



AMIR POURSAIDIGH

The Determinants of the Revolutionary Disintegration of the State in Iran



ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of
the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Tampere,
for public discussion in the Paavo Koli Auditorium of the University,
Kanslerinrinne 1, Tampere, on May 17th, 2003, at 12 o'clock.

Acta Universitatis Tampereensis 923
University of Tampere
Tampere 2003

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

University of Tampere, Department of Sociology and Social Psychology
Finland

Distribution



University of Tampere
Bookshop TAJU
P.O. Box 617
33014 University of Tampere
Finland

Tel. +358 3 215 6055
Fax +358 3 215 7685
taju@uta.fi
<http://granum.uta.fi>

Cover design by
Juha Siro

Printed dissertation
Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 923
ISBN 951-44-5640-8
ISSN 1455-1616

Electronic dissertation
Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 243
ISBN 951-44-5641-6
ISSN 1456-954X
<http://acta.uta.fi>

Tampereen yliopistopaino Oy Juvenes Print
Tampere 2003

CONTENTS

1. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
2. INTRODUCTION.....	5
3. THEORIES OF IRANIAN REVOLUTION RECONSIDERED	9
3.1 THE UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT MODEL.....	9
3.2 THE VOLCANIC MODEL	12
3.3 THE IDEOLOGICAL MODEL	16
4. AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO IRANIAN REVOLUTION	22
4.1 THE DETERMINANTS OF REVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES	22
4.2 UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN IRAN.....	25
4.3 FUNDAMENTAL CLASSES.....	29
4.4 THE STATE	35
4.5 PERMISSIVE WORLD CONTEXT	38
4.6 CRISES IN SOCIETAL PARADIGM	44
5. CAUSES OF SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN IRAN.....	51
5.1 THE RISE AND CRISES OF STATE.....	51
5.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ITS CRISES.....	63
5.3 THE RISE OF REVOLUTIONARY SITUATIONS	72
6. REVOLUTIONARY CHALLENGERS.....	88
6.1 CLERICAL OPPOSITION	89
6.2 THE NATIONAL FRONT	106
6.3 THE LEFT.....	120
7. CONCLUSIONS.....	135
7.1 STATE AND ACCUMULATION	135
7.2 STATE AND CLASS	136
7.3 REVOLUTIONARY SITUATIONS.....	138
7.4 REVOLUTIONARY CONTENDERS	140
8. APPENDIX: CENTRAL YEARS AND DATES IN IRAN 20TH CENTURY HISTORY UNTIL 1979 REVOLUTION.....	143
9. BIBLIOGRAPHY	153

1. Acknowledgments

It is not easy to know how to properly acknowledge those who have helped me to complete this dissertation, since it was the sum total of their inspiration and assistance which made the writing possible for me. I can say, however, writing, like most other extended activities in our culture, requires money and support. I am grateful for excellent opportunities given to me to teach by the department of Sociology and Social psychology at University of Tampere that helped me keep working and for which I am most deeply appreciative of Professors Raimo Blom, Harri Melin, and Vilma Hänninen. I thank my supervisor Professor Blom for always helping me and for never imposing his own views and preferences. I wish to express my special thanks to Professors Risto Alapuro and Martti Siisiäinen who provided their expert comments. I am grateful for their suggestions. Raija-Liisa Poursadigh and Maxim Petteri Poursadigh have, in their conversations with me over the years, helped move my analysis along to its present course. To both I am thankful. Thanks also to Päivi Tyni, for her technical assistance.

2. Introduction

This is a study of the problems of state formation and the revolutionary disintegration of the state in Iran. The framework this study will present incorporates aspects of various orientations to the subject of revolution in social sciences exemplified in the works of Skocpol (1979), Goldfrank (1979), Tilly (1978), Walton (1984), and Foran (1992). The analysis is organized around four interrelated themes which account for an important aspect of the social origins of Iranian revolution: namely, the role of the state, its specific relations both to international developments and domestic classes, and economic conditions. The study, therefore, is an interpretive history of the pattern of class formation and class alignment/conflict via the state with particular emphasis on the role of the state in this process.

The main proposition of the study is that the Iranian revolution was a product of the contradictions of combined and uneven capitalist development in Iran. It was not Islamic ideology and/or Shia discourse that radicalized the revolutionary processes, but the power struggle itself brought the radicalization of the revolution. Many of the slogans and key concepts during the revolutionary process were essentially democratic and borrowed from the West. But once the Pahlavi regime was swept aside, the drive toward Islamization began. If there were any ideological guiding force behind the revolution, the only ideology with a hope of mass support was populism which Khomeini incorporated all its significant aspect, appealing to the people's sense of: nationalism, respect for liberty and freedom, economic well-being, cultural heritage,

and self-respect. This ideological mobilization was not possible without the contribution of moderate, secular, and leftist groups. Exclusive concentration on the oppositional potential of Shiaism and its tradition of struggle and the organizational power of the mullahs embedded in their control over the mosques and bazaars, however, has led many analysts to focus largely on the ideologies' origins and leader who advocated them. Thus they confuse the process of tactical coalition formation, in which different social groups shift their support to favor such leaders, with the process of ideological conversion, in which the participants tend to adhere to leaders' ideologies. Failing to distinguish political coalition from ideological conversion, such analyses treat Shia Islam as it had a universal appeal to all social groups and classes. Shia ideology and/or Islam played no role or did little in the conflicts and collective actions of Iranian workers and entrepreneurs (bazaaris) who constituted the central actors in revolutionary conflicts and overthrow of the Shah's regime.

The study is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 first presents a brief summary of three different explanatory views of the Iranian revolution and examines their shortcomings. The first choice example is Abrahamian's *Iran Between Two Revolutions* (1982), who argues that the revolution took place because of uneven development. Assuming uneven development is the root cause of revolution, leads to the conclusion that revolutions are possible any time the level of the critical variable—the gap between the state and civil society—becomes 'too high', and so begs the question it claims to answer. Why did revolutions occur in Iran and Nicaragua, but not in Iraq and Brazil? The chapter goes on to argue that another bad way of formulating the problem of Iranian revolution is presented in Amir Arjomand's *The*

Turban for the Grown (1988), who blames the “sudden revolutionary explosion” in Iran on the “malaise”, “anomie”, and “disorientation” caused by “rapid social change”. Such discontents are present in all modernizing societies; yet not all such societies experience revolutionary situations, much less successful revolutions. Another problematic factor of revolution is the role of ideology. Since the Iranian Revolution in 1979 a revival of interest in the role played by ideology in revolutions has emerged. Analyzing the cause of the revolution in terms of the rise of revolutionary Islam, Mansoor Moaddel (1993), among others, goes as far as to claim that it was Shia Islam revolutionary discourse that transformed the social discontent into revolutionary crisis. It is all too easy to argue that Iranians generally relate to certain moral symbols and forms of social communication offered by Shia Islam. Yet to maintain that Shia discourse produced the collective actions of these social groups, it remains a matter of faith.

Chapter 3 provides an alternative approach to Iranian revolution, first posing the question that the object of such approach is, not to provide a blanket theory or any all-in Theory of Revolution covering and explaining revolutions as a whole, but to provide ourselves with a theoretical explanation of certain pivotal actions that constitute key links in the history of revolutions as a whole. All political upheavals, which have been called revolutions, share both common and opposite features with each other's. To explain revolutions, it is necessary to break their history up into “theoretically understandable bits”, which can be explained through multiple causations. What is needed is thus an approach alert to the problem of multiple causations.

Chapter 4 argues that the Iranian revolution is a product of the recent history that spanned several decades. To understand it we ought to combine a concern for the power of the state with a focus on large-scale social relationships that may reinforce or limit state power—relationships between state and elite and contending groups, and between major social classes and the state. We need to look and find weaknesses in the very structures of the state and society, since revolution is only likely when powerful groups press competing claims on the government, and the government lacks the resources to either satisfy the claims of contending groups or to defeat them.

Chapter 5 discusses that people do not automatically mobilize for collective action, no matter how revolutionary intention they may have. They need to have some kind of organization, offices of a directing, formal or informal, to channel discontent and enable action. The chapter argues that it was the clerical opposition, especially Khomeini who provided a novel leadership by down playing the ideological differences among the rival opposition movements and making them to act harmoniously for the achievement of a politically justified common goal: the overthrow of the Shah's regime. Chapter 6 provides the summary and conclusions of the study.

3. Theories of Iranian Revolution Reconsidered

Ever since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, a great deal of study has emerged on its causes and outcomes. Yet most of the resulting analyses reveal lack of consensus among scholars over what factors should be emphasized in explaining the Iranian Revolution. They even differ over what events or popular direct actions were vital in the making of the revolution. To be sure, the varied nature of the literature on the Iranian Revolution, like any other question, owes to a conceptual framework scholars adopt, and every theory makes us expect certain findings. Since “one cannot study anything without a theory about its nature” (Evans-Pritchard 1976: 242), and since “a theory of phenomenon is an explanation of the phenomenon, and nothing that is not an explanation is worthy of the name of theory” (Homans 1967:22), one must start with inadequate explanations and get good ideas in.

3.1 The Uneven Development Model

The first choice example is Abrahamian’s *Iran Between Two Revolutions* (1982). Following Huntington’s model of revolution, Abrahamian concludes that, the revolution took place neither because of over-development nor because of underdevelopment but because of

uneven development. (1982:427)¹ Accordingly, it was the gap between the state and civil society, the increasing disparity between the underdeveloped political system and developing socio-economic system that led to revolution.

In Huntington's model, collective violence and revolution are understood as the upshot of 'modernization' processes that set demands for political participation growing much faster than the traditional political institutions can co-opt:

The effect of the expansion of the political participation, however, is usually to undermine the traditional political institutions and to obstruct the development of the modern political ones. Modernization and social mobilization, in particular, thus tend to produce political decay unless steps are taken to moderate or to restrict its impact on political consciousness and political involvement. Most societies suffer a loss of political community and decay of political institutions during the most intense phases of modernization. (1968: 4)

Abrahamian applies this lead-lag model to the Iranian case, maintaining that the state's economic policies, though modernized the socio-economic structures, destroyed the intermediate structures that

¹ The 'overdevelopment' thesis maintains that the Shah's mistake was that he modernizes too much and too quickly for his traditional -minded and backward-looking people. Guy Arnold (1991) is the main advocate of this view. Alternatively, the proponents of "underdevelopment" thesis argue that the revolution came to Iran because the Shah failed to modernize rapidly enough. This view is exemplified in the work of Norris Hetherington (1982). Both views lack solid theoretical underpinnings, and are primarily descriptive in their approach.

historically had connected the state to various social classes, and did little to develop the link between the regime and the new classes and preserve the existing links between the regime and the old classes. This increasing gap between the state and civil society eventually led to the outbreak of the revolution (1982: 435). By this standard one might reasonably argue that revolution should have happened by now almost in all modernizing societies, since most of them faces similar disjunction between their political institutionalization and modernization, but social revolutions have been rare in these countries. True, large-scale, structural changes, such as capitalist development and state formation, set the stage ready for violent conflict and revolution, but they do so in an indirect manner by affecting the social composition of classes waging struggle for local and central power. For example, the big-city lumpen-proletariat in modernizing countries tends to be a passive or even conservative political force. (Tilly 1973: 443)

Under the circumstances of uneven development large numbers of industrial men might become discontented, but people do not automatically mobilize for collective action, no matter how angry, hostile, or aggravated they may feel. They need the offices of a directing, coordinating organizations, formal or informal. (Aya 1990: 61) Otherwise, “the unhappy merely breed passively on the sidelines” (Shorter and Tilly 1974: 338). What is more, pure spontaneous mass explosion (which supposedly occur when uneven development come to the boiling point) in fact has never led to revolution.

This is because, as Ernest Mandel puts, “spontaneity exists only in books containing fairy tales” (1978: 96). Never have there been

revolutions without some kind of contending organizations and/or opportunities to act. Undoubtedly, for revolution to occur, then various combinations of structural patterns—the specific interrelations of class and state structures, and the complex interplay of domestic and international development—are needed. Assuming uneven development is the root cause of revolution, revolutions are possible any time the level of the critical variable – the gap between the state and civil society – is ‘too high’, and so begs the question it claims to answer. Why did revolutions occur in Iran and Nicaragua, but not in Iraq and Brazil?²

3.2 The Volcanic Model

Another inadequate way of formulating the problem of Iranian Revolution is presented in Amir Arjomand’s *The Turban for the Grown* (1988).³ He blames the “sudden revolutionary explosion” in Iran on the “malaise”, “anomie”, and “disorientation” caused by “rapid social change”:

Persistent sense of malaise and anomie caused by rapid social change was a much more basic cause than the sudden downturn in economic growth that triggered it. It was not so much sudden frustration as

² Interestingly, Abrahamian’s work does illuminate in masterful detail, many factors that are essential for explaining the logic of Iranian Revolution, but they remain irrelevant and unfit to his theoretical generalization of the root cause of revolution.

³ Arjomand’s work, *The Turban for the Grown*, is praised by the New York Times as a major contribution.

constant disorientation resulting from a decade of concern of the middle class for their fundamental national and cultural identity. (Arjomand 1988:110)

Accordingly, the state's failure to integrate uprooted elements, especially the socially mobile, newly educated elements into its own political system offered Khomeini and the Shia Islam an opportunity for performing as the rival integrative social movement capable of destroying even stronger regimes. (1988:200)

This argument comes from a theoretical synthesis of two overlapping models of revolution: *aggregated-psychological* theory, which sees the roots of revolution in the state mind of the people,⁴ and *structural-functionalist* (systems/value consensus) theory, which explains revolution as violent responses of the ideological movements to a state sever disequilibrium in social system.⁵

Boiled down to their essence, then, these two approaches form a single model of revolution, a 'volcanic' model. (Aya 1990:7) Simply put, they argue that where you have rapid social change, discontent, and disorientation, there you get revolutionary violence. Take Gurr, for example, who argue that the self-evident premise is that the potential for revolutionary and political violence depends on the intensity and scope of socially induced discontent among its members: "the premise

⁴ Ted Gurr's *Why Men Rebel* is a representative theoretical work within this approach.

⁵ Principal exponents of this view include: Chalmers Johnson's *Revolutionary Change* and Neil Smelser's *Theory of Collective Behavior*.

is essentially a generalization of the frustration-anger-aggression principle from the individual to the social level” (Gurr 1973: 365). And it is the gap between expectations and capability to satisfy them (i.e. “relative deprivation”), which generates discontent. When this sense of individual dissatisfaction becomes widespread, the cumulative effect is violence and revolution.

Whereas the social-psychological theories see the roots of revolution in the aggregate psychological states of the masses, when the masses enter a cognitive state of ‘frustration’ or ‘deprivation’ relative to some set of goals, the structural functionalist theories emphasize on ‘strain’ or ‘dysfunction’ without direct reference to any intervening psychological variables (Gurr 1973: 368). But discontent and disorientation constitute their common premise. For Chalmers Johnson the most fundamental cause of revolution is a disequilibrated social systems, a state in which society’s values and the realities with which it must deal in order to exist are no longer in harmony with each other, producing value-environmental dissynchronization. As he writes, when “values and environment are dissynchronized, regardless of the direction in which the one or the other has moved, a threat of revolution always exist” (1966: 63).

A disequilibrated social system creates demands that the system be resynchronized or adjusted. This is done whether by the competent and skillful elite, who occupy the statuses of authority in a social system, through successful implementation of conservative change and reform, or by a revolutionary movement. (Johnson 1966: 94) Hence the resynchronization of the social system’s value and environment depends upon the abilities of legitimate leaders. When they are unable

or unwilling to resynchronize, then they become the targets of revolution.

Volcanic theorists of revolution, by and large, reduce particular political grievances down into generalized discontent of 'disequilibrium-introduced tension', omitting to specify who suffer 'systemic frustration,' 'relative deprivation', 'structural strain', 'systemic disequilibrium', or some such generalized socio-psychological deviants. Like Gurr and Johnson, Arjomand gives no clue of who experienced social dislocation in Iranian revolution.

But whereas Arjomand is quick to say the recent migrants into towns become the "disinherited of the Islamic revolutionary ideology", because "the Shah did not integrate this group into his political system" (1988:107), he ignores the fact that those who are discontented or dislocated are not necessarily those who rebel.⁶ On the contrary, there is evidence that the marginal and isolated social groups did not play any important role in the revolutionary movements.⁷ Arjomand's account of the alliance of the ulama (the clerics) and the bazaaris (the traditional bourgeois and the guilds) is even worse. He has no evidence of 'disorientation' or 'dislocation' concerning these social groups. He only says that "developmental policies of the government were often detrimental to the interests of the bazaar and, especially, of the guilds" (1988:106). Yet, he gives no reason as to why discontent as such causes revolt among these people.

⁶ As Arjomand himself acknowledges, "the extent of participation of the recent migrants in the revolutionary movement is not clear" (ibid: 236). This is because "the powerless are easy victims", as Wolf maintains (1969:290).

⁷ See, for example, Kazemi 1980.

To say that whenever discontents arise, angry people will revolt, however, is plainly false. People's intention to remedy grievances is nowhere near enough to take part in revolutions, you need capability to fight and opportunity to get away with it. Rather than research the main actor's goals and constraints – resource availability among contenders for state power, volcanic theorists omit them, filling gaps in their data with psychological clichés. Such discontents are present in all modernizing societies; yet not all such societies experience revolutionary situations, much less successful revolutions.

3.3 The Ideological Model

Another problematic factor of revolution is the role of ideology. Since the Iranian revolution in 1979 a revival of interest in the role played by ideology in revolutions has emerged. Take Skocpol, for example, who had earlier made too much of structure and little of ideology by insisting that revolutions are not made; they merely come (1979). But in regard to the Iranian case she argues that ideas, in particular, Shia ideology was decisive in the Shah's overthrow. (1982) In much of such approaches the role of ideological conversion has been over-played as the factor of revolution.

Analyzing the cause of the revolution in terms of the rise of revolutionary Islam, Mansoor Moaddel, among others, goes as far as to claim, "ideology is not simply another factor that adds an increment to the causes of revolution" (1993: 2). He says that there was nothing inherent in the interest of the bazaar and workers that necessitated the revolutionary overthrow of the monarchy. It was Shia revolutionary

discourse that transformed the social discontent into revolutionary crisis. (1993: 153-163)⁸

In order to incorporate the factor of the ideology into adequate explanation of revolutions it is indispensable to distinguish revolutionary ideology from ideology. Here Moaddel's account is not satisfactory: "Revolutionary discourse contradicts the discourse of the state and advances an alternative way of viewing – and seeking solutions to the problem of the social life through direct, unmediated revolutionary action of the masses" (1993:18).⁹ And ideology is, as he maintains, "a set of general principles and concepts, symbols and rituals" (1993:16), according to which people formulate their strategies of action.

The question is: how revolutionary discourse is generated in terms of its mass appeal and mobilization? He says it is formed "within the context of the interaction and propaganda warfare between the state and its opposition" (1993:19), and its mobilization occur not simply through the internalization of the alternative value system but rather through "the discursive field generated by the ideology, that is a symbolic space or structure within the ideology itself" (1993:19).

For one thing Moaddel's inadequate definition of ideology as cultural system leads him to inconsistent usage of the term ideology – calling

⁸ Perhaps the original modern social theorists of this view are William Sewell (1985) and Michael Walzer (1979). Sewell, for example, maintains "the ideology plays a crucial role in revolutions, both as cause and ... as out comes" (1985:84).

⁹ Moaddel uses the terms discourse and ideology interchangeably. For him ideology is an episodic discourse (1993:17).

different things by the same name, or the same thing by different name. Bad definitions may also lead to bad explanation. Failing to distinguish a plural cultural universe – which offers people a range of possible identities – from ideology as “ self-conscious rationales and program for political and social action” (Goldstone 1991:406), he tends to treat the revolution as synchronous and complete replacement of one episodic discourse by another. Thus, he is forced to down play the ideological variants deployed by identifiable groups or alliances, and fold them into a universal category of ‘Shia revolutionary discourse’.¹⁰ It is even false to talk of Shi’ism as a singular discourse. Let alone as an ‘identity of the opposition’.

Far from being undifferentiated, the Shiaism of political protest assumed three broad ideological orientations: those of the secularized educated middle and upper classes, the traditionally educated religious students, and the popular folk. According to Michael Fischer, there are at least four styles of using Shi’ism: “the popular religion of the villages and bazaars; the scholarly religion of the madrasas or colleges where the religious leaders are trained; the mystical counterculture of Sufism; and the privatized, ethical religion of the upper classes” (1980:4).

¹⁰ Scocpol’s distinction between ideology as self-conscious political arguments by identifiable political actors to justify the use of state power, on one hand, and the cultural idioms as nonintentionalist, anonymous discourse, on the other hand, is more useful for studying revolution than anthropological ideas about cultural system (1985:91).

Islam and/or Shi'ism as history, religion and culture helps define loosely the identity of the most Iranian, but as religious movement could only gain the support of a small minority. It is hardly surprising that the clergy needed to dissimulate their political enterprise until after the seizure of power.¹¹ (Eqbal 1982: 296) The clerics used the language of class against the ruling elite, not that of religion. Many of the slogans and key concepts during the revolutionary process were borrowed from the outside world, especially from Europe. But once the Pahlavi regime was swept aside, the drive toward Islamization began. If there were any ideological guiding force behind the revolution, the only ideology with a hope of mass support was populism which Khomeini incorporated all its significant aspect, appealing to the people's sense of: nationalism; respect for liberty and freedom; economic well-being and cultural heritage and self-respect. This ideological mobilization was not possible without the contribution of moderate, secular, and leftist groups.¹² Exclusive concentration on the oppositional potential of Shiaism and its tradition of struggle and the organizational power of the mullahs embedded in their control over the mosques and bazaars,

¹¹ The appointment of a social democratic government as the Provisional Government, with Dr. Mehdi Bazargan as Prime Minister, and Cr. Karim Sanjabi, the leader of the National Front, as the Foreign Minister is a case in point. Bazargan's cabinet included no mullahs or a clerical leader, all were essentially of members or sympathizers of the Liberation Movement of Iran, a few National Front figures, and some independent nationalist lay politician.

¹² The revolutionary process started in 1977, and the Iranian intelligentsia and the professional were the first to take action. Khomeini was far from being the central figure he became in 1978. "In January 1978, as the opposition began to gather momentum, the Pahlavi regime did Khomeini the honor of singling him out for its most publicized and personal attack. From this point on he was to become the popular counterpoint to the hated but central figure of the Shah" (Iqbal 1982:297).

however, can lead one to interpret the past in terms of the present. This retrospective view has led many analysts to focus largely on the ideologies' origins and leader who advocated them. Thus they confuse the process of tactical coalition formation, in which different social groups shift their support to favor such leaders, with the process of ideological conversion, in which the participants tend to adhere to leaders' ideologies. Failing to distinguish political coalition from ideological conversion, such analyses treat Shia Islam as it had a universal appeal to all social groups and classes.

