy of sedentarization continued for Bakhtiaris until 1936. Upon the order of Reza Shah Administration, his military officers were obligated to prevent the migration of Bakhtiari tribe from the winter-quarters to the summer-quarters via maximum and unconditional violence and secondly, sedentarize them in the planned regions (Pur Bakhtiar G. 2008). By cutting the interactions of the Bakhtiaris of the summer-quarters and the winter-quarters, the power of the heads and commanders of Bakhtiari tribe was alleviated and the ordinary people lost their touch with each other and these along with other factors led to the weakening of their authority, solidarity and integrity (Kazemzadeh Iranshahr H. 1923)

For mandatory sedentarization of Qashqaei nomads, in 1937 Reza Shah appointed Chief Commander Shokat Al Molk Alam as the governor of Fars. Also Hassan Ezam Qodsi – Ezam Al Wuzara – was also chosen as the special envoy for implementation of the sedentarization policy of Qashqaei Nomads. Qodsi formed a special commission after his arrival.
at Shiraz. The aforementioned commission planned a special budget plan for the sedentarization of the Qashqaei nomads, two actuaries were hired and an office was established in Fars Governery called the Office of the Sedentarization of Nomads. Reza Shah Administration arranged a uniform for the shepherds and designed a brass plate that was supposed to be placed on the uniform and have the following information; the name of the owner of the herd, the tribe’s name, number of the shepherd and the license of the migration from the winter quarters to the summer quarters.

Following the resistance of the Qashqaei people before this plan, Reza Shah used military forces. He deployed the mechanized army to identify the routes of the migration of Qashqaei tribe by tanks and airplanes and implemented a violent plan of sedentarization.

The places that had been chosen for mandatory sedentarization of Qashqaei tribe were completely inappropriate. Lewis Beck describes these places as follows: “These places were truly bad and lacked proper water resources for farming and many cattle died”. For example, almost 90% of the horses of the Darshuri tribe died because of their being forced to stay the whole winter in the summer quarter of Semi rum.

The mandatory sedentarization of the Qashqaei tribe caused numerous damages to the Qashqaei economy. William Douglas referred to the mandatory policy of the Qashqaei sedentarization as the policy of the “genocide” of the Qashqaei by Reza Shah (Oberling S. 2004).

Nationalization of the Tribal Territory and Resources

The strategy of nationalization of the territory of the tribes was implemented through different ways including the confiscation of the tribal lands, plan of nationalization of the pastures, interchange, forced sale, fragmentation, land reforms policy, and superficial battle against the great landowners. The policy of confiscation of the properties and lands of tribes was begun after 1920 coup. Reza Shah took away the ownership of a major part of the whole of the great landowners, Khans, and the leaders of the tribes and nomads.

In 1932, the bill entitled “exchange of the properties of the leaders of the tribes and nomads” was taken to the parliament. According to this law, the properties of the leaders and the Khans were confiscated and the inheritors of the leaders or the owners were forced to seal their lands to Reza Shah Administration, or these lands were exchanged with other lands in different places. In a paragraph of the aforementioned bill, it was predicted that if the revenue of the exchanged lands is lesser than the original, the difference will be covered by the government but this did not happen at all. Later a specific commission was established for the exchange of the properties of the leaders of the tribes under the title of “Commission of Exchange of Properties”. The exchanged properties given to the leaders of the tribes and the nomads were located in most cases in a point that was very distant from the main residence of the tribes. After the apprehension of Solat Al Dawlah and Naser Khan Qashqaei in 1932, their all properties within Qashqaei territory were confiscated by Reza Shah and in return of these lands some other lands were given to them in Varamin and Tehran’s environs; later the rest of their properties were confiscated and were exchanged with Khurasan lands that belonged to the leaders of Hazarrah and also with the properties of Bakhtiaris. Upon direct order of Reza Shah, those Bakhtiari Khans who had several villages in their custody were forced to exchange their lands or sell them (Pur Bakhtiar G. 2008). The documents show that the majority of the Bakhtiar leaders were forced to exchange or sell their properties in 1938.

Following the discovery of oil within Bakhtiari territory, an oil contract was sealed between the Bakhtiari and the Britain. Accordingly, every year 3 percent of the oil sale belonged to the Bakhtiari. After the arrest of Sardar Aasaad and other Bakhtiari elders, the oil contract between the Britain and the Bakhtiari was cancelled by Reza Shah in 1938-1939.

As to the Qashqaei, after the discovery of the oil within Qashqaei territory, they sought to take advantage of its economic benefits. After the discovery of oil in Gachsaran (Koroglu), they signed a contract with the British Oil Company in South. Solat Al Dawlah Qashqaei had sealed a contract with the British Oil Company for the oil region of Bakarz that is part of the Qashqaei territory. Reza Shah voiced his disagreement with this contract first but after ascension to power cancelled it.

Population Relocation

The policy of relocation of the tribes was one of the goals of the Persian archaist nationalism for creation of a modern nation-state that was implemented by Reza Shah. In the spring of 1936, upon the order of Reza Shah, the central government relocated almost three to four thousand Bakhtiari nomad families from Chahar Mahal to Khuzestan under the pretext of the construction plan of Khuzestan. In August 1936, a group of Bakhtiari nomads were forced to migrate from Chahar Mahal and Bakhtiari to Khuzestan. Changi reports that Reza Shah administration forced the Bakhtiari tribes to immigrate to North Khurasan, Qazwin, Loshan, Manji, Kerman and. In the same time, the Qashqaei leaders exiled to Tehran along with their families and even later they were sent to Mashhad.