Shia ideology and/or Islam played no role or did little in the conflicts and collective actions of Iranian workers and entrepreneurs (bazaaris) who constituted the central actors in revolutionary conflicts and overthrow of the Shah's regime. It is all too easy to argue that Iranians generally relate to a certain moral symbols and forms of social communication offered by Shia Islam. Yet to maintain that Shia discourse produced the collective actions of these social groups, it remains a matter of faith.

Emphasizing ideology in the way Moaddel does as the constitutive feature of revolution – is plainly false. This is not to deny the proper place of ideology in revolutionary causes and their outcomes, since one cannot explain social actions without reference to the relevant actor's goals, which involve ideology. But the trouble is that many analysts confuse the radical projects for renovating state and society, which is often imposed on popular movements by certain of their coalition partners, with the ordinary lower-class citizens' notion of utopia, which is their own idea of existing society minus its most disagreeable and oppressive features. As Moore puts it:

Revolutionary objectives are generally imposed by leaders on an angry mass that serves to dynamite the old order when other conditions make it possible ... To the extent that angry little people want something new, it generally amounts to their perception of the old order minus the disagreeable and oppressive features that affect them. (1978: 351-52)¹³

Let me conclude by saying that although “revolutionary ideologies” are necessary components in the “great revolutions”, these ideologies as such do not explain either the “activities of the revolutionaries” or the “outcome of the revolutions” (Skocpol 1979:170). Ideologies can act as propaganda and as program in revolutions, yet many characteristics of these guiding visions depend not on the particular ideologies, but on the conditions of revolutionary struggle per se (Goldstone 1991:425). In Iran, the opponents were forced to become more radical because of the fear and distrust of counter-revolution rather than by ideological forces. It was not Islamic ideology and/or Shia discourse that radicalized the revolutionary processes, but the power struggle itself brought the radicalization of the revolution.

¹³George Orwell makes the same point:” To the ordinary working man ... The Socialist future is present society with the worst abuses left out, and with interest centering around ... family life, the pub, football, and local politics” (1937:154-55).

4. An Alternative Approach to Iranian Revolution

The object of an alternative approach is, not to provide a blanket theory or any all-in Theory of Revolution covering and explaining revolutions as whole, but to provide ourselves with a theoretical explanation of certain pivotal actions that constitute key causal links in the history of revolutions as whole. All political upheavals, which have been called revolutions, share both common and opposite features with each other's. To explain revolutions, it is necessary to break their history up into "theoretically understandable bits", which can be explained through multiple causations. What is needed is thus an approach alert to the problem of multiple causations.

4.1 The Determinants of Revolutionary Processes

Although all serious analysts agree that there are a variety of possible factors for revolutions to occur, they usually accord the primacy of some type of cause over the others, treating them only as background. As Goldfrank argues:

Logically, we need a conception that brings together elements that by themselves are insufficient conditions. That is, "X", "Y", and "Z" may be necessary conditions but will not be sufficient conditions unless they occur simultaneously or in a particular sequence... Four conditions appear to be necessary and sufficient, ...they are: (1) a tolerant or permissive world context; (2) a severe political crisis paralyzing the

administrative and coercive capacities of the state; (3) widespread rural rebellion; and (4) dissident elite political movements. (Goldfrank 1979: 148)¹⁴

John Walton, in *Reluctant Rebels*, seeks to explain through a synthesis of the case studies¹⁵ the causes of revolutionary situations that contribute to, what he calls, 'national revolts'.¹⁶ His theory of 'national revolts' includes four general and interrelated processes: "(1) the context of uneven development; (2) the conditions of protest mobilization; (3) modernization crises and coalitions; (4) the role of the state" (1984: 161). Walton adds considerable detail to demonstrate how a revolutionary situation ¹⁷ arises out of the general context of uneven development, a factor that this study will elaborate below.

Skocpol's analytical scheme in *State and Social Revolutions* is perhaps the most sophisticated attempt to develop a structural perspective.

¹⁴ This study finds the concept of "permissive world context" introduced by Goldfrank very convenient, since it points to certain world contextual conditions that are conducive in actualizing the disintegration of a given specific state. However, his third condition, "a widespread rural rebellion", does not fit Iranian revolution, at all.

¹⁵ Three such cases are the Huk rebellion (Philippines), the Violencia (Colombia) and the 'Mau Mau' (Kenya).

¹⁶ Walton maintains that 'national revolts' may or may not result in a transfer of power, but they have "same general causes as "successful social revolution" defined by Skocpol (Walton 1984:188).

¹⁷ Walton adopts Tilly's distinction between revolutionary 'situations' and revolutionary outcomes. A revolutionary situation is identified by the condition of multiple sovereignty (when a single, sovereign polity splits up among two or more groups of power holders) and revolutionary outcomes by the displacement of incumbents by insurgents (Tilly 1978:190-99, Walton 1984:11-12).

According to her, the key to successful structural analysis lies in a focus on the role of the state, its specific relations both to international developments and domestic classes, and economic conditions. (1979:291) Social revolutions, as Skocpol explains them, include four interrelated processes: (1) old regimes collapse; (2) a revolt from below; (3) a transfer of power to revolutionary radicals; and (4) revolutionary vanguards take drastic measures to transform state and society. (Skocpol 1979: 17-18) The first two processes constitute what she calls, “social revolutionary situations”; the last two processes are “social –revolutionary outcomes”(1979: 17, 40-41).¹⁸ To explain why social-revolutionary situations occur, she maintains that one must focus on old regime with regard to the pressures on state from the international system, and relations between state and ruling class. (1979:18, 60-67) To explain social-revolutionary outcomes, “one must be able to identify the objectively conditioned and complex intermeshing of the various actions of the diversely situated groups that give rise to the new regime” (1979: 18). That is, explaining the lower-class organizational capacity, and post-insurrection state building.

Skocpol’s main contribution is her nonintentionalist approach focused on the “nexus of state/state, state/economy, and state/class relationships” (Skocpol and Trimberger 1978: 292) concerning the susceptibility of old regimes to revolutionary overthrow. She singles

¹⁸ Given Skocpol’s definition of “social revolution” as “rapid, basic transformation of a society’s state and class structures”, she therefore sets social revolution apart from other sorts of conflicts which do not result in structural change. In her words, “rebellions, even when successful ... do not eventuate in structural change. Political revolutions transform state structures but not social structures” (1979:4).

out two specific types of exclusionary and authoritarian regimes as distinctively vulnerable to actual overthrow by revolutionary movements: “neo-patrimonial or Sultanistic dictatorship identified with a foreign power and colonial regimes” (Goodwin and Skocpol 1989: 498). This, as she points out, implies that the state maintains its almost total autonomy from internal classes, which is a characteristic of all peripheral states that have been topped by revolutions. (1989: 502) Although *sultanistic* neo-patrimonial regimes are especially vulnerable to revolutions, it only explains the ‘launching’ of revolutions, and as such is not sufficient to precipitate them. Thus, to explain revolutionary processes, “a close scrutiny of the societal context and the pattern of urban mobilization are also necessary” (Farhi 1988: 245).

The Iranian revolution seems to fit the structural perspective advanced by Skocpol, yet her explanatory hypotheses are not applicable to the Iranian case without certain modifications.¹⁹ Therefore, I shall propose a model of the Iranian Revolution that relies on aspects of each approach mentioned above—Skocpol, Tilly, Walton, and Farhi.

4.2 Uneven Development of Capitalism in Iran

Combined and uneven development in Iran has had direct negative consequences on the changing balance of class forces and the state building. The most decisive characteristic feature of the peripheral

¹⁹ As we shall see, when Skocpol deals with the Iranian Revolution, she retreats from her previous work (1979), “while trying to remain faithful to her structuralist method” (Foran 1993:6; Goldfrank 1982:301).

societies is the persistence of the simple commodity production articulated to capital. This connection is important because it reflects the historical peculiarities of capitalist production in the periphery: “we have here the whole of capitalist production without its advantages...” (Marx 1971: 165). In other words, the major share of both industrial and agricultural outputs are being still carried out by small units of production in which the labor process is based on the exploitation of family labor. According to Jairus Banaji, this type of labor process—small-scale parcellized production—permits no scope for the production of relative surplus-value; therefore, it forces capital outward in its drive to self-expand, incorporating into its network an ever-growing number of small family units with the specific social function of wage labor—but a concealed wage. (1977: 36)

The extent to which small-scale inefficient units persist in the periphery can be demonstrated by the case of capitalist development in Iran where, despite its considerable industrial growth, simple commodity production remains dominant. For example, in 1976, small industries were accounted for about 75 percent of the country’s total industrial output. (Amirahmadi 1990: 92) In terms of number of units, by 1977 out of an estimated 250,000 manufacturing establishments only about 6000 units employed ten or more people and could be considered as modern industrial units. (Halliday 1980: 148) Strangely enough, by 1989 this sectoral relationship has changed in favor of traditional establishments. (Amirahmadi 1990: 192)

A similar trend can be seen also in agriculture. In many provinces of Iran, small family holdings are basis for agricultural production. There are above two million households at the present time. (Lahsaeizadeh

1993: 268) Iranian performance in this field still lags far behind the center in terms of productivity and per capita output.

The most disastrous aspect of the insertion of simple commodity production into the capitalist accumulation is the super-exploitation of the small producer to the benefit of urban-industrial capital. Under the strict control of merchant/industrial capital, the petty producer is reduced to the status of a proletarian who has to work, not for profit but for the minimum necessary for subsistence. This mode of accumulation does not solely depend on the automatic functioning of labor market, but also on the coercive subjugation of the small commodity producer, which falls into the realm of the state. In other words, the ability to maintain existing pattern of accumulation rests heavily on the ability of the state to subjugate the simple producer. The effort to ensure this becomes therefore an important factor in reinforcing the development of an authoritarian state.

The assertion that simple commodity production is incorporated into capital accumulation does not deny the fact that its persistence, however, hinders the expanded reproduction of capital power relation; if only because it imposes obstacles to the widening of market. The fundamental postulate of Marxism maintains that the most important presupposition for capitalist development is the ability of the bourgeoisie to expand its power and hegemony over all societal levels by causing the disintegration of the antagonistic modes of production. (Milios 1989: 166) Because of its historical weakness, the peripheral capitalist class cannot exercise class domination through economic and ideological hegemony, and is thus forced to resort to the mediation of the state. In this situation, the state assumes a crucial role in

establishing the prior and essential conditions for the development of modern industrial capitalism.

John Foran seeks to explain the development of repressive state in Iran on the basis of world system. “The World System as theorized by Wallerstein generates the external pressures—economic, political, and military” (1993: 9). The result is a process of accumulation based on ‘dependent development’. “The reproduction of such a system”, he writes, “often requires a repressive state to guarantee order in a rapidly changing social setting in which much of the population is suffering” (1993: 9).²⁰ This type of perspective is contaminated with an implicit functionalist-economistic bias and leads to a belief in the primacy of external causes. According to Jose Serra, it neglects the internal contradictions, tension and dynamic that can, on their own terms, determine the likely future direction of change in the balance of power at any given regime. (1979: 101) In their view, the international capitalist intervention is seen as the principle contradiction to be resolved in dependent Third World countries. (Lipietz 1987: 19; Mars 1989: 388) The international relations may have different effects on the internal class relations depending on the type of articulation of the given social formation within the context of world state-system. But it is the power and force relations in the class struggle internal to the

²⁰ In the literature on revolutions, emphasis on rapid change and its correlation with people’s suffering is exaggerated and misleading. On the contrary, as Hetherington points out, it was a failure to modernize rapidly enough that contributed to increasing dissatisfaction with the Shah’s regime (1982:362).

given social formation that decide both the nature of their articulation and also the direction of its own struggles.²¹

In sum, uneven development in terms of internal class formation and sectoral disparities produces new forms of inequality sanctioned in law and state's economic policies, causing mass grievance and protest. This protest may go on for a long time without making any satisfactory result. That movement begins to emerge when the repressive state organization turns to be weakened by international pressures – permissive world context – accompanied by political splits between dominant classes and the state. (Skocpol 1982: 266; Goldfrank 1979: 148)

4.3 Fundamental Classes

The discussion of political split between the dominant classes and the state, as one determining factor in causing the disintegration of the state leads us to ask what was the pattern of class formation and class alignment/conflict via the pre-revolutionary state. Skocpol's emphasis on state/class split is generally correct, but she leaves a crucial question unresolved, that is the concept of 'dominant class' in

²¹ Locating the peripheral states within the competitive international states system allows us to appreciate "the role of international competition in stimulating peripheral states to undertake politically different modernizing efforts, which can serve to trigger a potentially revolutionary crisis" (Farhi 1988:236). But to stress the methodological primacy of international system, as Foran does, it is plainly wrong, since it is within the national framework that almost all political struggles and institutional compromises are then focused (Lipietz 1986:22).

periphery. In drawing an analogy between the peripheral state and the central state, Hamza Alavi argues that in the advanced capitalist countries the state has developed in accordance with the needs of a single dominant class and is therefore subordinate to it, whereas in the periphery the 'fundamental' classes do not have any direct control over the state. (Alavi 1982: 301)

This is because in the periphery the pattern of class formation and class alignment is marked by the structural presence of a plurality of 'fundamental classes' – namely, the indigenous bourgeoisies, the metropolitan bourgeoisie and the landed classes – whose competing interests and roles are mutually exclusive rather than complementary. This is why we not regard any one of them, unambiguously, as the dominant class. (Alavi 1982: 298) ²²

It is due to this mode of class formation—the plurality of the dominant classes lacking complementary functions to their structural presence—that the state acquires an autonomous role and develops into an alien force not only vis-a-vis the subordinate classes but the fundamental classes as well, even while maintaining the fundamental interest of the latter. (Alavi 1982: 301) In order to be able to mediate between the rival classes, the state must present the creation and development of

²² One of the contributions of Skocpol's approach lies in her emphasis on state autonomy, but she tends to take for granted that states are potentially autonomous. With respect to Iran, she does not argue under what circumstances the pre-revolutionary Iranian state assumed its autonomy. By applying the concept "Rentier state", borrowed from Hossein Mahdavy (1970), she contends that a state whose revenues come from charges on an easily extractable, exported resource such as oil is extremely amenable to control by an individual autocrat" (1982:281). If the rationale behind the autonomy of the state lies in the state's independent economic base why should this call for a particular autonomous state controlled by an individual autocrat.

effective representative political institutions. This would have implied the developmental of corporatist framework in order to channel diverse interests. But what in practice emerged under the Shah's regime was clientelism, in which agents with channels of access to public institutions extracted resources and influenced public policy. (Bashiriyeh 1984: 46)

Of course, the very patterning of class conflict/alliance is, by and large, shaped by the state's economic strategy and its ideological orientation. In Iran, the state was unable and unwilling "to undermine effectively the prominence of certain traditional classes within the civil society" (Farhi 1988:238). In addition, the economic strategy and the ideological discourse adopted by the state in 1960s and 1970s considerably antagonized the two fundamental classes, the merchants and landowners, and as well as the ulama and the intermediate classes.

By the intermediate classes, I refer to those of (1) small and medium-sized entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, merchants, and the self-employed or small employers, and (2) the salaried/professional personnel, including professional in the middle and lower ranks of the bureaucracy and business (e.g., the intellectuals, university professors, teachers, students, lawyers, physician, bank clerks and literary people). I shall refer to (1) and (2) as the traditional middle class and modern middle class, respectively. Following Aijaz Ahmad, Farhi argues that the intermediate classes try to exercise dominance/hegemony not only over subordinate classes, such as proletariat and peasantry, but over the fundamental propertied classes as well. "And, in this process, appropriate ideologies are generated in

order to cement self-organization as well as to establish hegemony over other classes” (Farhi 1988: 237).

Alternatively, Amirahmadi rightly argues that these intermediate classes lack a coherent and strictly middle-class ideology or a sound political voice. (1990: 3) This is because the middle classes face an extreme internal heterogeneity both ideologically and politically, including secular and religious tendencies, modernists and traditionalists, and Leftist, Rightist, and Centrist groups. “This extreme internal heterogeneity is a major source of inter-strata conflict within the class” (Amirahmadi 1990: 3).

However, given the Iranian model of development characterized by combined and uneven development, the new petty bourgeoisie grew numerically and qualitatively significant without undermining the persistence of the traditional bazaar petty bourgeoisie.²³ For example, in 1966, the professional personnel (the new middle class) were counted for about 416,000, by 1976 it had grown to around 1,560,000 out of a population of 33 million. (Bashiriyeh 1984: 14) Despite their growth, the new middle class, whose technocratic and managerial abilities were essential to both private and public bureaucracies, was excluded from taking part in the state’s decision-making. The state’s mode of governance, which was based on the supreme patron – the Shah considerably antagonized the new middle class. As a result, the new middle class began to engage in protest activities against the state.

²³ Iran’s industrial growth during 1963-77 period has been of a magnitude almost unmatched in history (Issawi 1978:150; Abrahamian 1983:428:

The emergence of the authoritarian regime under the Shah in the early 1960s also antagonized the traditional petty bourgeoisie, who mainly concentrated in the bazaar—centers of small commodity production and exchange in the urban areas. This class comprised three closely-knit groups. Its core group was bazaaris with almost half a million merchants, shopkeepers, traders, and workshop owners. The second contained some well-to-do urban entrepreneurs with investments outside the bazaars. The third group was made up of an estimate 90,000 clergymen who were integrated into their class through their family and financial ties. (Abrahamian 1982: 433) After the coup of 1953, this class was generally pushed out of the process of state building coupled with the state's overtly hostile policies towards the traditional petty bourgeoisie.²⁴ Despite its relative decline under the Shah, the bazaar managed to preserve much of its power. As Abrahamian explains:

The bazaars continued to control as much as half of the country's handcraft production, two-thirds of its retail trade, and three-quarters of its wholesale trade ... In fact, the prosperous 1960s allowed well-to-do bazaars to finance the expansion of the major seminaries ... Paradoxically, prosperity had helped strengthen a traditional group. (1982: 433)

Halliday 1980:138). This exceptional industrial development was the main cause for the rapid growth of the new middle class.

²⁴ The Shah admitted his contempt for the bazaaris: "The bazaaris are a fanatic lot, highly resistant to change because their locations afford a lucrative monopoly. Moving against the bazaars was typical of the political and social risk I had to take in my drive for modernization" (Pahlavi 1980:156).

Another prominent class crucial to the Iranian social structure and Shah's overthrow was the urban working class, in particular, the oil workers.²⁵ They were in a classically strategic position to affect national politics via the strike weapon. (Goldfrank 1982: 303) If we take a broad economic definition of the working class as comprising all wage-laborers who contribute to the creation and the realization of surplus value, the total number of working-class people in Iran would probably exceed four million. (Bayat 1987: 26)

The state sought to achieve industrial peace with the working class without politically activating them. This turned out to be a fiasco, since industrial peace would have implied the existence of independent working-class organization. After the coup of 1953, the Shah decisively crushed the existing unions, instead creating state-run unions whose principle object were "securing the political and ideological positions of the regime" (Halliday 1978: 202). However, the Iranian working class was not only excluded from the political participation but also was subjected to physical repression and political oppression in the work places.

There was even a movement for the reform of the Shah's mode of governance from within the upper bourgeoisie, which favored the limitation of the Shah's absolute power. This fraction began to emerge

²⁵ Some authors, such as Arjomand (1988) have completely neglected the role of Iranian working class in the making of the revolution, thus intensifying the misleading impression that Khomeini and the mullahs made the revolution. In fact, the general strike of the oil workers in Abadan and Ahwaz, which lasted nearly six months, not only broke the back of the Shah's dictatorship, but also it was one of the longest and by far the most effective in the entire previous historical period in Iran or for that matter to other revolutions in modern history.

within the Shah's single party, Rastakhiz (Resurgence), prior to the revolutionary crisis.²⁶ As the crisis deepened this faction became increasingly vociferous in its opposition to the Shah. In July 1977, the Shah was forced to dismiss Amir-Abbas Hoveida, who had headed the government for the previous twelve years, and gave the premiership, as a concession to their faction led by Jamshid Amouzegar, a fifty-one-year-old American educated technocrat.

4.4 The State

As a distinctive mode of development, peripheral fordism,²⁷ which experienced in almost all major peripheral countries was virtually initiated and led by the state. To do this, according to Lipietz, the state must be: a) politically autonomous from traditional forms of foreign domination; b) autonomous from ruling classes connected with earlier regimes of accumulation; c) autonomous from the popular masses. He concludes, "it usually requires a dictatorship to break the old balance and to use the state to create managerial personnel who can play the part of the ruling classes within a new regime of accumulation" (1987: 73).

²⁶ For instance, Ali Rezae, a major industrialist in Iran, told to Shah: "You determine the prices, the wages, the profit, the customs duties and so on. It would be better if you would please take charge of the management of industries yourself" (quoted in Bashiriye 1984:102).

²⁷ The peripheral fordist model involves the conjunction of bloody Taylorism and mass production with higher mass consumption in "less advanced countries" which intended to catch up with the West.

According to Guillermo O'Donnell, this process involves the suppression of two fundamental political mediations – citizenship and *lo popular*.²⁸ (1979: 293) A crucial aspect of this idea of the nation, long with that of citizenship, is the solidity of the state's particularization, allowing the state to appear as a formally independent, class-neutral political apparatus in the process of conflict and collision interests. Moreover, without the ideas of citizenship and *lo popular* the state cannot maintain the consensual basis needed for an accumulation regime. In such a situation the state is forced to rely on its authoritarian features.

In short, the development of the authoritarian state during the period 1953-77 did, however, antagonized and excluded a great number of indigenous classes from state power. The Pahlavi state should be seen as the personal/institutional embodiment of a historically peculiar form of the class alliance/compromise, which lacked any solid bases. It was based upon a system of political exclusion of the ongoing activated popular social classes by closing the democratic channels of the access to the government. "This exclusion is guided by a determination to impose a particular type of 'order' on society and guarantee its future viability" (O'Donnell 1979: 292). The Shah's 'all embracing single party, The National Resurgence Party, was designed to maintain such order and to secure its future reproduction.

In 1975, the Shah dissolved all the 'official' political parties and set up The Resurgence Party, whose main goal was to transform the somewhat old-fashioned military dictatorship into a totalitarian-style one-party state. The new move, which was labeled 'the era of

²⁸ Lo popular means, in this context, people voice.

resurgence', resembled mass movements to the extent in which it attempted to integrate popular classes into one-party political system and into one societal community. The party was to function based upon the principles of 'democratic centralism', synthesize the best declared that the Shah – the Great Leader (Farmandar) and the Light of the Aryan Race (Aryamehr) – had eradicated from Iran the problems of class exploitation (Abrahamian 1982: 441).

The growth of the Resurgence party, however, deepened the rift between the state and the prominent classes, since its aim was to strengthen the regime and further institutionalize the state into the wider society. This implied the intensification of the state control over the propertied middle class, the party's populist efforts, such as the sale of shares in industrial enterprises to workers, the adoption of measures to control businessmen through price controls, an anti-profiteering campaign and checks on the wealth of high-ranking officials – all these efforts struck fear in the upper bourgeoisie, who constituted the regime's main source of support.²⁹ One thing seems clear: The Resurgence Party defeated its own objectives: instead of establishing stability, it weakened the whole state machinery and intensified the split between the fundamental classes and the state. It was through this deepened rift that the revolution was launched.

However, it must be said that this was not the first time that the split between prominent classes and the state occurred. In fact, the lack of

²⁹ According to Nikki Keddie, "such measures were either scapegoating or in face of rising profits, income inequalities, high inflation, corruption, and a failure to meet government promises of greater economic and social equity" (1981:173). They were designed to allay the discontent of factory workers that were expressed through fairly frequent, illegal, and unreported strikes.

a solid coalition between the state and indigenous fundamental classes characterizes the entire political history of modern Iran and its state-building. Why this time it led to the outbreak of the revolutionary situations? A revolutionary situation is likely to occur if internal crisis arises together with what Goldfrank terms a “permissive world context”.

4.5 Permissive World Context

The concept of ‘permissive world context’ refers to the variety of favorable world conditions in which a let-up of external controls takes place. Goldfrank offers several possible alternatives: (1) when majors powers are themselves preoccupied by war or internal problems; (2) when major power balance each other and are mutually antagonistic; and (3) when rebels receive greater outside help than the state does. (1979: 149)

The case of Iran had brought forth another world contextual condition: “the perceived withdrawal of strong support for the repressive practices of a dictator” (Foran 1993: 10). Concrete historical analysis can point to several important changes in the world context, particularly changes in the relationship between the United States and Iran that were conducive in actualizing the disintegration of the Iranian state. (Farhi 1988: 242)

From its very inception, the Shah's rule was heavily based on the US support.³⁰ In the first phase of his rule (1953-63) which was marked by the reconstruction of the repressive apparatus, the Shah received over \$500 million US military grants, which was the largest military grant that Washington had offered to a non-Nato country. (Baldwin 1967: 200; Katouzian 1981: 205) Richard Cottam has maintained, "from 1953 to 1963 Iran could be described not only as an American client state but as an American dependency" (1979: 323).

The Shah's dependency on the United States was greatly reinforced due to a certain changes in US foreign policy. As a result of American difficulties in Vietnam, the US government was unwilling any further to employ the strategy of direct intervention by its own forces, and the subsequent inauguration of the "Nixon doctrine", which meant getting local allies to ensure the stability of the region against communist infiltration, the Nixon administration underwrote the Shah as the 'gendarme' of the Persian Gulf region; and it agreed to sell him whatever non-nuclear arms he wished. ³¹ (Keddie 1981: 176) This, coupled with Shah's own virtual mania for buying large amounts of up-to-date military equipment, led to a massive military build-up

³⁰ To be sure, the CIA played an active role in organizing the coup of 1953. But the CIA intervention cannot be considered, contrary to the popular belief, as the main cause of the formation of the Shah's regime. The explanation lies within the internal contradictions, balance, tensions, and dynamic of social forces in Iran, which also determined the very nature and degree of the US intervention.

³¹ According to Gary Sick, the principle White House aide for Iran, Nixon and Kissinger visited Tehran in 1972 and discussed a new relationship with Iran, based essentially on the Nixon doctrine. "One important outcome of that meeting was the blank check given to Iran for military equipment" (1986:173).

which was the fifth largest military force in the world. (Abrahamian 1982: 436)

The US support gave the Shah's state "increased leverage in relation to the older, nearby imperial powers, Britain and Russia, and eventually to help it bid for regional military power in the Middle East" (Skocpol 1982: 269). Thus Iran's government became an American "client/dependency state", and closely linked to the strategic preference and policies of the United States, and extremely sensitive to the rhythms of the domestic politics of the United States.

The fall of Saigon in 1975, the war between Israel and the Arab states, the Greek-Turkish war over Cyprus and the fall of the Greek military regime, the end of the fascist government in Portugal, and the overthrow of the monarchy in Ethiopia—all these led to a reevaluation of Nixon's global design, since it had collapsed in the region of its primary concentration. (Ahmad 1982: 298) Given its importance to American foreign policy, Iran became part of these reassessments in Washington. As Farhi puts it, "Iran was dragged into internal US politics"(1988: 242). Even before this, there were significant disagreements between the US Congress, the US military program, the CIA, and the State Department concerning the overall policy of US towards Iran. (Halliday 1979: 254) In addition to this, a Sub-committee on Arms Sales, after receiving information from these said organizations, concluded that it was potentially dangerous to sell so many weapons to such an authoritarian regime. (Abrahamian 1982: 500)

As a result, there was a growing criticism in the West, particularly in the US Congress of Iran's military build-up, and human rights

abuses.³² By 1975 many in the West began to criticize the Shah's repressive political system. Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists concluded that Iran was one of the world's "worst violators of human rights" and violating the basic civil rights of its citizen."³³ The vociferous Iranian student movement in the United States and Western Europe, which was supported by influential intellectual such as Jean Paul Sartre, also helped to bring to the fore the police methods of the Shah's regime. As a result, many influential Western press like Sunday Times of London began to run a series of articles on SAVAK, the State Intelligence and Security Organization, and concluded that "there was a clear pattern of torture used not only against active dissidents but also against intellectual who dared whisper criticism of the regime".³⁴

However, the most important aspect of the growing criticism in the West was the adoption of the human-rights policy initiated by President Jimmy Carter's administration, which assumed office in 1977, implying that countries guilty of basic human-rights violations might be deprived of American arms and aid the State Department's

³² It is said that Shah went beyond the task assigned to him by the United States, which implied performing security functions in the region on behalf of the West, and developed the ambition of turning Iran into an Indian Ocean power (Hunter 1992:103). According to Halliday, no Third World state has a record of intervention outside its frontiers comparable with Iran's (1979:272). These aspect of Iran's foreign policy, coupled with the Shah's personal ambition, created serious tension in Iran relation with both its allies and its enemies.

³³ Amnesty International, Annual Report for 1974-75 (London, 1975); International Commission of Jurists, Human Rights and the Legal System in Iran (Geneva, 1976).

³⁴ P. Jacobson, "Torture in Iran," Sunday Times, 19 January 1975.

Bureau of Human Rights condemned the Shah's regime for its violation of human rights, and the US Ambassador in Tehran, William Sullivan, passed on the administration's human rights advice to the regime. (Pahlavi 1980: 186)

The Shah could not remain indifferent to such pressure, especially from a Democratic administration. He was aware of the fact that it was the Eisenhower administration that brought him back to power, and it was Kennedy administration that imposed on him to appoint a reformist Prime Minister, Ali Amini, and to implement land reform. (Bakhash 1985: 13) In responding positively to external pressure, he agreed to open up slightly the political system, and to relax police controls, starting in early 1977.³⁵ Throughout the first half of 1977, the regime released political prisoners, of whom the vast majority belonged to the clerical opposition. International Commission of the Red Cross was allowed for the first time to visit prisons and see inmates. He also slightly loosened press controls. In July, the Shah dismissed Amir-Abbas Hoveida, who had hold the premiership for an unprecedented twelve years, and appointed Jamshid Amouzegar, a liberal American-educated technocrat, as prime minister.

A headlong rush to protest began. In May 1977, fifty-three lawyers sent an open letter to the imperial court, accusing the government of illegal interference in court proceeding and demanding an independent judiciary. Twenty-nine opposition leaders, intellectuals, and lawyers joined together and became the 'founding council' of the Iranian Committee for the Defense of Freedom and Human Rights. In

³⁵ The Shah claimed the plan for liberalization of Iranian society was his own initiative, denying any external pressure on him (Chehabi 1990: 225).

comparison to other political grouping, this association became far more effective in protesting against the Shah's arbitrary rule. A group of professors and university faculty members formed the National Organization of University Teachers, demanding academic freedom. (Katouzian 1981: 341)

There was therefore a coincidence of US reevaluation of its foreign policy over Iran, the election of Carter who preached human rights, condemnation of the Iranian regime by Amnesty International, and the vociferous Iranian student movements in the United States and Europe which was reinforced and compounded by internal crises—all these put the Shah's regime to walk toward the abyss of revolution. As Mehdi Bazargan, the first prime minister of Islamic Republic of Iran, put it, "Carter's election made it possible for Iran to breathe again."³⁶ Without this favorable international contextual conditions attempt at political change, let alone the launching of revolution, would be most likely fail to sustain its momentum. The political apparatus would not be responsive to political demand of oppositions. We may conclude that a certain favorable international context becomes a crucial factor in facilitating political upheaval and revolution. The permissive world context, however, can only explain the launching of revolution, in order to explain its metamorphoses, we must now describe the concept of societal paradigm without which one cannot make sense of revolution.

³⁶ In a "Letter to the Editor", Ettela'at, 7 February 1980, quoted in Abrahamian (1982:500).

4.6 Crises in Societal Paradigm

Societal paradigm is the term to delineate a mode of structuration of the identities and legitimately defensible interests within the “universe of political discourses and representations” (lipietz 1994: 340). It is the ‘world view’ central to the model of development in which a certain way of life in society, regarding what is moral, normal, and desirable, is permeated.³⁷ Once societal paradigm is consolidated, two forms of struggle emerge: systemic struggle within the same paradigm, aiming at the improvement of regulatory mechanisms of the distribution of mutual benefits; and anti-systemic struggle against the hegemonic paradigm, representing an alternative paradigm, whose conception of social life involves a different regime of accumulation and social bloc.

We can now look at the characteristics of the societal paradigm evolved under the Pahlevi regime. During 1960s and 1970s Iranian society went through a severe dislocation, which rested upon three pillars: technological progress, social progress, and state progress. This triple progress was supposed to deliver a widespread social change, welding together a restless population in society.

A dominant theme in the literature on the transformation of Iranian society is the absolute neglect of ‘democratic’ conception of social progress.³⁸ This progressivist paradigm not only excluded citizens from

³⁷ For Kuhn, also, paradigms are general ways of seeing the world, dictating what kind of scientific work should be done and what kinds of theory are acceptable. (1970)

³⁸ On contrary, many scholars see an incompatibility between democracy and development. It is argued that economic development is best promoted when there is a high degree of political stability and order, safeguarding the already

decisions about what is to count as progress (vis-à-vis consumption, public services, town planning and so forth) but also it created arbitrary rule and undue interference in citizen's affairs. The distinctive feature of the peripheral fordist societal paradigm adopted by the Shah regime was its limited capability of promoting both growth and welfare. Its state is, therefore, marked by its authoritarian developmentalist regime, which is reform oriented and enjoys a high degree of autonomy from vested elites interests. The Shah pushed economic development through agrarian reform and the transfer of economic surplus from agriculture to industry, promoting technological progress.³⁹ The reform also corresponded to the political logic of Shah's societal paradigm, in which regime sought to champion 'modernization' and the peasant by undermining the landowners and clergy and to outmaneuver the secular nationalist reformers and oppositions in general.⁴⁰ It goes without saying that Shah's interest in emancipating the peasants was to stabilize his authoritarian state

weak institutions of developing countries from all kinds of pressures stemming from numerous religious, ethnic, regional, and class divisions. (Huntington: 1968)

³⁹ As to the regime's motives for accomplishing land reform, there are opposing views. Some scholars, including the remainder of this work, stress on economic imperatives: the need to modernize agriculture in order to provide a foundation for industrial growth by ensuring adequate food supply and generating a substantial reserve of labour which was continuously drawn upon by the urban sector throughout the period of rapid investment of 1963-77. (Karshenas 1990, McDaniel 1991) Others emphasize the potential political benefits of agrarian reform: establishing a mass base support in the countryside, lessening the threat of peasant rebellions afflicting so many Third World countries. (Cottam 1988)

⁴⁰ As Ali Amini, then prime minister of Iran, puts it, the regime sought "to bring together the people and the government, to unite all layers and classes of the population" (1963: 80).

through removal of the possibility of a peasant-based revolutionary movement. This factor was also the U.S. concern in pressuring the Shah to implement land reform.⁴¹

Although agrarian reforms helped to bring about growth and structural change in the economy as a whole, it failed simply because it was incomplete; its implementation led to a worsening distribution of both land and income. (Karshenas 1990: 140) Some studies have concluded that land reform resulted in peasant impoverishment, dispossession, proletarianization, and mass migration to the cities.⁴² Others have maintained that Iran's post-land reform agricultural growth showed a positive response in generating moderate rates of growth of output and causing financial inflow, or product inflow, and real resources into agriculture throughout the period of 1963-77.⁴³

Apart from these contrasting claims, the reform at least was successful in attacking the social and political position of the landed elite. As McDaniel writes, "having neutralized the landed elite as a political force, the Shah made it clear that there was no potential role for them as a key social base of the regime" (1991: 103). Landlord resistance to

⁴¹ American pressure for land reform in countries under its influence began at the end of World War II. Subsequent to the reforms in Japan, U.S. advisers helped supervise reforms in China (prior to 1949), Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Egypt, Bolivia, and Iran. (Halliday 1979: 135) According to the American ambassador to Tehran at the time, "the idea was that Iran's demise was about to take place...and we just had to take some dramatic and drastic steps" (cited in Saikal 1980: 75).

⁴² The proponents of this view are Keddie (1973), Katouzian (1981), Halliday (1979), and Moaddel (1993).

⁴³ For detailed studies of this view, see Karshenas (1990), Majd (1992), and Amuzegar (1992).

the reforms certainly made itself felt, particularly from the clergy, who themselves often owned agricultural properties.⁴⁴

Of course, some clergy did not reject the land reform in principle, they just tended to emphasize the unconstitutional enactment of the reform. For instance, Khomeini criticized the Shah's land reform by insisting that it was enacted, "in order to create markets for America," that it had resulted in the complete destruction of all forms of cultivation and that it had left the country dependent on the outside world for all our essential needs (1981: 257). Khomeini's protest, however, focused on entire reforms program later known as the White Revolution.⁴⁵ These reforms were attacked by much of the religious establishment, including such grand ayatollahs as Shariatmadari, Marashi-Najafi, Khonsari, Golpayegani, and Qomi. The issue of vote for women was also focused of their discontents. These denunciations helped turn the June 1963 Moharram processions into violent street protests against the regime, in which Khomeini came to prominence. In the midst of the 1963 crisis, Khomeini was arrested and later on was deported to Turkey, from where he made his way to Najaf in Iraq. The year 1963 represented a major political setback for the clergy but their social and ideological power remained strong beneath the surface

⁴⁴ One scholar of the theology in Teheran claimed that the land reform was incompatible with Islam, for "Moslems cannot pray on land acquired by force" (quoted in McDaniel 1991: 175).

⁴⁵ Besides land reform, the shah launched a six-point program known as the White Revolution: nationalization of forests, privatization of state factories, profit-sharing for industrial workers, extension of the vote to women, and establishment of a rural literacy crops.

and politically was reinforced as a result of being subject to the Shah's repression.

The Shah's development model has been a matter of controversy until this day. There are two contrasting views. According to one view, the Shah's basic development strategy was nothing but the 'pseudo-modernist strategy' resulted in establishment of modern industrial showpieces' "in order to demonstrate Iranian economic progress and so keep the growing state clientele happy" (Katouzian 1981: 278). According to the other view, the Shah was successful in achieving most of its economic and social objectives, which were designed to transform a largely farm-based economy to a modern society: "this was so because Iran had experienced a transformation not less profound and, in many respects, more spectacular than Japan" (Lenczowski 1978: xvi).

Strangely enough, both supporters of these rival views have appealed to the fall of the Shah in 1979 as an indication to their claims. Some of the supporters of the latter view have argued that the Shah's mistake was that he modernized too much too quickly for his traditional-minded and backward-looking people. As Guy Arnold maintains, "the Shah's mistake was to attempt too much too quickly in a society that was conservative, semi-illiterate and heavily influence by a powerful Muslim clergy (1991: 433).

Alternatively, others have argued that the revolution came to Iran because the Shah failed to modernize rapidly enough. As Norris Hetherington believes, "it was a failure to deliver immediately in full measure or even in partial measure sufficient to encourage realistic hope of progress toward obtaining the material benefits of a modern

industrial nation, that contributed to increasing dissatisfaction with the Shah's government and to climate of public conducive to revolution" (1982: 362).

However, both views are economistic in nature with political bias. They fail to explain the Iranian revolution in terms of the interaction between class, politics, economy, and ideology. For one thing, the process of autocratic modernization gave birth to unusual social and political vulnerabilities. Nothing is perhaps more damaging to sustained economic growth than political and ideological weaknesses of the state. For another, the state encouraged the development of 'internal bourgeoisie', and expanded the ranks of the modern middle class and the industrial working class in line with the emerging economic base: "an industrial economy which had Fordist tendencies, even if it was not yet Fordist as such" (Lipietz 1987: 116).

But the State failed to modernize on another level—the political level. This provided the soil for the rise of cultural elite proposing another paradigm of social life against the hegemonic paradigm in which the new social classes were totally excluded from political life and they were given economic privileges in exchange for their passive political participation. It is therefore not surprising that an economic crisis was able to bring down the whole societal paradigm. This revealed the depth of popular dissatisfaction with the Shah's development model and the continuing failure of the state to consolidate a political base. The political movement which had begun in the late 1977 was deeply rooted in Iran's socio-economic structure than any previous ones: the mass demonstrations increasingly were coordinated with the growing strikes by the industrial workers, civil servants, and bazaaris for

maximum disruptive effect and economic pressure on the regime than any before and, in contrast to all others, have been provoked almost entirely by internal rather than international developments.

Huntington argues that a key aspect of modernization is the demand for increased participation in politics. Where certain groups do not have access to political power, their demands to change and broaden government may lead to revolution. (1986: 39) How would we go about estimating the probabilities of revolution within the next few years if we had been in Iran in 1978? The answer to this question is the focus of next chapter.

5. Causes of Social Revolution in Iran

In his critical appraisal of Huntington's view, Tilly suggests that when we study a society, we ask: What groups are contending for power? What claims are they making on the central government? What ability do contending groups and the government have to mobilize resources—money, manpower, weapons, information, and leadership—in order to enforce their claims? Revolution is only likely when powerful groups press competing claims on the government, and the government lacks the resources to either satisfy the claims of contending groups or to defeat them. (1986: 47) The Iranian revolution is a product of the recent history that spanned several decades. To understand it we ought to combine a concern for the power of the state with a focus on large-scale social relationships that may reinforce or limit state power—relationships between state and elite and contending groups, and between major social classes and state. We need to look and find weaknesses in the very structures of the state and society.

5.1 The Rise and Crises of State

The establishment of Pahlavi state was the result of the conflicts between social forces and classes over the 1906-21 periods. In the midst of the intense conflict for political power both between rival political cliques and between competing centrifugal regional and tribal forces, Reza Khan, the commander of the Cossacks—with force of 3,00

men—conducted a bloodless coup on 21 February 1921. The coup was greeted with an enthusiastic reception by diverse political trends in Iranian nationalism.⁴⁶ Soon after the February coup Reza Khan successfully suppressed all tribal revolts and disarmed the most troublesome tribes: Lurs, Baluchis, Bakhtiari, Qashgais, and the Kurds. Most politically aware Iranian received this suppression of tribes gratefully, even by those who opposed Reza Khan's dictatorship. This was regarded as a major contribution to the nation's internal security. During this period Reza Khan crushed down a number of regional movements, among which the Socialist Republic of Gilan was the most important one.

The suppression of various autonomous power centers in Iran led to the rapid increase in the power of state, which was bound up with the growth and centralization of the military and bureaucratic apparatus. Although the army played a crucial role in Reza Khan's acquisition of imperial throne, his rise to power would not have been peaceful and lawful without reliance on civilian population support. The Pahlavi dynasty was novel for being the first dynasty of non-tribal social foundation.

The reform of traditional legal system was an important impetus toward modernization of state and society. Central to the reform was the secularization of the judiciary. It was a severe blow to the monopoly of the clergy over the legal practices. Before the reform all the legal issues were determined by the religious laws (Sharia). But at each successive step of the reform the clergy's judicial power were

⁴⁶ Even the leader of the Socialist Party, Iskandari gave a full support to Reza Khan and referred to him as a 'bourgeois national leader'. (Ghods 1991: 40)

progressively reduced.⁴⁷ Once the unified and centralized bureaucratic machinery was established, the state machinery turned towards leveling out the multi-ethnic structure of the society, trying to transform Iran into a unified state with one people, one nation, one language and one culture. The integration of tribes into unified state was carried out primarily by destroying their political and economic structures through the execution and imprisonment of tribal leaders, as well as property confiscation and forced settlement.⁴⁸ In this period the state action against tribal leadership was the most significant step toward the political domination of the population in general.⁴⁹

The attempts of the Iranian nationalist regime were in the direction of reforming the population to prepare them for the new model state.

⁴⁷ Ali Akbar Davar, who had a law degree from the university of Geneva, was entrusted with creating a new general civil code. However, the civil code, which was approved in 1928, was a compromise between the state and Sharia courts. Issues relating to personal status, marital, family, and inheritance problems were to be adjudicated by Sharia court. By 1936 the secularization of the judiciary was further emphasized by legislation that required judges to hold a degree from the Tehran Faculty of Law or from a foreign university. Many of the ulama left the judiciary at this point. (Savory 1978: 92)

⁴⁸ For example, by 1930s the nomadic pastoralists were forcibly settled. (Beck 1983: 117).

⁴⁹ During this period Reza Shah and his fellow bureaucrats attacked on whatever might have resembled dissimilarity with European societies. Therefore attack on religion and even traditional ways of dressing cloths, from male's headdresses to female's veil, became the crux of the state social policy: conduct of religious rites were highly restricted, the customary public procession during the 'holy' month of Muharram was outlawed, and the wearing of European suits, jackets, trousers and the French hat was made compulsory for civil servants, and it was imposed indirectly to other social groups. (Katouzian 1981: 125)

Nationalism also implied an anti-liberal economic philosophy, as it did in the original German and Italian version. In both examples, the creation of a national economy had been the primary goal of the bourgeoisie who saw in liberalism a threat to their survival and worldwide expansion. (Keyder 1987) For Iran this period reflected a whole range of often contradictory aims and conflicting interests that intersected with state's effort in bringing about the modernization of the state and society.