Disarmament of Tribes

After the fall of the semi-autonomous government of Sheikh Khazal at Khuzestan, the conditions became better for the suppression of other traditional governments of tribes. The operationalization of the disarmament of the Qashqaei tribe
was begun in 1927. Reza Shah relocated his military center at South Isfahan to the political center of Qashqaei, i.e. Shiraz. The military officials were deployed in three points of Kamfiruz, Dozdtkard, and Semirum that were located within the Qashqaei territory and they established disarmament centers. In 1925, the officers of Reza Shah met Naser Khan Qashqaei and informed him of the order of Reza Shah for disarmament of Qashqaei tribe. In this plan, almost 70 thousand rifles were gathered from Qashqaei tribe (Oberling S. 2004).

Disarmament of Bakhtiaris was carried out in two stages. In 1925, Reza Shah issued the order of disarmament of Bakhtiaris (Pur Bakhtiar G. 2008). In this stage of the disarmament of the Bakhtiaris tribe, there was no tension and conflict between the Reza Shah forces and the Bakhtiaris. The second stage was done in 1933 after the apprehension of the leaders of Bakhtiaris tribe. This stage was arranged by the military forces. Through these two stages, more than fourteen thousand rifles were gathered.

Assimilation of Cloth

The policy of the assimilation of cloth was one of the other proposed mechanisms of the pro-Persian archaist nationalism intellectuals for the creation of a united nation-state in Iran.

Reza Shah’s regime first suppressed the tribes and later forced them to leave their traditional clothing aside and wear a uniform cloth while these tribes had their specific clothes and culture for more than a thousand years and they were very dissatisfied with this order. To assimilate the clothes of the tribes, Reza Shah forces the heads and elders of the tribes to give the guarantee on behalf of their tribe that this policy will be implemented.

Eteleat Newspaper as one of the propaganda centers of Reza Shah, after providing a description of the Qashqaei clothing had claimed that the assimilation of clothing was in line with the goal of the creation of a united nation-state.

The semi-independent tribal governments including the Qashqaei and Bakhtiaris tribes resisted this mechanism of the tribal policy of Reza Shah just like the other policies. One of the key demands of the Bakhtiaris and the Qashqaei in their uprisings against Reza Shah was this policy. As to the Bakhtiaris, Jean Pierre Digard claims that they hardly left their traditional clothing (Douglas W. 1998). But after a while, the Bakhtiaris like other tribes left their clothing aside and instead wore the clothes designed by Reza Shah. Qashqaeis also experienced the same process which the Bakhtiaris had undergone through.

Before the operationalization of the political mechanism of education by Reza Shah Administration against the Bakhtiaris tribe, they had themselves started to teach their children. The ordinary people after getting permission from the Khans could attend the school for free and become literate. Most Bakhtiaris Khans annually helped the schools either in cash or by giving wheat or barley. Nevertheless, Reza Shah Regime used a specific educational policy for Bakhtiaris for creation of a united nation-state and in line with the assimilation and creation of a united national language based on Persian. According to reports and historical documents, in 1931 a school was established in Shahre Kord within the Bakhtiaris territory. This school had four grades of Primary School with five teachers and administrative staff and almost 80 students (Pur Bakhtiar G. 2008).

Before the arrival of Reza Shah, education existed in a scattered form among the Qashqaei people. This education did not have a public form rather only the children of the higher classes in the social structure of the Qashqaei tribe had the opportunity to learn the reading and writing literacy in such fields as scientific, religious, historical, geographical, and mathematical themes. There were no clear sources, educational periods, and also a unique specific language for teaching rather various sources and languages like Turkish, English, Arabic, and Persian were used.

In Reza Shah’s Official Statement about the legitimization of the policy of creation of Persian speaking schools among the Qashqaei, it has been noted:

“Since parts of the residents of Fars are tribes, and unfortunately in these tribes, there was no school and the nomads were usually deprived of education … Three schools with four classrooms must be established for three tribes of Shesh Boluki, Dare Shuri, and Ameleh.

The policy of the creation of Persian speaking schools was not only implemented within Qashqaei territory and for the Qashqaei rather the children of the heads and leaders of Qashqaei tribe in exile in Tehran were forced to attend Persian speaking schools. Mohammad Beigi the chief executor of Nomadic Education (from the projects planned under the US President Trumann’s article 40) in Iran during the reign of Mohammad Reza had been graduated from these schools in Reza Shah’s time.

CONCLUSION

The Persian archaist nationalist intellectuals in the era of Reza Shah struggled to legitimize the Reza Shah’s ideology of a united nation-state and put an end to the semi-autonomous governments of the tribes. To this end, they first raised such allegations as backhandedness of the tribal life, the anti-development spirit of nomads, rebellion and separatism and the barriers of the national integrity in order to provide the scene for the intellectual and ideological theorization of Reza Shah’s tribal policies. At the same time, they determined the required mechanisms and methods for Reza Shah’s confrontation and contact with the tribes through which Reza Shah Administration put its tribal policies into practice as
to the Qashqaei and Bakhtiar tribe. By operationalization of its specific tribal policies, Reza Shah Regime finally succeeded to topple the semi-autonomous traditional tribal governments like Qashqaei and Bakhtiar at South and Southwest Iran and control them.

SUGGESTION

One of the topics that can be suggested for future research is the study of the influence of tribal and semi-independent tribal governments, through the establishment of parties, communities, and newspapers and various activities in the administrative and bureaucratic spheres in other monarchies era of Persian kings.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

It may be useful to do the same research about other tribes.
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