One good example among many is that of the state's economic policies towards the agriculture and industry. While on the one hand the state encouraged industry by obtaining a higher real surplus from agriculture at the expense of both peasants and landlords, on the other hand strengthened the institution of absentee landlordism and semi-feudal relations of production which was an obstacle to the capital accumulation and growth.

Only towards the beginning 1960s did Iranian state begin to envisage new state-society linkages other than liberalism. During the 1920-40 periods, what we have instead is the state constituted by the contradictory and changing social forces located in transitional formation. As a result, this period was over-determined by the characteristic authoritarian equation: a politically strengthened center combating rival principle of social cohesion, while allowing the development of the market and its implicit organization.

The relation between the state and the landlords in this period actually resembled a political compromise: landlords did not interfere with the state machinery, and, in return, the government did not intervene in internal social relations of villages. The countryside in a way formed a

state within a state.⁵⁰ In fact, the formation of this new centralized state in a predominantly pre-capitalist economy entailed, above all, the institutional separation of the state from the medieval land-based economy.

As to the traditional middle class, the state's orientation was an outright neglect of its interests, undermining its organizational power. The middle class opposition to the state led into major protest demonstrations in 1927 and 1937. (Jami 1983: 173) Needless to say, the working class was at the top in the hierarchy of sufferers from the authoritarian state. Having antagonized the majority of the urban and tribal populations, the state relied increasingly on its coercive machinery.

From the fall of Reza Shah's despotic machine in 1941 until the reimposition of the authoritarian rule of the Shah due to the coup d'état of 1953, the country became an open field for competitive political groupings, leading to the emergence of a multitude of parties, parliamentary groups, and interest groups. An important aspect of the mass politics in this period was the development of horizontal mass political organizations centered on class-based and broad national economic issue, cutting through the clientelistic political ties of the early decades of the twentieth century. An equally striking expression of the class politics was the development of the trade union movement

⁵⁰ It was due to the power of landlords within the society that there was no mention of land reform during this period. And this has led some writers to believe that the state was an instrument of landlords. This is wrong, not only because of its theoretical premises but also because of its empirical inadequacy.

during this period.⁵¹ However, the integration of labor union into the state system, which was intended above all to insure that potential threats to 'national' security within the ranks of labor are suppressed, introduced certain legal advantages to Iranian workers in the post war era, as compared to the inter-war period which was marked by the elimination of all forms of unionism.

By 1949 the nationalist movement was restructured leading to the formation of the National Front with the program of demanding social justice and implementation of the constitutional laws: free elections, free expression of political opinion, and the improvement of economic conditions. The National Front had its zenith from march 1951 to August 1953, the year of Mosaddeq's prime-ministership, a period which was marked by the struggle for the nationalization of oil and the power struggle between the national bourgeoisie headed by Mosaddeq and the conservative forces led by the Shah.⁵² Given the weakness of the National Front, resulting above all from its lack of determination in attacking the conservative power bloc once and for all, and the overwhelming power of the army within the state apparatus, remaining as a royal preserve, this power struggle was settled by a direct coup

⁵¹ The Trade Union of the Workers of Iran was established in 1941. It was followed by the emergence of various independent trade unions. The government soon began creating state-run unions, among which the Union of the Syndicates of Iranian Workers—founded in 1946—was the most important. (Ladjevardi 1985: 173)

⁵² Learning that no oil money was forthcoming, the Iranian bourgeoisie had the choice of remaining nationalist, proud, and poor by continuing to support Mosaddeq, or to back his rival, the Shah, hoping the latter would encourage national industry and commerce. Many of the leaders of the National Front—such as ayatollah Kashani, Qonatabadi, Makki, and Baqai—abandoned Mosaddeq and joined forces with the Shah. (Moaddel 1993: 49)

imposed by the coalition of the military, the Shah, and the US government (the CIA). To be sure, the CIA played an active role in organizing the coup, but the CIA intervention cannot be considered, contrary to the most popular explanations, as the main cause of the overthrow of the 'popular government' of Mosaddeq. The explanation lies within the internal contradictions, balance, tensions, and dynamic of social forces in Iran, which also determined the very nature and the degree of the US intervention. Two factors are crucial here. First, had Iran had a land reform that would freed the peasantry from the strict control of big landlords, the independent peasantry would have widen the social basis of restricted liberal democracy and would have made the resistance to the coup much more substantial.⁵³ Second, Iran's nondependent bourgeoisie, which was represented in the National Front, was nationalistic first, liberal second. (Chehabi 1990: 19) In other words, as a political force, the bourgeoisie was not striven to lead the fight for liberal democracy but rather to establish Iran's sovereignty. In so doing they relied above all on the army and US support, a reliance that had no objective basis and therefore turned against themselves.⁵⁴

⁵³ In 1963 Hassan Arsajani, the Shah's agricultural minister, was trying hard to create a class of independent small-scale farmers tied to the government through the newly established rural cooperatives. But the Shah failed to support the rural cooperatives, and once again he deprived himself from this important political base, the peasantry. (Moaddel 1993: 68)

⁵⁴ Mosaddeq, after a fateful interview with the American ambassador, who promised aid if law and order was established, instructed the army to clear the streets of all demonstrators. Not surprisingly, the military used this opportunity to strike back against Mosaddeq. The armed forces proceeded to dismantle the National Front as well as Tudeh Party. (Abrahamian 1983: 280)

In terms of political domination, absolutism, clientelism, outright military dictatorship, and boldness in pursuing a modernization program, there was not much difference between the authoritarian regime of the Shah during the 1953-77 period and that of Reza Shah during the inter-war period. In the decade after the 1953 coup, the Shah spent much of this initial period rebuilding the state's coercive and bureaucratic apparatuses and reasserting his own authority over these institutions.⁵⁵ In the words of one American observer: "the entire reign of the shah, with temporary setbacks, can be characterized as a quarter century in which the civil and military bureaucracies have continually expanded their control over the activities of the population at large, while the Shah has even more relentlessly expanded his power over the bureaucracies"(Zonis 1971: 17).

The shah became an absolute monarch, who refused to act as a figurehead monarch, but rather a practicing patrimonial absolutist. And he played bureaucrats and military officers off against one another, never allowing stable coalitions or lines of responsible authority to develop. The Shah allowed no major decision to be taken without his approval—about high official appointments to major economic investments. Once the state faced the revolutionary crisis in 1977-78, the government and armed forces could not function without

⁵⁵ Central to this institution building was the creation of the State Intelligence and Security Organization (SAVAK) with the technical assistance from the CIA and the Israeli intelligence service in 1957. The main task of SAVAK was the identification and destruction of all those who in any way oppose the Shah's rule. To do this, SAVAK created through the Ministry of Labor an array of trade unions, and scrutinized anyone recruited into the university, the civil services, and large industrial plants.

him, since it was the Shah who controlled the armed forces, symbolically and actually, and not vice versa.⁵⁶

In making it much more difficult for any armed forces commander to challenge his position, the Shah did everything possible to discourage corporate solidarity and mutual trust within the hierarchy.⁵⁷ The highest-ranking officers were seldom allowed to communicate among themselves directly; as a result, the three services had few links other than through the person of the Shah. The military apparatus became wieldy, with unclear lines of authority and a poorly defined structure. As a result, in the face of revolutionary onslaught, the armed forces could not and did not do anything to save the state at his expense. Remarkably, many top leaders of the state and military secretly established contact with Khomeini even before the end.

When increasingly unpopular regimes respond to their growing unpopularity by blocking the opposition's legal or constitutional access to power, the rapid development of the ideological apparatus is

⁵⁶ The shah's rule was also heavily based on the military build-up. In the first phase of his rule (1953-63), the Shah received over \$500 million US military grants, which was the largest military grant that Washington had offered to non-Nato country. (Baldwin 1967: 200) In the mid-1970s Iran became the largest single purchaser of US arms in the world, "and through these acquisitions Iran in a short space of time became a major power and police in western Asia." (Halliday 1980: 64)

⁵⁷ The military actually played a marked economic and social role. It was an important source of employment: its size was increased from 12,000 men in 1953 to 410,000 in 1977. The annual military expenditure rose from \$293 million in 1963 to \$1.8 billion in 1973. (Abrahamian 1983: 435) According to Halliday, Iran's defence spending in 1976 was as much as that of China, with the difference that Iran had only one tenth of the number of men in the armed forces. (1980: 72)

necessary in order to whip up legitimacy—whether in the name of development, ‘national security’, or whatever—for the authoritarian structure of the state. The Shah was thus forced to establish the ideological foundations of his regime, with its commitment to progress. The regime appealed to a vigorous nationalism, which evoked the greatness of the Iranian past, claiming that it was monarchs who brought this about.⁵⁸ The pre-Islamic past of Iran was glorified and was taught to children in schools at the expense of Islamic period, which the regime did everything to play it down. The Shah claimed to have been chosen by God to bring protection and progress to his people. In his interview with Oriana Fallaci, the Shah stated:

I believe in God, in the fact of having been chosen by God to accomplish a mission. My visions were miracles that saved the country. My reign has saved the country and it's saved it because God was behind me. I mean, it's not fair for me to take all the credit for myself for the great things that I've done for Iran. Mind you, I could. But I don't want to, because I know that there was someone else behind me. It was God. (1976: 268)

Just as the Shah clashed with clergy by secularizing education and the law, and by down playing the importance of religious holidays and

⁵⁸ The celebration of 2,500 years of monarchy in 1971 was designed to underline this connection: establishing a historical continuity between the political past and the present. In his own words: “When there is no monarchy, there's anarchy, or an oligarchy or a dictatorship. Besides, a monarchy is the only possible means to govern Iran. If I have been able to do something, a lot, in fact, for Iran it is owing to the detail, slight as it may seem, that I'm its king. To get things done, one needs power, and to hold on to power one mustn't ask anyone's permission or advice. One mustn't discuss decisions with anyone”(Fallaci 1976: 16).

rituals, yet he claimed to be deeply religious and participated in religious rituals in a symbolic way. In essence, his goal was the creation of a non-Islamic nationalism consistent with his idea of progress: evoking an ideal image of contemporary western society; defining tradition and Islam as the root of backwardness; and arguing that Iran has to get rid of its traditional obstacles before modernization can occur.⁵⁹ Prime Minister Hoveyda stated, “the structure must be completely destroyed. Only then can a new system be built. You can not build the new on the foundation of the old”(James Bill 1972: 142).

To propagate his ideological elitism further, the Shah began to portray himself as the champion of revolutionary change, a revolutionary rhetoric that was way out of tune with the nature of the regime. The shah proclaimed: “Iran needs a deep and fundamental revolution that could, at the same time, put an end to all the social inequality and exploitation, and all aspects of reaction which impeded progress and kept our society backward” (Pahlavi 1967: 12). The Rastakhiz Party (or the Resurgence party) established by the Shah was designed only to educate people to his own ‘superior’ vision. In 1975 he dissolved all the ‘official’ political parties and declared that the country now had a one-party system. “The party was counted on to penetrate all of Iranian society, replacing other organizations and previous forms of association; the enlistment of a huge mass membership; obligatory voting for the party; and an aggressive policy toward independent

⁵⁹ The Shah was not alone in his assumptions of progress. He basically adopted the shaky assumption of the classical modernization studies, which characterized modernization as an irreversible, progressive, and lengthy Americanization, and focusing on the negative role of traditions. Critics of the modernization attack the functionalist assumption of incompatibility between tradition and modernity.

groups or organizations, whether traditional or modern”(Mcdaniel 1991: 133). At this point the Shah began to demand a total ideological commitment to his rule:

Iranian had the choice of supporting or rejecting the three basic principles of Monarchy, Constitution, and the White Revolution. Supporters now would join the Rstakhiz party to consolidate and promote these objectives. Opponents could either remain apathetic and be non-participants (in which case they would be denied the fruits of Iran’s prosperity); or if they wished to actively oppose these principles, they would be allowed to leave the country. (Cited in Zabih 1979: 9)

The regime’s attempt to create a mobilizational one-party system on the basis of these ideas turned out to be fiasco, leading to the consequent illegitimization of the regime. Ironically, the regime proved much more effective in weakening the modern than the traditional urban sector, although its intent was to convince the population that the regime is indeed the manifestation of a modern nation-state. Acquiring legitimacy through change from above, inevitably confront the waning of the charismatic foundation of that legitimacy. Either that base of legitimacy must be routinized, that is, converted to a legal-rational, elective-democratic base, or the regime will have to rely on pure coercion. Revolutionary mass movements in the Iran are fixed on either establishing a new nation state, as it was the case with the constitutional revolution of 1906-09, or asserting national identity and popular sovereignty over perceived alien or minority rule, such as the Shah’s rule. Shaping this emergent nationalism are a variety of unique forces and perspectives deriving from the mass of the population:

perceptions of economic dependency on, and exploitation by, the *comprador* or national bourgeoisie; perceived foreign, or minority domination; and weakness of the state within the international system. Failing to establish the fundamental elements of nationalism and to construct an operational state with internal legitimacy from these elements generate a revolutionary challenge to existing political order. The Shah's regime was losing its legitimacy, that is, its acceptance when mass movement began to challenge it. It was only the prospects of economic improvement of the 1960s and early 1970s that produced at least some tacit acceptance.

5.2 Economic Development and its Crises

In the 1960s and early 1970s Iran had undergone substantial capitalist development and had witnessed important change in the industrial structure which were mainly initiated by the state. Iran's economic development during this period reflected yet another example of the by now bankrupt development strategy of the 1950s and 1960s with its undue emphasis upon maximal growth, industrialization and foreign technical assistance at the expense of better income distribution, more balanced growth and greater economic reliance. However, during this period the GNP grew at the annual rate of 8 per cent in 1962-70, 14.2 per cent in 1972-3, 30.3 per cent in 1973-4, and 42 per cent in the 1974-5. Between 1963 and 1978, the share of manufacturing in GNP increased from 11 to 17 per cent, and the annual industrial growth rose from 5 to 20 per cent. (Issawi 1978: 150; Abrahamian 1983: 428; Halliday 1980: 138) This exceptional

industrial development was made possible largely by the state's initiative role and its increasing oil revenues.⁶⁰ The state adopted three strategies of industrial development: the encouragement of foreign capital investment; import-substituting industrialization; and state capitalism.⁶¹

As regard to foreign capital, in 1955 a Center for the Attraction and Promotion of Foreign Investment was established, in which a number of guarantee was given to foreign firms: five-years tax exemption; the right to repatriate profits in the currency in which they first invested; and exemption from duty on necessary imports. There was also substantial inflow of foreign capital in the form of official aid and grants during this period: the government received more than \$890 million in the form of aid and grant from the US government alone. (Bharier 1971: 119). Ramazani gives a more up-to-date figure \$2.3 billion. (1976: 327) Nevertheless, the total share of foreign capital investment was not more than 4 per cent in the 1973-8 Development

⁶⁰ Halliday argues that "the flow of oil revenues to the Iranian state has provided a limited historical opportunity for Iran to develop"(1980: 139). On the contrary, the impact of oil revenues on the process of growth could not be analyzed in abstraction from the nature of socio-historical factors which shaped the role of the state in the economy. The provision of finance through institutions such as the specialized banks and the Plan Organization, combined with the government's protection policy which created numerous opportunities for investment, helped to generate a powerful investment drive in the economy during the Pahlavi's era. (Karshenas 1990: 237)

⁶¹ These strategies were carried out in a series of 5-years development plans. The first, Second and Third Plans, which began in 1949 and ended in 1968, concentrated on developing the physical and social foundation of the country's industrial development, notably modernization of the transport system, the establishment of financial institutions, the transformation of agriculture, and the attraction of foreign capital. See Mehner (1978: 169).

Plan. (Bayat 1978: 23) But the main aim in attracting foreign capital has not been, as it has in many other Third World countries, to get investment monies from foreign firms, rather to fulfill areas where Iranian expertise is lacking. As Halliday puts it, “the Iranian state, for its part, is heavily reliant on these firms for its industrialization program since it is only in this way that under capitalist relations it can install and run the equipment needed for developing the medium and heavy sides of industry” (1980: 155).

The rapid deterioration of the Iranian economy over the post-oil nationalization period (1951-77) derived from the following reasons. First, with little industrial base, Iran was forced to spend large sums of foreign currency to import almost all manufactured goods. Second, in order to earn the needed foreign currency, Iran had to rely upon oil export.⁶² Third, the lack of foreign currency led to the incurrence of a substantial foreign debt. (Katouzian 1981: 328) Consequently, the restriction of imports of non-essential goods was proposed to help the country’s balance-of-payment problems, and to break out of this

⁶² In terms of backward and forward linkages between different sectors of the economy, oil has no developmental effects, since it establishes no significant linkage with the rest of economy: it employs a tiny labor force, and acquires its capital and technology from abroad; and its product is exported. It only provides a source of energy and thereby saves the foreign exchange from importing the needed supply. Many Third World countries, apart from relying on primary exports, promoted their manufacturing exports to pay for a proportion of their imports of capital goods, while Iran continued instead to rely heavily and almost exclusively upon oil export. (Karshenas 1990: 235)

dependence on primary commodity export. This laid down the foundation of an import-substitution industrialization (ISI) strategy.⁶³

The provision of import substitution was largely carried out by the private sector, with large amounts of financial aid as well as indirect support from the government. More than 70 per cent of total long-term industrial credits went to the private sector over the 1963-77 period, and 95 per cent to a relatively small number of large factories, employing more than fifty workers with a capitalization of above 25 million rials each. (Walton 1980: 279)

This modern sector contained 21 manufacturing enterprises and was the main beneficiary of the preferential credit, foreign trade and fiscal policies of the government over this period. (Karshenas 1990: 205) During this period the share of production in this sector has risen sharply: chemicals from 4.6 to 6.2 per cent, basic metals from 0.8 to 4.9 per cent, machinery from 0.6 to 5.8 per cent, and motor vehicles from 4.4 to 7.6 per cent. (Issawi 1978: 152) The division of Iranian industrial market between primary and secondary markets came about by the development of these modern manufacturing industries.

Given the monopoly position of some these new industries—which was reinforced with the state protection and the existence of a relatively small market for import substitution goods—together with the high labor productivity and the need for the skilled and stable labor, allowed a rapid increase in real wages in this sector compared to that of the small-scale units in the secondary sector. High productivity

⁶³ Instead of importing all manufactured goods, through ISI Iran would pursue the replacement of these imports by boosting domestic industrial production.

growth in modern sector helped the real wages to grow at the annual rate of 4 per cent over the 1960s, 11 per cent over the 1970s. (Karshenas 1990: 181)

But there was large wage-differential among different sectors, those in the advance sectors receiving wages twice or even more times as high as those in traditional areas.⁶⁴

The adoption of import substitution, combined with the rising oil revenues and the political stability, generated high profit expectations, and thus ensured a high and sustained growth of the industrial sector. But its contribution to the increase in manufacturing employment was relatively low, declining from 18 per cent over the 1963-7 period to 13 per cent in 1968-72, and to merely 10 per cent in 1973-7. (Karshenas 1990: 18). By 1976 the manufacturing sector had achieved a much higher degree of diversification, shifting to export-promotion and from assembly to production of new consumer durable, intermediate, and capital good industries, accompanied by a shift away from imports of consumer goods in total imports. The reason for this shift was the fact that import substitution strategy has led to scarcity of foreign exchange and had become a barrier to expansion of economy. First, since the majority of the population in Iran lacked the necessary purchasing power, thus the domestic production was geared toward a tiny urban market of luxurious and consumer durables. Second, the domestic bourgeoisie did not have the capital or technology to start domestic industrialization. This led to the incurrence of foreign debts

⁶⁴ Despite its position as large-scale employer of stable workforce, the primary sector generated a wider wage-differential within itself than that between the primary and secondary sectors.(Walton 1980: 279)

and dependent industrialization under the dominance of foreign capital. Third, instead of resulting in the import of foreign manufactured goods, import substitution strategy speeded up the import of foreign capital and technology. This followed by massive outflow of profit back to the home countries of transnational corporations.

It must be mentioned that as prescriptive formula, ISI does not exclude foreign direct investment in manufactures nor prevent such direct investment from enjoying the same protection as domestic capital. In practice then, neither from the point of view of openness to foreign capital, nor in terms of its impact on the volume of trade, does ISI decrease or hinder world economic integration.

Given the post-war structural transformation of advanced industrial countries, it may be argued that the relocation of certain standard-technology industries to country pursuing an ISI strategy was desirable from the point of view of international capital pursuing a worldwide strategy. This structural change was made possible by increasing government investment in heavy industries without having undermined the role of the private sector in investing in consumer goods branches and in particular in the new consumer durables goods. Government investment covered areas that were beyond the investment capacity of the private sector.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ The regime never actually advocated state capitalism, always emphasizing its adherence to the private enterprise model. But the supply of local bourgeoisie was limited, and government revenues and foreign capital were absorbed by the requisites of the state-led development. According to McDaniel, the outcome was neither private capitalism nor state capitalism,

This model of accumulation points to another significant dimension undertaken by the state. As the dynamic sector of the economy shifted away from imports of consumer good to consumer durable, to capital goods, consumers had to be found or created with sufficient discretionary income to constitute a market for new industries. But for any individual capitalist, the logic of the capitalist system requires maximization of profits and correlatively minimization of wages. To keep wages which make up the market in a magnitude consonant with the volume of production, the state has to maintain a degree of autonomy from individual capitalist interests and fulfill the function of the distribution of income to a degree that would serve the logic of the model of accumulation.

In Iran the state failed to function as a guarantor of the mechanism of income distribution, which has a decisive effect on the evolution of private consumer demand and the structure of the domestic market. The different aspects of government policies contributed to the concentration of income in the hands of a narrow section of the population whose consumption pattern dominated the structure of the home market. The labor incomes and agricultural incomes did not increase with industrial production.

The outcome of industrial policies of the state was the concentration of industrial investment in a relatively small number of highly capital-intensive modern plants with little backward linkages to the rest of economy. The state's strong support of the modern sector helped to

"but a kind of neopatrimonial economic system bringing together the court, the bureaucracy, and private enterprise"(1991: 135).

create intersectoral disarticulation by undermining the traditional sector: where a tiny segment of labor force was employed in the high productivity, high wage and technologically dynamic modern sector, while the major part of the labor force was absorbed by the informal sector with stagnant labor productivity and low income. In this model of accumulation only those social group which remained inside the modern industrial sector, consisting of the rentiers, capitalist, wage and salary earners, emerged with the strongest structural position for bargaining.⁶⁶

In addition to the absence of deliberate policy intervention by the state aimed at redistribution of income, we may mention that the Shah's family and their close business associates played a detrimental role in the development process over the period under investigation. In the pursuit of quick and easy profit, "the Pahlavi Family used their political authority to ensure firstly, that they became business partners of most major manufacturing enterprises, hotel banks, and insurance companies; and secondly, that by resort to bribery, arm-twisting and enforcement of changes in the country's trade and banking regulations, they created an appropriate environment for their own purposes, which often proved contrary to the objective of

⁶⁶ The state could have remedy the problem of unequal distribution of income by the social wage, that is, state expenditure designed to supplement the collective consumption of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie. In oil-exporting economies like Iran, the presence of relatively large share of public expenditure is not likely to bring about a drastic change in income distribution; since the availability of oil income did away the need to tax the consumption of the high incomes groups. Under this circumstance the setting up of an effective tax system appears to be essential prerequisite for the institutionalization of social security system in terms of redistributive income, unemployment benefit, and retirement benefit.

achieving balanced growth and a more equitable distribution of income” (Walton 1980: 280).

The expansion of domestic demand far beyond the country’s output potential and capacity to import goods, especially for the growing consumption of the higher income group, rather than an extensive growth of mass consumption, inevitably resulted in a marked acceleration of the domestic rate of price inflation. (Kaeshenas 1990: 187) The sharp rise in prices and interest rates considerably reduced profitability of the private sector and foreign capital. The later responded with holding back on new investment. The sharp decline in the oil revenues in 1975 meant that the government had to scale down its development activities to pay its operating expenses. Yet the total expenditure of the Fifth five-year Plan, whose implementation had started in March 1973, was doubled.⁶⁷ The revised Plan created shortages of both the unskilled and skilled labor force, resulting in substantial wage increases in some sectors. The Shah’s answer was substituting capital for workers, foreign experts, increasing the demand for the highly scarce skilled personnel.

To these bottlenecks was added the weaknesses of public administration to handle such a large state expenditures and led to increased corruption and, in turn, causing public’s discontent with government to reach new heights. By 1977, it was already too late for the government to revise its economic policies. The balance of payments effects of adverse terms-of-trade, and the impact of a shrinking world market for exports were taking their toll, and making adjustments policy in policy more difficult. By this time, the state

⁶⁷ A vivid and accurate account of this is given by Graham. (1979 ch.5)

could hardly pay its employees on time; it had a budget deficit of some 20 per cent of the general budget. (AmirAhmadi 1990: 18) The Iranian and foreign capital began to flee the country even before the revolution was fully underway.⁶⁸ Through a chain of causation from the decline in capacity utilization to declining in investment and profits, and increasing unemployment, economic growth stopped, unveiling various shades of social conflict. Without growth, social pay-off could not be continued, and social tensions which had been harbored within the rapid transformation of the society gained new dimensions: political protests and revolutionary upheavals.

5.3 The Rise of Revolutionary Situations

Rapid industrial growth between 1963 and 1977 was the weak cement which had held the political spectrum within manageable limits. The cohesion through the market, however, exhibited its fragility in crucially depending on the performance of the economy. When the expectations of ever-rising material wealth were becoming clearly frustrated, the economy could not continue in the role of guarantor of social cohesion, and instead revealed itself as the source of conflict. Here, the suggestion is not that the generalized frustration was the source of political outrage; it was rather the violation of what people

⁶⁸ The complete lifting of restriction on foreign exchange transactions in 1974, together with 1975 profit-sharing scheme, which required owners to sell 49 per cent of their shares to their employees and the public, resulted in a massive capital outflow. For example, already in 1977, B.F. Goodrich and Allied Chemical, had sold their investment and left the country. Some \$5 billion may have left the country in 1978 alone. (Amirahmadi 1990: 20)

understood as their rights (things they felt rightfully entitle to) and the failure of the state to carry out its obligation that set the stage for grievances.

Once the national state becomes the primary locus and focus of political activity, so politics itself means striving to share power or influence the division of power among states or groups within a state (Weber 1978: 78), revolution joins war as the last resort in political conflict. But in actual fact, the beginnings of the revolution are complex and the first spark can be pushed back to the various events leading to the outbreak of revolutionary situations. The revolutionary situation itself is one of 'multiple sovereignty', as Tilly defines it, in which two or more sets of power holders each strive to govern a territory previously ruled by a single regime. (Tilly 1978: 189) This political condition can arise in a great many ways, most often through the fission of governing groups into belligerent factions.

In Iran the crack in the governing group began by August 1977, when the Shah replaced the largely corrupt and bureaucratic Cabinet of Amir Abbas Hovaida, who had headed the government for the previous twelve years, with the mainly technocratic government of Jamshid Amouzegar, who headed the more 'progressive wing' of the Resurgence party. Amouzegar liberalized judicial rules by introducing four important changes: civilians brought before military tribunals could choose nonmilitary lawyers to be their defense attorneys; detainees were to be appear before magistrates within twenty-four hours of their detention; defense lawyers could not be prosecuted for statement made in court; and trials were to be open unless such publicity endangered public order. (Abrahamian 1982: 501)

This change, though too little, encouraged the opposition to raise its voice, allowing more and more of the accumulated grievances of the past came to the surface. Given the vanguard of the modern educated elite in the Middle East consists mostly of lawyers, lawyers took the lead in protesting the government for its violation of the constitution. In May 1977 fifty-three lawyers wrote to the imperial palace accusing the government of breaching the law and court proceeding. In October 1977 hundred-twenty lawyers formed the Association of Iranian Jurists, and announced the formation of a special commission to publicize SAVAK torture and monitor prison conditions. Dissident academics, journalists, doctors, and engineers followed the lawyers and revived their own professional associations which had been suppressed since 1964. (Katouzian 1981: 342)

Similarly, the National Front and the Liberation Movement were revived, and had begun to work closely with the bazaar community, calling for the implementation of the 1905-09 constitution. Finally, the Tudeh party⁶⁹ reemerged from its underground existence, revived some of its cells, and started publishing its newspaper named Nuvid (Harbinger). (Hiro 1985: 124)

To explain revolutions, Stinchcombe says that we need to break their history up into “theoretically understandable bits”. (1978: 14) Those ‘understandable bits’ are human actions that constitute key links in the history as a whole, in which the conclusions or the effects of one thing leads to another. Hence the question is which events marked the

⁶⁹ The Tudeh party was founded in September 1941 as a broad-based alliance of various progressive forces. Although the founding members of the Tudeh were Marxists, they did not call themselves communists.

start of a new stage in the revolutionary process? The revolutionary process went through several steadily stages before openly calling for the establishment of either a republic or an Islamic republic.

Until mid-1977, the opposition focused its energies on indoor activities: “writing letter, forming new group, reviving old ones, drafting manifestos, and publishing newspapers” (Abrahamian 1982: 505). The turning point began on November 19, when, in a series of poetry recitals, attended by some 10,000 students, organized by the Writers’ Association, the police attempted to disband the tenth session. As a result, the students overflowed into streets, clashing with the police, in which one student was killed, over seventy were injured, and some one hundred were arrested. (Hiro 1985: 189) Those arrested were tried by civilian courts, which indicated to the people that SAVAK could no longer use military tribunals to intimidate dissenters. This event, which was followed in the next ten days by more student demonstrations, clearly pointed to the fragility of state power structures—that is, their vulnerability to fragmentation from above and challenge from below.

Another event, which proved to be major turning point in brining about the revolutionary situations, was the publication of an article, written under a pseudonym in the daily newspaper *Ittilaat* that mounted an attack against the antiregime clergy, calling them “black reactionaries” and accusing Khomeini of black (i.e. British) imperialism, who in his youth had worked as a British spy and, to top it all, had written erotic Sufi poetry.⁷⁰ The article outraged the ‘holy’ city of Qum, leading to large street demonstrations. The bazaar and theological colleges closed

⁷⁰ “Iran and the Black and Red Reactionaries”, *Ittilaat*, 7 January 1978.

down in protest, demanding a public apology. On January 9, 1978, 4,000 theology students clashed with the police, leaving many dead and wounded. (Fischer 1980: 193) Khomeini responded by calling for more demonstration, congratulated Qum and the protestors for their heroic popular standing against the regime. Ayatollah Shariatmadari together with eighty-eight clerical, bazaar, and other opposition leaders, called upon the country to stay away from work on the fortieth day of the mourning for those killed in Qum by the police. Traditional death memorials are held on the third, seventh, and fortieth days. February 18 was the fortieth day after the Qum massacre, which led to another round of violence and death. (Katouzian 1981 346)

The main riot on February 18 was in Tabriz, when police shot down a young demonstrator and the locking of the public out of congregational mosque. The rioters attacked seventy-three banks, liquor stores, police stations, the Resurgence party offices, the movie houses showing sexy films, and any businesses that had not observed the strike call.⁷¹ The Tabriz uprising lasted thirty-six hours, subsiding only when the government responded with tanks and infantry: at least 100 were killed, 300 wounded, 700 arrested. (Hiro 1985: 194)

This was the largest public protest since 1963. The Shah declared martial law, dismissed the governor-general as well as six police chiefs, and sent a general to meet with a delegation of ten religious leaders in Tehran. The troops remained on the streets of Tabriz until March 3. The next major event was the fortieth of Tabriz massacre, March 29,

⁷¹ It is well known that all the large banks that were attacked lost all their records but not a single cent from their tills. These demonstrators were interested more in making a political statement by their actions than simply lining their pockets. (Abrahamian 502)

called by the religious leaders and the National Front. On that day and the following two days, demonstrations occurred in fifty-five urban centers. Although most of these processions were peaceful, in Tehran, Yazd, Isfahan, Babol, and Jahrom they turned violent. In Yazd, where the most violent of these confrontations took place, over one hundred people were killed. Once again, Khomeini and other religious as well as lay opposition leaders asked the people to honor the dead by attending mosque services on the fortieth day after the uprising. (Fischer 1980: 195)

The next fortieth came on May 10. This time as many as twenty-four towns turned violent. In Tehran many were killed, injured, and arrested. In Qum, the disturbances lasted a full ten hours and dispersed only after the authorities had cut off the city's electricity and shooting indiscriminately into crowds. The police invaded Ayatullah Shariatmadari's home and killed two theology students who had refused to shout 'long live the Shah'. The government made a public apology. To avoid violence on the next fortieth day, the Shah offered an olive branch to the ulama and the bazaar. He promised to re-open Qum's Faiziya seminary, closed since 1975. In the end, the June 19 protest passed off peacefully despite Khomeini's plea in which he urged his followers to keep up the protest until the tyrannical dynasty had been overthrown. It was not in the power of the mass demonstration to overthrow the state; more powerful forces were required. (Keddie 1981: 231)

Another major event was a fire inside Cinema Rex on August 19, 1978, in the working-class district of Abadan, which killed 410 men, women, and children: all the exits had been securely locked, and the local fire

department had been sabotaged. The government blamed the opposition, citing the recent mob attacks on movie houses. The public accused SAVAK, arguing that demonstrators attacked only movie houses that were empty and specializing in foreign sex film, whereas the cinema Rex was showing a contemporary Iranian-made film, entitled *The Deer*, which reflected veiled criticism of contemporary society. Whatever the truth, the people interpreted that cold-blooded mass murder as a SAVAK operation, with or without the Shah's prior knowledge, and the whole country rose in revolt with one simple message: "Burn the Shah and the Shah must go". (Katouzian 1981: 344)

It is clear that revolutionary situation arose in Iran when government military and police forces attacked the opposition, which was gaining influence by and large peaceably. The oppositions fought back through collective action that forced the government to undertake reforms to redress the grievances of opposition leaders and their rank-and-file. Thus, trying to stop the opposition by force, the government reinforced the revolutionary situation, and by launching reforms, the government strengthened simply the opposition on one hand, and weakened the state on the other hand. To deal with the crisis, which was heightened with the atrocity of cinema Rex, on August 27 the Shah removed Amouzegar as premier, and appointed Sharif Emami, chairman of the senate, to form a government of 'national reconciliation', including a mandate to negotiate with the moderate clergy and make concessions to the religious opposition.⁷² Forming a new government, Sharif

⁷² To relax the situation further, the Shah gave more concessions to the opposition: he announced that all the parties except the Tudeh would be free to campaign in the forthcoming parliamentary elections; he amnestied

Emami acted swiftly: he set up a Ministry of Religious Affairs; abolished the Ministry of Women's Affairs; cut off state subsidies to the Resurgence party; lifted censorship; closed down the casinos belonging to the Pahlavi Foundation; dismissed seventy officers and to be tried for their role in the suppression of the recent riots.⁷³ (Moaddel 1993: 160)

Sharif Emami's superficial attempt at symbolic conciliation seemed to work. Ayatollah Shariatmadari agreed to give the new government three months to implement the constitution; stating that if it failed, civil disobedience would resume. Emami reached an agreement with the opposition leaders in arranging a peaceful celebration of Ayy-e Fetr (Festival of Breaking the Fast, Ramadan), which fell on September 4, by promising to place the military out of public view. (Abrahamina 1983: 439) The festival passed off peacefully: masses prayed in the streets and handed out flowers to the soldiers, shouting, "the army is part of the nation"; "free all political prisoners"; "we want Khomeini back"; "brother soldiers, why do you kill your brothers?"⁷⁴

another 261 political prisoners; allowed the press to carry information on labor disputes and opposition parties; removed military guards from the universities; declared that deputies were free to leave the Resurgence party if they wished; and permitted the revival of teachers' union and Pan-Iranist party. (Katouzian 1981: 346)

⁷³ Moreover, Sharif Emami pandered to the allegation that the Shah relied excessively on Bahais, and began a well-advertised campaign against prominent figures of Bahais faith: the general in charge of Iran Air was killed and Bahai employees of the airline were dismissed; three other general alleged to be Bahais were dismissed. (Hiro 1985: 136)

⁷⁴ In the words of a foreign observer, the vast crowd was friendly and contained incongruous elements: dissident students in jeans, traditional women in chadours, workers in overall, merchants in suits, and, most

But the following three days saw an enormous peaceful parade of people in the streets, even though the opposition appealed for restraint and the government banned all demonstrations. By September 7 half a million people poured into the streets of Tehran, shouting “death to the Pahlavis”, “the Shah is a bastard”, “Khomeini is our leader”, and, for the first time, “we want an Islamic republic”. This was the largest demonstration ever held in Iran. Symbolically, it marked a shift from the reform call for the return of the 1905 constitution to a revolutionary change of the political system. (Fischer 1980: 211)

To control the situation, the Shah took drastic action, on the evening of September 7; he demanded the cabinet to impose martial law in Tehran and eleven other cities. The Shah gave the job of the military governor of the capital to General Oveissi, nicknamed the “Butcher of Tehran” for his ruthless actions during the riots of 1963. The Shah also issued warrants for the detention of opposition leaders (Bazargan, Matin-Daftari, Moghaddam, Nuri, Frouhar, Moinian, Lahiji, Behazin). (Abrahamian 1983: 446).

The martial law and daylight curfew went into force at 6 am the next day, September 8, known as Black Friday. Over 15,000 people began to gather in Jaleh Square in eastern Tehran to stage a sit-down demonstration. At 8 am commandos and tanks surrounded the demonstrators. Without warning the troops fired to kill. In southern Tehran, the working-class residents set up barricades and fought back by throwing Molotov cocktails at army trucks, and received bullets in return. That night the government announced 87 dead and 205

conspicuous of all, bearded in black robes. “The Shah’s Divided Land”, Times, 18 September 1978.

injured. This was a lie, said the opposition. They claimed that the dead had been as many as 4,500. (Fischer 1980: 214) Whatever the true figure, the Black Friday enflamed public emotions, radicalized the population, and ruled out any compromises with the Shah. It confronted Iran with two stark choices: a revolution that leads to basic changes of state and society or a military counterrevolution that leads to the reemergence of the Shah's autocracy.

This is not to suggest that people's intention was to make revolution.⁷⁵ On the contrary, their radicalism had been wholly tactical, and their revolutionary intervention was an attempt to turn high-level political crises to their own advantage, keeping things they felt entitled to. The masses of people were not at any point in a revolutionary frame of mind, they just fought in self-defense.

The Black Friday proved to Iranian that the Shah's earlier concessions were a ruse to gain time to muster his forces and crush his opponents. Revolution is not simple eruption of rage, nor its motive lies in a vague social frustration, but principled disagreements over recognized bones of contention; it reveals a political pattern and tactical logic—akin to war and diplomacy. Thus when the Shah tried to compromise with the leader of moderate opposition, he discovered to his disappointment that these leaders had no longer the capability to contain popular movements. "These popular movements have been led, staffed, and supported not by the most downtrodden and oppressed members of society, but by people who, while having plenty to fight for and against,

⁷⁵ "To the extent that angry little people want something new, it generally amounts to their perception of the old order minus the disagreeable and oppressive features that affect them" (Moore 1978: 351).

also had something to fight with”(Aya 1990: 58).⁷⁶ On September 9, oil refinery workers in Tehran went on strike, and demanded higher wages and lifting of martial law. On September 11, workers in the oil refineries of Isfahan, Shiraz, and Abadan downed tools and joined the strike. (Bayat 1987: 80)

On September 13, cement workers in Tehran went on strike, demanding for higher wages, and removal of martial law. (Bayat 1987: 79) On September 18, the regime’s credibility received a final blow from an unexpected quarter. Employees of the Central Bank of Iran published a list of 177 affluent Iranian who had recently sent over \$2 billion out of the country. (AmirAhamdi 1990: 21)⁷⁷ The wave of strikes reached to the point that crippled almost the entire economy. They ranged from the petrochemical complex in Bander Shahpour to the National Bank to the copper mines near Kerman. By the third week of October, blue-and white-collar workers went to a massive and unprecedented general strike, demanding for wage rises of 50 to 100 per cent with such sweeping political calls as the dissolution of SAVAK, the ending of martial law, the return of Khomeini, and the release of all political prisoners. This was not just a general strike but also a political general strike. (Bayat 1987: 81)

⁷⁶ A common fallacy in literature on Iranian revolution is the belief that those involved in making of the revolution were a mass of angry unemployed workers or urban poor who had much to gain and nothing to lose in overthrowing the regime.

⁷⁷ The list showed that Sharif Emami had transferred \$31 million, General Ovessi \$15 million. The list included the royals as well as top politicians, civil servants and military officers.

The strikes were supported by mass demonstrations, spreading from the larger cities to smaller towns. On November 4, students gathered at the University of Tehran and pulled down the statue of the Shah. The troops opened fire, killing thirty to sixty students. (Hiro 1985: 187) The next day, in a gesture of solidarity, the bazaar closed down, and students who gathered for the funeral of their dead colleagues took to the streets, shouting “death to the Shah”, selectively attacking banks, tourist hotels, American and British airline offices, and, after escorting personnel out of a section of the British embassy, burning down that section. (Fischer 1980: 211) The army rank and file, formed entirely of conscripts, was joining the demonstrators, and that garrison troops in Tehran air force, Hamadan, Kermanshah, and other cities were giving guns to civilian dissidents. There was no longer any effective force on the side of the regime.⁷⁸

Unable to control the situations, the Shah pressed on with his repressive measures. He replaced Sharif Emami with General Azhari, the commander of the Imperial Guard, to form a military government of six high-ranking officers plus four civilians. He reintroduced censorship, arrested opposition leaders, extended martial law to more cities, and persuaded the Iraqi government to place Khomeini under house arrest in Najaf and then to deport him.⁷⁹ The opposition called a general strike to protest the military government and the arrests of

⁷⁸ For example, when on September 12 sent censors to two Tehran newspapers offices, all the 4,000 employees walked out. Unable to enforce censorship, Sharif Emami lifted it on September 15. (Hiro 1985: 224)

⁷⁹ The Iran-Iraq treaty of 1975 required each signatory to stop all subversive activities directed from its territory against the other.

Sanjabi⁸⁰ after his return from his visit with Khomeini. The bazaars, universities, and ministries that had just reopened closed down again, followed by three days of rioting in the oil cities of Khuzistan province. On November 15, violent confrontations took place in the Kurdish areas, especially in the towns of Mahabad, Kermanshah, and Sanandaj.

By December, the month of mourning, Muharram, more violent demonstrations took place. General Azhari enforced night curfew and refused to issue permits to take part in religious celebrations. (Abrahamian 1983: 415) Ayatollah Shariatmadari responded to the government ban that the people did not need government permission to commemorate the religious traditions. Khomeini asked the faithful to “organize your gatherings without referring to the authorities, and if you are prevented from holding them, gather in public squares, in thorough-fares and streets, and proclaim the sufferings endured by Islam and Muslims, and the treacherous acts of the Shah’s regime” (Khomeini 1981: 243).

General Azhari called a press conference on December 5, in which he tried to portray a strong government, claiming that less than 5 per cent of the population was involved in the anti-regime demonstration, and that foreign enemies were plotting disturbances and Khomeini was their tool. Meanwhile he backtracked and sought to reach an agreement with opposition for peaceful marches on Tasua and Ashura, the final days of the mourning period. He released Sanjabi, Foruhar⁸¹,

⁸⁰ Karim Sanjabi was an influential member of the National Front.

⁸¹ Daryoush Foruhar was the founder of the National party.

and another 470 political prisoners. He also allowed religious processions to take place in all the urban centers, keeping the military out of the sight. In exchange, the opposition leaders agreed to keep to prescribed routes, and avoid riots. The day of Tasua saw a massive peaceful march in Tehran by over half a million people, led by a most people-orientated ayatollah in Iran, the sixty-eight-year-old Taleqani accompanied with Sanjabi. (Hiro 1985: 121)

The Ashurah march was even larger, attracting some two million people in Tehran, led once again by Taleqani and Sanjabi. The marchers passed through the city for eight hours and ended at Shahyad Square, where the crowd ratified a seventeen-point charter by acclamation. It called for the overthrow of the monarchy, the establishment of an Islamic government, the acceptance of Khomeini's leadership, the revival of agriculture, the protection of religious minorities, the return of all exiles, and the delivery of social justice for the deprived masses. This event conferred legitimacy on the opposition, demonstrating that there already is an alternative government. (Fischer 1980: 204)

For three days after Ashura, the Shah and his military went on rampage in various cities, killing at least forty people. The soldiers tore down anti-regime posters, put up banners of the national colors (green, white, and red), and painted over anti-Shah graffiti. (Fischer 1980: 206) The regime tried to stage pro-Shah demonstration by mobilizing lumpen-proletariat, and used even violent intimidation to get people to join these demonstrations. These attempts not only failed but also discredited the regime further. The Shah began to settle for what a month earlier he would have regarded as totally unacceptable: the

appointment of a government headed by a secular opposition leader. In late December the Shah asked Sanjabi to form a government of national reconciliation. Sanjabi refused, unless the Shah resign as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, leave the country, and wait for a national referendum to determine the fate of monarchy.⁸² Sanjabi issued statement saying that there could be no settlement with the illegal monarchical regime.

The Shah eager to find a civilian premier before December 30, which was a the Day of Mourning for the last year's Qum martyrs, turned to Dr Sadiqi, a highly respected political figure and sociology professor. The National Front issued a statement declaring that Sadiqi was not one of its members, and deploring his move. Sadiqi insisted that the Shah must leave the country soon after his appointment to premiership. (Katouzian 1981: 348) The Shah refused, and Sadiqi withdrew from the arena. On December 30 the Shah appointed Bakhtiyar prime minister, a less experienced leader of the National Front who feared the clergy more than the military. Bakhtiyar agreed to form the government if the Shah merely took a vacation abroad, and exiled fourteen general, including Oveissi. On January 3 Bakhtiyar received a 'vote of intent' in the Majlis as well as the Senate. Insisting that there would be no peace until the Sha abdicated, the National Front expelled Bakhtiyar from its rank. (Moaddel 1993: 162) He was discredited with the rest of the opposition. He was unable to influence events, except he succeeded in getting the Shah to leave.

⁸² Also Allahyar Saleh, the aged former leader of the second National Front, and Muhammad Sururi, the former President of the Supreme Court, had already declined the Shah's offer. It is said that Sanjabi subjected the offer to Khomeini's approval. Khomeini refused it. (Katouzian 1981: 348)

On January 16, 1979, the Shah left Iran, leaving behind a demoralized and divided army, and a gigantic bureaucracy that no longer functioned. On February 1, 1979, some three million people poured into streets of Tehran to hail Khomeini's triumphant return. Khomeini refused to negotiate with Bakhtiyar, and announced that the demonstration would continue until Bakhtiyar resigned. On February 5 Khomeini nominated Mehdi Bazargan, an influential spokesman of the Liberation Movement, as the head of the new provisional government. A situation of dual power existed for ten days with neither side willing to attack the other; but on February 10 and 11 the fighting broke out. Helped by thousands of armed volunteers, and army and air force deserters, the four main guerrilla organizations captured the capital's prison, television station, Majlis building and military academy. At 2 pm the chief of general staff agreed to hand over power to Bazargan, and announced that the military would remain neutral in the present political crisis and ordered the troops to return to their garrisons. Four hours later the city's radio station declared: this is the voice of Tehran, the voice of true Iran, the voice of the revolution". On March 30 a referendum proclaimed Iran to be an Islamic Republic, without sufficient time for public discussion, or official permission to all revolutionary forces to use the mass media for presenting their views. Within two months, however, the voice of the revolution became the voice of the Islamic revolution.

6. Revolutionary Challengers

To bring about social-revolutionary outcomes, revolutionary situations are not enough. Skocpol argues that for social revolutions to succeed, two factors are needed: revolutionary vanguard had to seize power, and set out to remake society. So no vanguard, no revolution. (1979: 163) This is because people do not automatically mobilize for collective action, no matter how revolutionary intention they may have. They need to have some kind of organization, offices of a directing, formal or informal, to channel discontent and enable action. Otherwise, the “unhappy merely brood passively on the sidelines” (Shorter and Tilly 1974: 338). Eric Wolf suggests why this pattern should prevail. For him, the prerequisite of militant collective action is “tactical power”, because “a rebellion cannot start from a situation of complete impotence; the powerless are easy victims” (1969: 290).

A decisive factor in endowing people with tactical power, thus, is the intervention of outside agencies, i.e. opposition parties and/or revolutionary armies, that crack apart established power domains by superior firepower—as well as through coalition with groups near the centers of power, including alliances improvised on the age-old rule that the enemy of one’s enemy is one’s friend. Here, what is needed is, thus, to sort out the social background of contending political forces, to see what political capital the contenders actually make of the capabilities and opportunities they have at their disposal.

6.1 Clerical Opposition

The ulama constitute a group of learned scholars and jurists, who had been an integral part of the polity of Iran—thanks to their religious statue which gave them significant economic wealth as well as social prestige and political power. Two factors have historically contributed to the strengthening of the role assumed by the ulama. First, the overwhelming majority of Iranian Moslems do not know Arabic, the Quranic verses only come to life through the Persian interpretation by the Islamic experts, the *Mojtaheds* (ulama). Second, more importantly, the Iranian ulama are disciples of a particular school of Shia'ism known as the Usuli, in which *Mojtaheds* (learned and qualified Islamic experts) are obliged to engage in independent reasoning in order to guide and lead the faithful in their private and social lives.⁸³

⁸³ The Shia believes that there are fourteen maasums (infallible souls) worthy and capable of leadership: Mohammad, Fatima, Ali and their eleven descendants. The last Imam is believed to have gone into occultation in AD 874, at the age of nine. The Gheybat (absence) of the Twelfth Imam—the ever-present Imam—created a spiritual and leadership vacuum among the shia. From AD 874 to the late 1700s, mainstream shia believed that the absence of the last Imam blocked the path to religious knowledge since only through the medium of the Prophet and the imams could such divine knowledge be obtained. This is known as Akhbari school. The ulama were prohibited from passing any independent judgements. Accordingly, the role of ulama was simply to report on and transmit the word of the Quran. It was not until the early 1780s that the Akhbari school began to wane under the forceful opposition of the prominent clergyman, Mulla Mohammad-Baqer-e Behbehani (died 1803). He founded the Usuli school of shia'ism. Behbehani argued that no one other than God was aware of the Twelfth Imam's date of reappearance, therefore it was harmful to leave the faithful without proper guidance during the Imam's occultation which could be very long. (Rahnema and Noami 1990: 18-20)

Prior to Usuli school, the Shia clergy argued that since all governments were in essence usurpers and unjust, true believers should shun the authorities like the curse. The Usuli school, on the hand, opened the path for the active involvement of the clergy in politics and in governmental positions. The religious domination of the Usuli school in Iran coincided with the fall of the Safavid dynasty and its replacement with the Qajar dynasty in 1790s. The rise of Qajar placed considerable social, political, and economic power in the hands of the ulama. They performed educational, judicial, and legitimating functions for the Qajar state. In return, they held a monopoly over the religious endowments and collected religious taxes: *Khums*, one fifth of profits, and *Zakat*, 2.5 per cent of income. The judicial system of the Qajar state was divided into two parts: the *Urf* and the *Sharia*. The ulama conducted the Sharia courts which dealt with personal and family matters. While the Urf courts covered the area related to state and customary law—appointed by the king.

Sharough Akhavi suggests that the rise of the Usuli school “issued in the active participation of men in shaping their existence” (1980: 121). In fact, it allowed the *Mojtahed* (the highest religious authorities) in particular and ulama (the religious authorities) in general, who constituted a very small part of population, to shape the lives of others. It also led to the development of religious status known as a *Marja-e Taglid* (source of emulation), or supreme authority on Islamic law, and that every believer must choose a *Mojtahed* as a source of emulation. The need to follow the rulings of a living *Mojtahed*, who was less fallible than any temporal ruler, gave a basis for power in the hands of the *Mojtaheds* that was far greater than that of the Sunni ulama.

The *Marja-e Taqlid* is an erudite, pious and just *Mojtahed* to whom other *Mojtaheds* pay allegiance. On the process of selection of the *Marja-e Taqlid*, Fischer points out “although it is admitted that, beyond the certification of *mojtahed* status, the question of who is the most learned of all is merely a matter of opinion, the theory hold that a consensus slowly emerges”(1980: 88).⁸⁴

The ulama, however, were divided in their political orientations, being pressured by conflicting interests in society, which were dictated by historical relations between the state, the landed interests, and the bazaar. For example, in the Tobacco Movement of 1890-92—a movement against the government for selling a major tobacco concession to a British entrepreneur—a major political division occurred among the ulama.

The political lines appeared clearly between those ulama that supported the Shah and the concession and the ulama that sided with the Iranian merchants against the concession. Similarly, in 1906, when the leading ulama participated in the Constitution Revolution, they were divided broadly into anti-constitutionalist and royalist ulama and pro-constitutionalist-modernist ulama. The former argued that drafting of a constitution means forcing subjects to obey a law that was not present in the Sharia (the Islamic law), denouncing the concept of constitution as an alien heresy. While the modernist ulama

⁸⁴ On the one hand, Moslems are free to choose a *Marja-e Taqlid* according to their individual preferences and reasoning and with a view to the *Marja's* reputation, qualities, proclamations, and writing. On the other hand, once the medium or channel to pious and Islamic life is chosen, then whatever the *Marja-e Taqlid* decrees has to be accepted without hesitation or questioning. (Rahnema and Nomani 1990: 22)

wanted to limit the monarch's power within a supervisory committee of senior ulama passed by the elected Parliament conformed to the sacred law. The latter won, and the leader of the anti-constitutionalist ulama, Sheikh Fazalah Nouri, the highly respected but ultraconservative Mujtahed, was executed. (Katouzian 1981: 63)

However, there was a fundamental paradox in the constitution, a paradox that reflected the persistence of the ulama as a social force. The constitution failed to maintain the separation of the religion and state. It instituted a 'supreme committee of Mujtaheds in order to scrutinize the religious legitimacy of all bills introduced into parliament. "The committee would sit until the appearance of the hidden Mahdi (May God Hasten His Glad Advent)" (Abrahamian 1983: 90).

The weakening of the ulama's power, however, began with the establishment of Pahlavi state. The initial step was the reform of legal system, leading to the secularization of the judiciary, which was a major blow to the monopoly of the clergy over the legal practices. In 1936, by passing legislation that implied judges to hold a degree from the faculty of law from an accredited university, many of the ulama left the judiciary at this point. (Fischer 1981: 55) The other major factor in reducing the power of the ulama was the secularization and modernization of educational system.⁸⁵ These reforms had far-reaching

⁸⁵ Central to educational reforms was the promotion of higher education. Beginning in 1928, 100 students were sent to European countries to study the fields of medicine, dentistry, mining, engineering, and agriculture. In 1934, University of Tehran with six faculties was established. Elementary education was neglected or received lowest priority. The reason behind this was perhaps the urgent need of bureaucracy for a highly trained cadre of competent functionaries. (Savory 1987: 93)

social effects by having freed the educational practices from the control of the clergy.⁸⁶ In this period, the ulama also lost all their seats in the parliament as well as their monopoly right over the Waqfs (religious endowments), and were brought under the government control. The 1934 Law of Waqfs authorized the ministry of education to take over all the religious endowments, to supervise others by approving or disapproving their budgets, and to transform a waqf into private property or prohibit such a development. (Abrahamian 1983: 123)

By the fall of Reza Shah in 1941 the ulama's oppositional orientation toward the state began to relax and eventually developed into a sort of ulama-monarch alignment that lasted until 1959. During the next thirties years, from the fall of Reza Shah until the re-imposition of the authoritarian rule of the Shah due to the coup d'état of 1953, the country became an open field for competitive political groupings, leading to the emergence of a multitude of parties, parliamentary groups, and interest groups.

To consolidate his political power in this period of the mass politics, the new Shah began to win the sympathies of the ulama, the one group in daily touch with the masses. The conservative ulama supported the new Shah, and, in return, the Shah annulled his father bans on religious ceremonies, reversed the rule which allowed the waqf properties to be sold commercially, and amended education law to help improve the management of religious schools. Ayatollah Burujerdi, an elite figure, even went so far as to organize a convention in Qum, on

⁸⁶ In the course of implementing these reforms the state took over many religious schools. This strengthened the hands of the Shah in his ongoing conflict with the ulama.

February 20-21 1949, in which “the ulama passed a resolution that prohibited the clergy from joining political parties or taking part in politics”.⁸⁷ (Moaddel 1993: 138)

To be sure, this did not prevent many senior ulama from issuing religious decree in favor of the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, a subject that dominated elections to Sixteenth Majles (parliament). However, only a tiny portion of influential ulama participated in the nationalist movement of the post-war era, led by the National Front. Ayatollah Kashani, a militant cleric, who had been popular with second rank clerics and itinerant mullahs, supported Mosaddeq’s nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company.⁸⁸

Although he was not dogmatically fundamentalist, Kashani demanded the cancellation of the secular law a passed by Reza Shah, the implementation of Sharia (Islamic law), re-imposition of the veil for women, protection of national industries, and Muslim unity against the imperialism. He called for the fusion of politics and religion, and believed that the distinction between religion and government is an act of imperialist conspiracy against Muslim people. (Abrahamian 1983: 154) Similar tenets were to be found many years later in Khomeini’s thought.

⁸⁷ For time being the Shah attracted the supports of all-important Maja-e Taqlid (the source of emulation) such as Behbahani, Burujerdi, Nuri, Lavasani, and Falsafi. “The left and nationalist leaders argued that this was designed to prevent young clergymen from taking part in the nationalist movement.” (Moaddel 1993: 138)

⁸⁸ Kashani founded the Society of Muslim Warriors, drawing supports mainly from bazaar, seminary students, and small shopkeepers.

However, given that the dominant political struggle against the Shah came from secular nationalist and leftist forces, combined with the successive wave of secularization in the past two decades, the ulama saw that a state that would come out of the fall of the Shah, could not be based on religious legitimization, leading to total decline of the ulama power and resources. The militant secularism of the Reza Shah came to signify political control over religious life by bureaucrats, rather than separation of religion and state. The corollary of such an understanding of the relationship between religion and the state, together with the secular and democratic commitment of the National Front and the left, threatened the religious establishment.

At this conjunction, the ulama were convinced that the alliance with the Shah against the menace of democracy and secularism is their best option in order to restore the status of the Islam in the society.⁸⁹ To illustrate the historical example of this ulama-monarchy alignment we may refer to the 1953 coup, to which a large section of the ulama gave their support. They also offered public approval of the repression that the Shah unleashed on the Tudeh party after the coup. The ulama were vehemently against the Tudeh party, and accused Mosaddeq and his government of falling under leftist influences. The Shah was generous to all those clergy who opposed Mosaddeq and worked for his comeback. In return, the Shah went out of his way to project himself as a savior of Islam.

But in the post-1953 period, the situation began to change. Having gained sufficient strength through a combination of effective state

⁸⁹ The traditional-religious wing of the National Front gradually broke off when Mosaddeq government pressed for fundamental social changes.

repression against the secular nationalist and leftist groups, and having reestablished its bureaucratic-authoritarian state, the Shah could now differentiate himself from the religious establishment at the level of ideology. The more the Shah insisted on his secular anti-religious ideology, the less his critics applauded him. The explicit ideology to which the Shah's reforms referred to was nationalism. And the more nationalism became a modernizing ideology, especially the more was applied in the direction of reforming the population to prepare them for the new model state, the less nationalism was appealed to in formulating an oppositional claim in struggle against the state. For politically repressed people, whatever the state ideology was that ideology was not right.

To achieve the desired national development, and to safeguard the status of the bureaucratic mechanism, the Shah switched strongly in favor of large establishments in the agricultural, industrial, and commercial sectors, which antagonized the classes constituting the historical bases of the ulama—the petty bourgeoisie, the merchants, and the landowners.⁹⁰ All of this, however, led the ulama to unite against the Shah. It may therefore be argued that the modernist zeal of the Shah became uniquely instrumental in coalescing the various elements of popular culture into an Islamic-populism reaction. What secularization did was to reinforce the imageries of an alternative Islamic society among the traditional middle classes. Populism, as the

⁹⁰ The Shah's land reform certainly made itself felt, particularly from the ulama, who themselves owned agricultural properties. The conservative faction of the ulama (Burujerdi and Behbahani) began to voice their disagreement with land reform, although they were avid supporters of the Shah. (Bakhash 1984: 27-33)

counterpart to an absent liberalism, was a major factor fashioning the ideological history of Iran in the post-war era. The drift towards populist rhetoric has been materially reinforced by a social structure dominated by small producer, which did not allow either a liberal-bourgeois or a social democratic ideology to develop in a pure form.⁹¹

In terms of the articulation of their ideologies with popular demands, the ulama faced much less difficulty than the left and liberal-nationalist forces. Despite their attempts, the two major political forces commonly referred to, as the left and the liberal remained unable to present clearly differentiated images to the public. While the religious movement riding on the social mobility of an era of rapid development, introduced identifiable revolutionary Islamic discourse, which clearly borrowed from populism, but the populist tenor remained dominant.

The Islamic discourse in its populist rhetoric emerged as a radical projects for renovating state and society against the Shah's reactionary violence. These Islamic-populist projects by which the Iranian revolution is identified and remembered have been imposed on popular movements by certain of their coalition partners, often by revolutionary

⁹¹ Populism refers to a movement of the propertied middle class that mobilizes the lower classes, especially the urban poor, with radical rhetoric directed against imperialism, foreign capitalism, and the political establishment. In mobilizing the 'common people', populist movements use charismatic figures and symbols, imagery, and language that have potent value in the mass culture. Populist movements promise to drastically raise the standard of living and make the country fully independent of outside powers. Even more important, in attacking the status quo with radical rhetoric, they intentionally stop short of threatening the petty bourgeoisie and the whole principle of private property. Populist movements, thus, inevitably emphasize the importance, not of economic-social revolution, but of cultural, national, and political reconstruction. (Abrahamian 1993: 17)

intellectuals; otherwise “ordinary people’s notion of utopia being their own idea of existing society minus its most disagreeable and oppressive features”(Moore 1966: 52).⁹² Khomeinism, as a form of populism and not fundamentalism, was an important factor fashioning the revolutionary ideology of the 1979 revolution.⁹³ Radical tendencies within Islamic political movements tend nearly universally toward populism, despite its religious dimension, in many ways resembles Latin American populism. They are characterized by the ‘moralizing’ tone that is both their strength and their weakness. Typically, the wealthier and better-educated classes benefit from the successes of the

⁹² Consider Ira Lapidus’ explanation of the Iranian revolution as “a special case of the problem of defining cultural and political identity and political action in a changing society...The Islamic revolution may therefore be understood as a struggle to reject the Pahlavi regime with its Western supporters and Westernizing cultural orientation in favor of a more truly Islamic identity” (1988: 13). On the contrary, people participated in the revolution, not to renovate society or to remodel it on a new Islamic identity, but to reclaim their rights which they believed to be violated by the Pahlavi regime.

⁹³ Here Abrahamian makes a useful distinction between Khomeinism and fundamentalism, rejecting the latter as an inadequate notion in defining Khomeini’s populist thought. First, if fundamentalism means the acceptance of one’s scriptural text, then by this definition, all politicians who have appealed to religions have to be considered as fundamentalist. Second, if the term implies that the believer can grasp the meaning of the religion bypassing the mediation of the clergy and their scholarship, Khomeini certainly would not be one, since he was a senior member of the Usuli school of shia’sim. Third, if fundamentalism implies the strict implementation of the laws and institutions found in the basic religious texts, then Khomeini certainly does not qualify, since the whole constitutional structure of the Islamic Republic was modeled on the French’s Fifth Republic. Fourth, if the term means a dogmatic adherence to tradition and a rejection of modern society, then Khomeini again does not qualify, since he stressed that Muslims needed to adopt western technology, industrial plants, and modern civilization. (Abrahamian 1993: 16-17)

movement, while the poorer and less articulate are unable to form their own movements in part because of the limited vision contained within Islamic populism.

Khomeinism, like Latin American populism, informed and strengthened the ideological and organizational capacity of an urban middle-class, providing the masses with radical interpretations of Islamic theory in order to defend themselves against abuses of an authoritarian domination. These movements had vague aspirations and no precise programs. Their rhetoric as a political campaign was more important than as their political programs. They freely borrowed concepts, language, and imagery from full-fledged radicals, especially from the left, but once they seized the state power, they stressed the need for national unity and utopias of revolution became new ideologies of rule. Religious fundamentalism could never have won such widespread and popular support. The play of revolutionary Islamic populism is thus a tricky one: it revolutionary against the old regimes and conservative once the new order was set up.

The call for the overthrow of the Shah by Khomeini was a gradual process. Throughout 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, he retained traditional attitude toward the state. In his first political tract, *Kashf al-Asrar* (Secrets unveiled), he explicitly disavowed wanting to overthrow the throne and repeatedly reaffirmed his allegiance to monarchies in general and to 'good monarch' in particular. (1943: 185) Khomeini only demanded in *Kashf al-Asrar* that the monarch respect religion, recruit more clerics into Parliament (*Majles*), and his tenure of the throne

should be conditional on the respect of sacred law.⁹⁴ Khomeini began to develop his concept of an Islamic government after he became convinced that the Pahlavis were beyond redemption and that their rule mortally endangered Islam and the shi'a establishment in Iran.

The development of Khomeini's new ideas of the Islamic state seems to have been the result of changes in the interrelationship between the state, various classes, and the ulama. The Pahlavi state was slowly but surely breaking with the ulama, and also antagonizing the members of the classes that had historical ties with the ulama. These actual changes, therefore, made Khomeini and his disciples to oppose the foundation of monarchy. He began to insist that Muslims have the sacred duty to oppose all monarchies; they must rise up against them. (Khomeini 1978: 177) In denouncing kingship, Khomeini put forth his arguments for the establishment of an Islamic government based on *Velayat-e Faqih* (The jurist's guardianship). The standard interpretation for this doctrine emphasizes the absolute authority of the just jurisprudent who holds the reins of governance as the deputy of the Hidden Imam, the chosen God. Although Khomeini attempted to establish some consistency of his views with shi'a political theory, and although he tried to define a true Muslim as anyone who believed in the authority of the ulama, in the 1970s he rarely made public

⁹⁴ In this work Reza Shah is attacked for establishing and maintaining a government at secular sins: for closing down seminaries, expropriating religious, endowments, propagating anticlerical sentiments, replacing religious courts with state ones, and the playing of sensuous music. Such criticism of the monarchy did not yet involve a demand for its abolition. He even says at one point that "up to the present no member of this class (the ulama) has expressed opposition to the principle of monarchy itself" (Khomeini 1943: 222).

pronouncements on doctrinal issues, especially his highly controversial concept of *Velayat-e Faqih*.⁹⁵

Avoiding doctrinal matters, Khomeini therefore directed against the Shah and US imperialism, and against all domestic sensitive socio-economic issues. He accused the Shah being an agent of anti-Islamic foreign imperialism, wasting oil and other natural resources of the country on the ever-expanding army and bureaucracy; destroying Iranian agriculture; failing to provide land to the landless peasantry; subjecting the working class to a life of poverty and misery; creating huge shantytowns at the gate of his pseudo-civilization; ruining the economic life of the bazzars by refusing to protect them from the transnational corporations; supporting the US and Israel against the Arab world.

⁹⁵ This concept was passed into law with the ratification of the new Islamic Constitution of 1979. And it is this aspect of the 1979 constitution that in effect establishes a system very close to a theocracy. This is unprecedented in Iran's history and certainly goes beyond the supervisory role for the ulama. In many regards, it is also an innovation in the shi'a theory of government and political legitimacy. (Hunt 1992: 15)

In her remarkable interview with Khomeini, Oriana Fallaci asked about the tension between democracy and clerical authority embodied in the later Islamic Constitution. Fallaci's question: the head of the country will have to be the supreme religious authority. That is you. And the supreme decisions will be made only by those who know the Koran well—that is, the clergy. Doesn't this mean that, according to the constitution, politics will continue to be determined by the priests and no one else? Khomeini's answer: This law, which the people will ratify, is in no way in contradiction with democracy. Since the people love the clergy, have faith in the clergy, want to be guided by the clergy, it is right that the supreme religious authority should oversee the work of the prime minister or of the president of the republic, to make sure that they don't make mistakes or go against the Koran. (Reproduced in the *International Herald Tribune*, 15 October 1979: 5)

However, Khomeini was not the sole founder of this Islamic populism. Two lay intellectuals were to play significant roles in popularizing Islamic populist notions, especially among the modern and educated sectors of the society. The first was a famous ex-Tudeh Marxist writer, Jalal al-Ahmad, whose work *Gharbzadegi* (Plagued by the West, or Westoxication) represented a turning point in 1960s toward an appreciation of the significance of Islam in the Middle East. Although he advocated that the root of the problem lies in the contradiction between Islam and Western culture, his works contained a strong Marxist influence with a class perspective.⁹⁶ According to Abrahamian, he was the only contemporary writer ever to receive favorable comments from Khomeini. (1993: 23)

Above all else, the main ideologue of the Iranian revolution was Dr. Ali Shariati whose ideas contributed directly to the revolutionary outbreak through his influence on Iranian students and intellectuals.⁹⁷ The

⁹⁶ "The West", al-Ahmad writes, "in its dealing with us, not only struggled against this Islamic totality, but it also tried to as quickly as possible tear apart that unity which was fragmented from within and which only appeared whole on the surface. They tried first to turn us into raw material, as they did the natives in Africa, and afterwards bring us to their laboratories...How can we view these twelve centuries of struggle and competition between East and West as anything but a struggle between Islam and Christianity?" (1982: 6).

⁹⁷ Not much is known by Westerners about Shariati's contribution and advocacy of Islamic populism. He was born in 1933 in a village near Mashhad. His father, Muhammad Taqi Shariati, was a well-known reformist cleric. Shariati won a state scholarship to the Sorbonne to study for a Ph.D. in sociology. He translated Che Guevara's *Guerrilla Warfare* and Jean-Paul Sartre's *What Is Poetry?* and began a translation of Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*. In 1964, he returned to Iran. After a short imprisonment, he was freed, but on being denied a position in Tehran University, he regularly lectured at the Husayniya Ershad, a religious meeting hall built by a philanthropist by the name of Muhammad Humayun. During the time he was active in the Husayniya Ershad (1967-1973), his

revolution not only made him a household name in Iran but also transformed him into a trophy in the contests of competing political groups, especially for the highly organized and motivated Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization, an organization which did some of the decisive fighting in the fateful days of February 1979. While drawing upon concepts from Marxism and Islam, he denounced the Stalinist version of Marxism and conservative Islam, especially the clerical variety. At any rate, he advocated a return to Islam and Shiaism, claiming that Islam transcends both Marxism and liberalism:

Humanity arrived at liberalism, and took democracy in place of theocracy as its key to liberation. It was snared by a crude capitalism, in which democracy proved as much a delusion as theocracy... The desire for equality, for liberation from this dizzying whirl of personal avarice, so horrifyingly accelerated by the machine, led humanity into a revolt that resulted in communism. This communism, however, simply represents the same fanatical and frightening power as the Medieval Church, only without God. It has its popes, but they rule not in the name of the Lord but in the name of the proletariat. (Shariati 1980: 92)

lectures were transcribed into some fifty pamphlets and booklets, and were widely circulated and received instant acclaim, especially among college and high school students. In 1972, the Husayniya was shut down by military units of the government. He was arrested, and charged with advocating "Islamic Marxism". He remained in prison until 1975. After his release, Shariati remained under house arrest until 1977 when he was permitted to leave for London. On June 1977 his dead body was found in the home of his brother in southern England. The British coroner stated that he died of a massive heart attack at the early age of 43, but his sudden death in mysterious circumstances has been interpreted by all observers to have been the work of SAVAK agents operating abroad.(Abrahamian 1988: 290-91)

Shariati presented a strong distinction between Ali's Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism:

It is not enough to say we must return to Islam. We must specify which Islam: that of Abu Zarr or that of Marwan the Ruler. Both are called Islamic, but there is a huge difference between them. One is the Islam of the caliphate, of the palace, and of the rulers. The other is the Islam of the people, of the exploited, and of the poor. Moreover, it is not good enough to say that one should be concerned about the poor. The corrupt caliphs said the same. True Islam is more than concerned. It instructs the believer to fight for justice, equality, and elimination of poverty. (Shariati 1969: 14)

Events made this Muslim sociologist as the most popular writer and ideologist of the revolt. His teachings of populist Islam contributed to the emergence of rival political groups. In fact, Shariati's ideas were far better known than those of Khomeini. In the opposition demonstrations, his portrait was carried beside that of Khomeini. The growth of the Islamic populist discourses increasingly conditioned the political actions of the secular forces, leading them to forge alliances with the Islamic opposition led by the ulama. In sum, Islamic populism enhanced the legitimacy of the clergy, despite Shariati's anti-clerical views. Not surprisingly, the leaders of the Tudeh party changed tactic and began to support the religious opposition. At the ideological level, there was no single, monolithic Islamic discourse, but a number of Islamic populist discourses and secular projects. Each of these discourses appealed to a particular social group that played a role in the revolutionary struggle. On the Islamic side alone, there were three variants:

Radical Islamic populism: the ideology of the young intellectuals who wanted to create a classless Islamic society;

Conservative Islamic populism: the ideology of the ulama, the petty bourgeoisie, and the dispossessed—groups that wanted to establish God’s government on earth.

Liberal Islam: the ideology of the bourgeoisie and the middle class—groups that wanted to share power with the state through non-revolutionary means.

To be sure, the novel phenomenon of Khomeini’s leadership was his ability to down play these ideological differences among the rival opposition movements and made them to act harmoniously for the achievement of a politically justified common goal: the overthrow of the Shah’s regime. As Keddie puts it, “he knew when to stand firm against the regime when others favored constitutional compromises, and he has often been able to sense the mood of the masses and the possibilities of a situation better than anyone else” (1986: 6). His uncompromising stand gave courage to oppositional ulama, and much mosque preaching became increasingly hostile to the Shah. Furthermore, to maintain his alliance with the National Front—an alliance without which there would be no revolution—Khomeini in France convinced many secularist that he would support a national-democratic system. His indications that he did not want to rule directly were probably based on the false assumption that others would rule just as he wanted them to.

Thus Khomeini created a broad coalition of social forces ranging from the bazaars and the clergy to the intelligentsia and the urban middle-

classes, “as well as of political organizations varying from the religious Liberation Movement and the secular National Front to the new guerilla groups emerging from Shariati’s followers in the universities”(Abrahamian 1982: 479). Although all recognizing the leadership of Khomeini, the coalition was primarily based on tactical considerations by all sides. By adopting a religious-oriented populist strategy, Khomeini made the maximum political capital of the breakdown of government.

It was not religious revival as such that explains the words and actions of revolutionary masses, on the contrary, their radicalism was wholly tactical, and their revolutionary interventions an attempt to turn high-level political crises to their own immediate sectional advantage, taking the opportunity afforded by a breakdown of state power to reclaim property and prerogatives lately usurped by dominant groups. Such was the context within which Khomeini-National Front alliance was formed: the National Front did not exist as a solid nationwide network, it was Khomeini who invited them to join the dance, and it was Khomeini who told them that the dance was over and that the time had come for them to return home.

6.2 The National Front

In 1941 the Allies invaded Iran and forced Reza Shah to leave the country, opening up his iron curtain on Iranian politics. During this period of open politics, the ideological spectrum appeared to be heavily weighted toward a nationalist-liberal middle ground. The span of political currents represented in the spectrum was much wider than

any time prior to the 1979 revolution: merchants, retailers, artisans, workers, younger intellectuals and students constituted the social bases of the National Front led by the charismatic leadership of Mosaddeq.

The political conflict during the period of nationalist ascendancy was centered on democracy and independence for Iran. The principle factor defining the National Front's ideological universe has been the absence of a contesting bourgeoisie—a class that the National Front was trying to represent. In Iran the bourgeoisie, which in the West led the struggle for liberalism, did not have the occasion, until today, to give themselves a separate identity. The bureaucratic-nationalists of Tehran closely determined the allocation of economic positions, guiding a capitalist development without corresponding bourgeois transformation. The state that directed the transformation did indeed create a serious obstacle to the development of a vigorous and self-confident bourgeoisie, a situation common to the peripheral societies. The state-led capitalist development had a direct impact on the bourgeois ideology in Iran; they were robbed of their imputed revolutionary will despite their economic success. 'Saving the state' summarized an entire political mood of the Iranian bourgeoisie who, for example, sacrificed civil rights for *rasions de'etat*, participation and democracy for solidarity behind leaders.

The intelligentsias thought exactly the same fashion, feeling that they are natural candidates for 'saving the state'. Even today the educated people consider their prerogatives to be self-evident. In addition, the dominant tendency in economic policy also worked toward inducing the bourgeoisie to passivity. Furthermore, the semi-colonial situation

of Iran, Iran's domination by outside powers meant that the developing bourgeoisie was far more nationalistic in its political orientation than liberalistic. Thus, the bourgeoisie became a full supporter of the centrality of the state, possessing no desire to challenge the normative concerns of the bureaucracy. In fact, by confining itself to macro-economic concerns and national strength, with no reference to income distribution and economic justice, the bourgeoisie played a suffocating role on societal dynamics, and a civil society lost its chance of learning-by-doing in the ways of participation.

Although the National Front headed a coalition of secular and religious nationalist groups, it represented above all the Iranian bourgeoisie. Its political objective was to check the arbitrary power of the monarch within the framework of the existing semi-constitutional monarchy. Its nationalist objective was to nationalize the Iranian oil industry that was controlled by the British. Nationalization of the oil industry was achieved soon after Mosaddeq was elected prime minister in the early 1950s.⁹⁸ Mosaddeq, however, was overthrown by an American-and

⁹⁸ The British government referred the dispute to the International Court at the Hague. The Court ruled that Iran had the right to nationalize. The Labour government, however, accepted the letter of the Iranian oil nationalization, though insisting on full compensation for the abrogation of the 1933 Agreement. The role and position of the American government were changing. At first it adopted the role of conciliator, since America was generally against the old-style European colonialism. Next, the US became increasingly hostile to nationalization, and American oil companies joined an unofficial worldwide major-oil-companies' boycott of Iranian oil, which caused severe economic problems for the nationalist government of Premier Mossaddeq. Iran sank into economic depression and political instability. Both the British and American governments began to picture Mosaddeq as a dangerous fanatic, likely to deliver Iran to the Soviets. Finally, its British allies and its Iranian clientele persuaded the US that the coup was a best possible political solution to the oil crisis and Mosaddeq. (Katouzian 1981: 188)

British-supported coup in 1953. The coup had a major impact on the National Front, since it was followed by wholesale arrests. Most of the National Front leaders were arrested and imprisoned. Mosaddeq himself was tried in an open military court, remained under the house arrest until his death in 1967.⁹⁹ Many of them, who were released in the course of 1954, emigrated or retired from politics, some maintained secret contact with Mosaddeq.

Only towards the beginning of 1960s did Iranian opposition received a chance to revitalize as the result of the inauguration of the Kennedy administration and subsequent pressures on the Shah to relax police control. Taking advantage of the new situation, in 1960 the new National Front was reestablished, naming it the Second National Front. Meanwhile, Mehdi Bazargan and Hojjat al-Islam Mahmud Taleqani, who was to play a crucial role in 1979, founded a new political group, the Liberation Movement of Iran, which became the main party of the Second National Front.¹⁰⁰ Among all the groups that constituted the

⁹⁹ The radical members of the National Front were repressed brutally: Fatemi was executed, Karimpour Shirazi was murdered in prison, Shayegan and Razavi, though released after three years' imprisonment, were under continuous surveillance.

¹⁰⁰ Bazargan was born in Tehran in 1906, and sent in 1931 to study civil engineering in Paris. In 1942 he became one of the founder of the Engineer's Association, which was joined by the overwhelming majority of Iranian engineers. In the mid-forties he left Iran party, since it had allied itself with the Tudeh party, and formed an Islamic Student Society at Tehran University, which was intended to stem the influence of the Tudeh party among the students. Bazargan was persuaded that Iran's political solution lay in welding religious faith to political activism, Islam to nationalism. He was a moderate who found himself heading a revolutionary provisional government. Taleqani, who became an Ayatollah later, was born in Taleqan in northern Iran in 1910, received his early education from his father, a local cleric who was politically active and who earned his living repairing watches.

National Front, the Liberation Movement played the most significant role in the 1979 revolution, owing its success basically to the adoption of nationalist-Islamic populism. As Bazargan put it:

The National Front was, as its name indicated, a Front. That is a union of social philosophies and prominent personalities which had a common goal, namely the independence of the country and the freedom of the people. But having a common goal is tantamount to having common motivations. One cannot expect that. Some may be motivated by nationalism, others by humanitarian feelings, race consciousness, or socialism...However, for us, for many of our friends, and perhaps for a majority of the Iranian population, there could be no motivation other than the principles and religious tenets of Islam. I am not saying the others were not Muslims or that they were opposed to Islam. Only, for them Islam did not constitute a social and political ideology. But for us it was the basic motivation for our social and political activism. (1971: 207-8)

The main thrust of the Liberation Movement was to synthesize Islam and nationalism, arguing for close cooperation with the ulama. The Movement adopted far more radical stance vis-à-vis the Shah than the Iran party. The Iran party believed that the regime should be attacked on concrete issues such as the lack of civil liberties and the imprisonment of Mosaddeq, while the Liberation Movement arguing that the Shah must reign and not rule. To be sure, both emphasized that the regime must hold elections and that the elections were a

He completed his religious studies in Qum, and began to teach scripture at a secondary school in Tehran in 1939. He devoted the rest of his life to various political causes, and, between 1960s and 1970s, he spent a decade in jail. (LMI 1984, Vol. 5)

cornerstone of Iran's Constitution. Although the Liberation Movement functioned within the National Front as an ally, it remained a rival of the National Front. According to Chehabi, "in the end even veteran leaders of the National Front had to admit that the Liberation Movement was the more popular of the National Movement's two wings" (1990: 163). The Liberation Movement owed its popularity to the decline of national-liberalism and Tudeh-style Communism on one hand, and the growth of Islamic populism on the other. As a result, the ideological framework and political discourse derived from Islam increasingly became attractive to the intellectuals and activists. The National Front was weakened by tactical errors and disorganization of the existing secular political groups, Mosaddeq had been the pole around which secular and religious Nationalists congregated. By the early 1960s the Shah began to resort to secularism and nationalism, and the more the state ideology insisted on secular anti-religious discourses, the more the climate became ready for mass conversion to Islam as an alternative revolutionary ideology.

The Liberation Movement operated openly from May 1961 until it was officially banned in 1963. It continued, however, to hold secrets meetings, and to organize abroad, especially in United States and France. After the bloody riots of June 1963, the Shah repression severed, arresting many of the Liberation Movement's leaders and outlawing the affiliates of the National Front, abolishing political life in Iran. This time the secular-liberal opposition to the Shah represented by the National Front collapsed inside Iran, for much the same reasons as before. The explosion of the internal divisions within the National Front was more severe than before, involving strategic and ideological issues. One bloc, formed by the Liberation Movement, the National

party, and the Socialist Society, wanted to wage an ideological war against the Shah, and insisted that the National Front should remain as a broad alliance of autonomous organizations. This bloc declared itself the Third National Front. The other bloc, formed of Iran party, called for the establishment of a secular democratic state in Iran, and insisted that the National Front must be transformed into a tightly knit party with one center, one official organ, and one political strategy. This bloc retained the title Second National Front, and intensified its activities among the Confederation of Iranian Students in Europe. (Katouzian 1981: 238)

The riots of June 1963 represents a watershed in opposition movements of Iran, since it was the religious leaders and not the political parties that inspired and encouraged the masses. Believing that the ulama have a crucial role to play on the political scene of Iran, the Third National Front began to establish a close link with exiled religious leaders, especially Khomeini in Iraq.¹⁰¹ Thus the period 1963-77 witnessed a rise of Islamic populism rather than Islamic fundamentalism, emerging a link between lay groups like the National Front and religious ones. This alliance between the secular and the

¹⁰¹ The organ of the exiled Liberation Movement, Mujahed (Freedom Fighter), declared in an editorial on "The Struggle of the Religious Leaders": "the Shia leaders have always helped Iran's struggle against despotism and imperialism. Since the days of the Constitutional Revolution, since the bleak years of Reza Shah's repression, and since the bloody demonstration of 1963, the ulama have allied themselves with the masses. Ayatallah Khomeini, who has lived in exile since 1964, is now the main opponent of the regime. The Shah, the so-called religious experts paid by the regime, and other national traitors do their very best to drive a wedge between us and the progressive religious leaders...We will do all we can to create unity between the political opposition and the religious leaders, especially Ayatallah Khomeini. United we will destroy the hated regime" (quoted in Abrahamian 1982: 462).

clerical forces, the moderates and the radicals who had made the revolution, owed its success mainly to the Liberation Movement and its leaders.

Ayatollah Taleqani played a prominent role in popularizing the Islamic populism and in bridging the deep gulf separating devout believers from secular reformers. Although he remained less powerful than Khomeini, he was the most popular of the ulama, and the most liberal and progressive among them. He had a close relationship with Sunni minorities, with the leftist groups, and also worked with the conservative ulama such as Motahari and Beheshti. He had friends and associates both among the clerics and the secular politicians. Among the works of Thaleqani the most important one is *Islam and Ownership* in which he discusses successively: the evolution of property since the origins of humanity; the social division of labor; the ideal community; the industrial revolution; and the emergence of worker's power and class struggle. As he wrote:

Ownership is relative and limited. Ownership means the authority and power of possession. As human power and authority are limited, no person should consider himself the absolute owner and complete possessor. Absolute power and complete possession belong only to God who has created man and all other creatures and has them constantly in his possession. Man's ownership is limited to whatever God has wisely willed and to the capacity of his intellect, authority, and freedom granted to him. (1983: 88)

For Taleqani, therefore, God is the absolute owner of the goods confided to us, and property is not sacred, as some of his conservative colleagues maintained. He opposed capitalism, for which property is

absolutely free; and socialism, which suppresses individual property. He did not, however, address certain important questions regarding the economy: taxes, nationalization, the banking system, and so forth. But he did clearly oppose one-man rule, both political and religious. He favored decentralization of the *Marja-e Taqlid* (source of imitation) and popular participation.¹⁰² Taleqani's main objective as an Islamic activist was to show the progressiveness of Islamic tenets, and to disclose Islam's appreciation of social problems. This was the main reason he became popular among leftist and secular groups.

Bazargan was another most important politico-religious leader of the revolution. In Tehran, Bazargan and Taleqani mainly led the Liberation Movement. He set out the basis of a modern image of Islam. Utilizing his reputation as an engineer and professor, Bazargan argued that Islam is in accord with scientific and technical progress. But he refused to separate the religion and the politic. He said "the development of the advanced societies shows that so long as the people do not believe in an ideology or a national political philosophy, success will not be achieved. In a civilized world a nation or a state without an ideology is henceforth unimaginable" (1976: 66). For him there should

102 Under the influence of his leftist children, Taleqani increasingly rejected formal democracy and insisted on the rule of the people in a vast network of councils: "From an Islamic point of view Western democracy is not government by the people, nor does it benefit the people. What is Western has a colonialist face. It rules over the whole people and deceives them with its false propaganda. The colonialist governments that had dragged people through blood and debased them derive from the same democracy". (quoted in Chehabi 1990: 60)

be general principles that guide politics. Religion must control and inspire politics, and not the contrary.

Moreover, Bazargan acknowledged that Islam has not specified strict formulas for dealing with the economy and with the state, “because there are no absolute and unchanging criteria on which to base economic policy in all places and all times”(1976: 227). For Bazargan, Islam only provides the basic rules for governing the society. But the application of these rules to everyday life necessitates the legislative activity of parliaments.

A frequent theme in Bazargan’s writings is a refusal to blame the West for the problem of underdevelopment confronting the Islamic countries, arguing that this underdevelopment predates the rise of the West. The problem began, for him, when religion withdrew from public affairs, leaving the conduct of social and political affairs to those not committed to Islamic values. (Bazargan 1951: 8) He criticized fossilized and often compromised theologians focused on minor points of faith. To avoid social conflict and communism, he believed that the Muslim should create associations in which they could come together and further their interest, and the ulama must take more interest in secular affairs, and found welfare, cultural, economic, and political institutions to lessen social inequalities. Upon this belief, the necessity of a Muslim presence in politics, led Bazargan to the founding of Liberation Movement, and his refusal to go into exile. Beside Taleqani, Bazargan remained in Iran and waged his opposition to the Shah from inside of Iran.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ The rhetoric of Bazargan’s writings has changed after the revolution. Before the revolution he focused on defending Islam against disbelievers, now

After the repression of Liberation Movement in 1963, efforts were made to create organizations of the Third National Front in the United States and in Europe. The Liberation Movement, which was a member of the Third National Front, would upon occasion issue statements in its own name. In North America, Muhammad Nakhshab, Dr. Ibrahim Yazdi, Mustafa Chamran, and Abbas Amir Entezam led the Liberation Movement. Nakhshab was the first Iranian to attempt to synthesize Islam with Socialism and to form a party based on modernist Islam.¹⁰⁴

he was forced to defend it against the guardians of its orthodoxy, the conservative ulama. He made little effort to disguise his commitment to moderation and the rule of law. Before accepting his office as head of the provisional government, Bazargan said "I avoid haste and extremes. I am given to careful study and gradualism. I was this way in the past and will not change my approach in the future" (1982: 27). In a talk at Tehran University, he stated: "Don't expect me to act in the manner of Khomeini who, head down, moves ahead like a bulldozer, crushing rocks, roots and stones in his path. I am a delicate passenger car and must ride on a smooth, asphalted road" (1982: 86). Bazargan's authority and his attempt at maintaining normalcy were challenged by a plethora of political parties and movements advocating various radical policies. After eight months he resigned and retreated from public life, and later return to politics as an opposition party in the Islamic Republic. Comparing his own and Khomeini's relationship with the revolution, he said: "it is astonishing that an eighty-year-old man should be much better attuned to the youth than I, who grew up among the young, in the university, and the revolutionary movement....If you read Khomeini's declarations now, they are very different from what he used to say a year ago, even six months ago. Unconsciously he has adopted the tone of the revolutionaries, and thus he has been able to influence them. I really sense an estrangement and a distance between myself and the people within the revolution, i.e. the young, the tollab, the university people, and the revolutionary guards. I also consider myself a revolutionary. But what I want is in contradiction with what they want, even though our ultimate aims are perhaps identical" (1979: 13-14).

¹⁰⁴ Born in Rasht in 1923, Nakhshab entered politics in 1944 when, as a high school student, he joined the Iran Party. In objection to the party's coalition with the Tudeh, he left the party in 1946. (Moaddel 1993: 143)

He formed first the society of God-worshipping Socialists and later his Iranian People's party, of which neither of them succeeded in attracting many member. Nakhshab left Iran for New York City in the mid-1950s and took a Ph.D. in Public administration at New York University, and worked at United Nations. He represented the Third National Front within the US division of the Iranian Student Confederation, and wrote articles for Mujahed, the exiled organ of the Liberation Movement. In the mid-1960s he began to concentrate on Islamic missionary work, also among Americans. He died in New York on the eve of the Islamic Revolution.

Yazdi, the most controversial leading figure of the Liberation Movement, started his political activities as a student member of the National Resistance Movement.¹⁰⁵ He left Iran in 1962 to study medicine in United States. He worked as an oncologist in Texas; he remained there until 1979. He helped organize the Liberation Movement American branch and the Islamic Student Society, and served as the group's main link with Khomeini. After the revolution, he became minister for foreign affairs.

Chamran left for the United States in 1959, where he completed a Ph.D. in civil engineering from Berkeley.¹⁰⁶ He founded the California

¹⁰⁵ Yazdi was born in 1931 to a traditional middle-class family in Qazvin. He became a leading member of the Islamic Student Society, in which he was the main assistance of Nakhshab. During the July 1952 events, he organized student support for Mosaddeq. (Akhavi 1980: 34)

¹⁰⁶ Chamran was born in 1933, into a devout family in south of Tehran. At the age of fifteen he began attending Taleqani's lectures at Hedayat Mosque. In 1953 he entered Tehran University, and became active the National Resistance Movement. (LMI 1982: 11)

branch of the Islamic Student Society. In 1964 he left for the Middle East to pursue guerrilla training from the Shia Amal movement in southern Lebanon. After the revolution he became defense minister, and was killed in the Iran-Iraq war in 1981, under dubious circumstances.

Entezam was sent to United States by his father to complete his degree at the University of California at Berkeley.¹⁰⁷ He was active within the Confederation of Iranian Student in America as well as the Islamic Student Society. In the early 1970s he returned to Tehran, and set up a flourishing construction company. He maintained contacts with Yazdi, and after the revolution became a deputy prime minister. He is the only prominent Liberation Movement figure currently in prison. In France, the Liberation Movement and its Islamic Student Society were organized and led mostly by Sadeq Qotbzadeh and Abdul Hassan Bani Sadr. In 1958 Qotbzadeh left Iran for the United States, where he had helped set up the local branch of the Student Confederation.¹⁰⁸ But he left the Confederation on the ground that the Maoists dominated it. He moved to Paris, and was constantly on the move between the United States, Canada, Europe, and the Middle East, serving as the main link between the Islamic Student Society in Europe and the radical Arab states, especially Algeria, Iraq, and Syria, where at one point he

¹⁰⁷ Entezam was born in 1933 into a wealthy carpet-manufacturing family. As a student at Tehran University he was active in the National Resistance Movement, and later became a founding member of the Liberation Movement. (Chehabi 1993: 111)

¹⁰⁸ Qotbzadeh was born in 1936 in Isfahan into a wealthy bazaar family. He was a high school delegate in the National Resistance Movement's ruling council as well as an active member of the Islamic Student Society. (Abrahamian 1982: 448)

acquired Syrian citizenship. After the revolution he became the director of National Iranian Radio and Television. Soon after Qotbzadeh became the first prominent political figure to be executed by the Islamic Republic.

Bani Sadr, who became the first president of the Islamic Republic, went to Paris in the early 1960s to pursue his doctorate in economics, which he never completed.¹⁰⁹ Although he avoided joining any political party, he helped the Liberation Movement and the Third National Front by joining the Islamic Student Society. He wrote numerous articles on Shia Islam as an alternative to the Pahlavi system and on Islamic government and economics. Bani Sadr met Khomeini in 1972, and became his disciple. He helped to promote Khomeini's reputation abroad, seeing in Khomeini a spiritual leader devoid of personal ambition and the means through which the Shah could be overthrown. When Khomeini was expelled from Iraq in 1978, Bani Sadr, along with Yazdi and Qotbzadeh, made arrangements for Khomeini's stay in Paris. The three men acted as interpreters, dealt with the press, and coached Khomeini to make sensible remark regarding women's right and civil liberties. Bani Sader was deposed by the parliament on June 21, 1981, and soon after he fled the country.

¹⁰⁹ Bani sadr was born in 1933 in Hamadan into a moderately prosperous landowning family. His father, Nasrollah, was a highly respected ayatollah. At the university of Tehran, he was a student political leader active in the university branch of the National Front. (Akhavi 1980: 23)

6.3 The Left

The Iranian left was more anti-imperialist than socialist, and the mostly Latin American inspired groups justified their anti-capitalism through the presentation of import-substituting Iranian bourgeoisie in a 'comprador' garb. According to this interpretation, the society and the state were dominated by an oligarchic-comprador alliance, sustained through the support they received from the imperialist center. This pattern of development has left the periphery on the margin of industrialization and has exacerbated existing forms of dependence. In sum, it has enhanced the 'privileged consumer society', which is detrimental to reproductive capital accumulation; it has failed to absorb the surplus labor; it has intensified the inflationary crisis of balance-of-payments problems. This line of reasoning pointed to the idea that the alliance between the center and the upper strata of the periphery is to be blamed for creating consumer capitalism, referred to as the 'insufficient dynamism of peripheral capitalism'.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ However these critiques were the tenets of dependency theories. As a general critique of these theories, it has been said the concept of dependence, fail to grasp the nature of underdevelopment for ignoring or mystifying Marxist class analysis, and for being built upon orthodox economics theory. (see, Geoffrey Kay 1975; James Petras 1978; Colin Leys 1983) It follows that they fail to theorize properly capitalism. In effect, instead of focusing on social relations and state control, that is the social conditions of accumulation, dependency theories tend to focus on distribution, the growth of productive forces and the mechanism with which surplus is drained and growth is blocked. Moreover, it has been said that although dependency theories stand well beyond the myths of modernization theories, it remains within same problematic, as Lipietz puts it elegantly: "it is as though two theorists [liberal and radical] were contemplating the development of history, each of them wearing a watch that has stopped. If the South was stagnating, one theorist could tell you precisely what time it was: if new industrialization was taking

Thus the only way out for the periphery is to disengage from the imperialist ties, since the internal domination patterns would then collapse. Given these drastically mistaken diagnoses, it was not therefore surprising that the left turned for inspiration to models of combat pioneered elsewhere in the Third World, and in particular to the theories of guerilla war prevalent in the late 1960s: in Vietnam, China, Cuba, and Palestine.

In 1971 the left began to take up arms against the regime, believing that the only way to liberation is armed struggle. The strategy of guerrilla warfare became widespread among the young Iranian intelligentsia after the constant defeats of the Tudeh party and the National Front. However, to understand the left's departure from more customary socialist aims and conventional means to achieve it, one must start with the Tudeh experiences as the origins of the Iranian new left.

The Tudeh party was founded in September 1941 soon after the abdication of Reza Shah and the release of twenty-seven members of the famous Fifty-Three¹¹¹. Ten days after their release they met at the

home of Soleiman Iskandri, the highly respected radical prince and former parliamentary socialist leader. The meeting was also attended by a host of older and younger political associates of Iskandri who had been opposed to Reza Shah. The meeting announced the formation of a

place, another would say it was time for 'take off'. If the newly industrialized countries were in crisis, the other would reply, I told you so"(1987: 3).

¹¹¹ In May 1937 the police detained fifty-three men and accused them of forming a secret collectivist organization. The group became famous as 'the Fifty-three', and few years later formed the nucleus of the Tudeh party.

political organization with the label of Hezb-e Tudeh-e Iran (The Party of the Iranian Masses), and elected Iskandari as the party chairman, who had impressive political backgrounds.¹¹²

At the time of its foundation, the Tudeh party was a broad-based alliance of various progressive, anti-despotic, democrat, communist, and non-Marxists forces. It was a popular democratic front, rather than a class-affiliated party. The party provisional program, published in February 1942, stressed the need to eliminate the vestiges of Reza Shah's dictatorship; to protect constitutional laws, civil liberties, and human rights; to safeguard the rights of all citizens, especially of the masses; and to participate in the world wide struggle for democracy against fascism. The party set itself few broad objectives: the establishment of parliamentary democracy; the reconstruction of the national economy; and greater public welfare and social justice. Although the Marxist faction of the party was predominant in the party leadership, the party kept Marxist demand out of its program and did not call itself communist. This was a concession to avoid attacks from the ulama. (Jami 1983: 488-90)

In October 1942 the party convened its First Provisional Conference, and adopted a detailed program instead of the provisional program. The new program spelled out specific proposal to attract workers, peasants, intellectuals, women, and craftsmen. The program called for labor legislation, an eight-hour day, paid vacations, overtime scales,

¹¹² As a radical nobleman he was an outspoken admirer of Rousseau, Saint-Simon, and Comte. His career was to span three generations of radicalism in Iran: he fought in the Constitutional Revolution, helped establish the Democrat party of 1909-1919, led the Socialist party in 1921-1926, and headed the Tudeh party in 1942. (Ladjevardi 1985: 23)

disability insurance, government-subsidized housing, pensions, and a ban on child labor. To peasant, it offered the redistribution of state and crown lands. To women, it promised political rights, welfare assistance for indigent mothers, and equal pay for equal pay. To craftsmen, it offered viable guild, state-subsidized workshops, and protection from foreign competition. (Abrahamian 1982: 284)

The most notable success of the Tudeh party, however, was in reorganizing Iran's labor movement. The Trade Union of the Workers of Iran, commonly known as the Central Council, was reorganized in the winter of 1942. Despite the Council's efforts to present itself as an independent body from the Tudeh party, it was too visibly a creation of the Tudeh party, since all of its founders were member of the party.¹¹³ By 1944, The Tudeh party was ready to announce the merger of four union federations into Central Council of Federated Trade Unions of Iranian Workers and Toilers, which brought the labor movement under the party control. While expanding and consolidating its mass organizations, the Tudeh also participated in the election for the Fourteenth *Majles* (Parliament), sponsoring twenty-three candidates. Of the list, eight were elected. (Ladjevardi 1985: 45)

¹¹³ Not only were all the founders of the Central Council members of the Tudeh party, but three-fourth of them were intellectual. For example, Ardeshir Ovanessian was a member of the Tudeh Central Committee and the party's chief ideologue. Other founders included Ibrahim Mahzari, Zia Alamouti, and Ali Kobari members of the Tudeh Central Committee; Hossien Jahani, involved in socialist politics since 1925; Mehdi Keimaram, an experienced labor leader who had represented the shoemakers in 1921; and Anvar Khomeini, a journalist who was elected a member of the Tudeh Propaganda Committee in 1944. (Ladjevadi 1985: 32)

Although the Tudeh deputies were in a definite minority, holding only 8 out of 136 seats, this outcome was widely understood as a success. It was for the first time in Iranian history a secular radical organization had found popular support, and was the only party with a well-designed structure, and a nationwide organization. By August 1946 the Tudeh reached its zenith, holding three cabinet ministries in Qavam's government. The Tudeh had considerable support among intellectuals, especially writers. They included Nima Yushej, the father of modern poetry; Bahar, the living symbol of classical poetry; Sadeq Hedayat, the leading figure of modern Persian literature. The Tudeh influence among the military officer was even more impressive. After 1949 the Tudeh began to create its Military Organization. Colonel Siamak and Ex-Capitan Rouzbeh headed the organization. By 1954 the organization had over 500 members, of whom 466 were brought to trial during the next three years.¹¹⁴

There have been a number of crises in the Tudeh party, partly due to its policies, especially its unswerving loyalty to the Soviet Union, and partly because of forces and circumstances outside its control. The first internal division was in 1948, when a group of members, led by Khalil Maleki, left the party.¹¹⁵ Maleki's main criticism was the party's

¹¹⁴ They included 22 colonels, 69 major, 100 captains, 193 lieutenants, 19 sergeants, and 63 cadets. Rouzbeh, Siamak, and 25 others were executed; 144 were sentenced to life imprisonment; 119 to fifteen years; 79 to ten years; and the others to shorter terms ranging from eight years to eighteen months. (Abrahamian 1982: 338)

¹¹⁵ These "separatists", as they were labeled, included nine prominent intellectuals, three of whom sat on the Central Committee of Tehran Province: Tavalloli and Parvizi, two famous writers from Shiraz; Eshaq, the economist; Makinezhad, a junior member of the Fifty-Three; Jala al-Ahmad, a young essayist; Ibrahim Golestan, a film director; Nader Naderpour, a well-

policy of giving unconditional support to the Soviet Union. For example, Tudeh party astonished everyone by rejecting the nationalization policy of Iranian oil and instead demanded for the abrogation of the 1933 Agreement alone. Maleki formed a new organization, naming it after his newspaper the Third Force, and soon attracted a large number of students, intellectuals, and workers, including the support of the youth and women's sections of the Toilers' party. The Third Force gave full support to Mosaddeq's government, denounced the clergy of mixing politics with religion, and accused the Tudeh party of collaborating blindly with Kremlin.

The Third Force tried to create an independent socialist position in Iran. Maleki, who died in 1969, was unable to develop this position, which was neither a Stalinist nor a social-democratic one, he argued that the opposition could help destroy feudalism if it openly supported the liberal wing of the upper class against the more reactionary landlords. "He ended up a victim of the regime's manipulations, alternately licensed and then silenced by it" (Halliday 1979: 234).

During Mosaddeq's period, between April 1951 and August 1953, the Tudeh gradually reemerged as a major political force and its leadership was confronted with a second division within the party. The question was whether or not to support the Mosaddeq administration. A group led by Nouraldin Kianouri favored an alliance with Mosaddeq and the National Front, arguing that his government represented bourgeois-democratic stage of revolution, and it could be transformed into a socialist revolution through mass action. Another group around Reza

known poet; Ahmad Aram, another well-know poet; and Dr. Rahim Abedi, a professor of chemistry. (Maleki 1951: 23)

Radmanesh not only opposed such an alliance but also advocated direct confrontations with the National Front. They argued that Mosaddeq was nothing but an agent of American imperialism, and his attempt to nationalize the Iranian oil as an imperialist conspiracy against the Soviet Union, which still claimed the concession for north Persian oil. (Halliday 1979: 234)

Although the debate did not lead to an actual split in the party, it was won by the hard-liners whose approach was adopted as the official policy of the party towards Mosaddeq. Kianouri was also later to declare that our left-wing sectarian mistakes were due to a failure in understanding the role of the national bourgeoisie. (1959: 61) Another moderate leader, Iraj Iskandari explained:

During the struggle for the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry we did not support Mossadeq, who undoubtedly represented the interests of the national bourgeoisie. We thought along these lines: Mossadeq is fighting for the nationalization of Iranian oil, but the American imperialists are backing his movement, which means that they are arguing it. And so we drew the incorrect conclusion that the communists should not support the nationalist movement. (1959: 10)

Mosaddeq and his National Front also opposed the formation of a united front with the Tudeh party, for they believed that if they allied with the Tudeh they would antagonize the United States. These mutual suspicions between the Tudeh and the National Front eventually helped to bring about the 1953 coup which destroyed Mosaddeq government and dismantled the Tudeh's effective organizations. From 1953 to 1958, three thousand party members were arrested and severely punished. Forty were executed. (Abrahamian 1982: 327) By

1959, the party had lost an impressive underground organization, and was a mere shadow of its former self. The Tudeh leadership was weakened by death, infirmities of old age, and defection. Some experienced leaders died in exile, and others removed themselves from party politics.

Moreover, the party was battered by more major splits that increased its isolation from the younger generation of militants inside the country. The first split was in 1964, when a group of Kurdish members left the party and revived the Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran. The second split occurred in 1965 when, in wake of the Sino-Soviet dispute, three members of the Central Committee—Qassemi, Forutan, and Seqai—left the Tudeh and founded a new group called the Tofan Marxist-Leninist Organization. This group accused the Tudeh leaders of blindly following the Soviet political lines, and refusing to learn from Mao's teaching on how to mobilize the peasantry for a mass armed struggle. This split marked the beginning of a period in which pro-Chinese policies of one sort or another were dominant within Iranian exile circles. The final split was in 1966, when a group of young members left the party and formed their own Revolutionary Organization of the Tudeh Party Abroad. This group viewed itself as Maoist, and accepted the revolution to begin in the villages, spread throughout the countryside, and then surround the cities. (Halliday 1979: 232-34)

By the mid-1960s, the Tudeh party was viewed by the most of young militants as a historically discredited party with an "anti-popular" policy; some went even further and regarded the Tudeh to be party of "traitors". This view was hold by the guerilla groups, who refused to

form a united front with the Tudeh. The climate of this period was one of immense frustration among the younger generation of militants who blamed the National Front and the Tudeh party for relying on constitutional methods. Out of this period there emerged a number of different groups, each planning to challenge the military might of the Pahlavi state through armed struggle.

Of such groupings, the Marxist Feda'iyan was by far the most significant who was able to sustain armed opposition to the regime until its downfall. The nucleus of the first Feda'iyan gained a national reputation on February 8, 1971, when thirteen young men armed with rifles, machine guns, and hand grenades attacked the gendarmerie post in the village of Siahkal on the edge of the Caspian forest.

In strictly military terms the attack was failure, since the security forces repulsed the group, and within few days fifteen guerrillas had been killed or captured. But politically, the Siahkal event implanted the seeds of courage and awareness upon the ancient piles of fear and hopelessness, at least within the student milieu where the groups recruited. By Siahkal, Feda'iyan wanted to emphasize that there is no alternative except to take arms against the regime.

It was exactly due to the significant political impact of this movement that the Shah's regime utilized a tremendous amount of all possible methods in order to destroy these combatants, and to extinguish their revolutionary message. The Feda'iyan Organization was founded of two militant groups. Bijan Jazani and his colleagues established the first

group, which was inheriting Tudeh Party and National Front traditions, in April 1963.¹¹⁶

In 1968 the SAVAK infiltrated the group and arrested Jazani and fourteen other members of his group. Hamid Ashraf, the youngest member, avoided arrest and found enough recruits to keep the group alive.¹¹⁷

The second group was formed in 1967, and was led by two university students, Massoud Ahmadzade and Amir-Parviz Pouyan.¹¹⁸ Both groups had reached the conclusion that the powerful American influence in Iran and the harsh repression against liberal dissidents had made peaceful activism entirely ineffective. Armed struggle was therefore viewed as the only escape towards liberty. The two groups merged in 1970 to form the Organization of the Iranian People's Feda'iyān Guerrillas (Sazman-e Cherikhaḡe Feda'iyān-e Khalq).

¹¹⁶ Jazani, the circle's central figure, was a student of political science who had been in and out of prison since the mid-1950s. Born in 1937, he had completed high school in his home town, Tehran, and had been active in the youth section of the Tudeh before leaving the party and forming his own secret group. (Feda'ī 1969: 1-28)

¹¹⁷ Ashraf, born in Tehran 1946, as a high school student joined Maleki's socialist circle and in 1964 entered the university and studied engineering, where he met the other member of his group. (Fedai 1969: 1-28)

¹¹⁸ Ahmadzadeh, the son of a prominent Mosaddeq supporter, as a high school student joined the National Front. But while studying mathematics in Aryamehr University in Tehran during the mid-1960s, he was drawn to Marxism, and in 1967 formed a secret circle to discuss the works of Che Guevara, Régis Debray, and Carlos Marighella. Pouyan, born in 1946 in Mashad, studied in the local high school, where he joined the National Front. But while studying literature in the National University in Tehran during the mid-1960s, he turned toward Marxism, especially to the example of Castro. (Abrahamian 1982: 485)

The central thesis of the Feda'iyān was the necessity for armed actions by a vanguard group as the only way to challenge the regime. There are two theoretical texts written in the course of 1970 by the leaders of the Feda'iyān which have served as the basis for the strategy of guerrilla warfare:

On the Necessity of Armed Struggle and a Refutation of the Theory of 'Survival', by Pouyan, written in the spring of 1970.

Armed Struggle: Both a Strategy and a Tactic, by Ahmadzadeh, written in the summer of 1970.

Pouyan tries to refute the theory which believes that to avoid being annihilated by the regime, one must work within such limits as to not provoke the military dictatorship to which he refers as "the theory of 'survival' ". It is also one of the first essays published by the group that puts forward the theory trying to prove the correctness of armed practice. As Pouyan writes:

Under the circumstances where the revolutionary intellectuals lack any type of direct and firm relationship with the masses, our situation is not like the example of "fish living in the sea of the people's support". Rather, it is the case of small and scattered fishes surrounded by crocodiles and herons. The terror and suppression, the absence of any democratic conditions, has made the establishment of contact with our own people extremely difficult... To break the spell of our weakness and to inspire the people into action we must resort to revolutionary armed struggle. (1970: 7)

Pouyan lays great stress on the need to win support amongst the population by liberating the proletariat from the stifling culture,

arming it with ideological ammunition, and shattering the illusion that the people are powerless, with what he calls 'revolutionary power'. And that the absence of vanguard proletarian circles, which have come into being through a relationship with an organized proletariat in the process of spontaneous struggles, has rendered contact with the proletariat impossible. This means that the political opposition groups are unable to establish contact with politically conscious individual workers. Therefore, Pouyan emphasizes, at the present moment "offensive" "propaganda" and "exercise of revolutionary power" is the only correct tactics.

Whereas Ahmadzadeh seems to lay stress on the armed struggle as a strategy for the whole revolutionary movement and not as an initial tactic which will set in motion other political movement of mass character. Ahmadzadeh writes:

If we wish to conclude, we can propose the following general line for the revolutionary groups of Iran: Under the present conditions, armed struggle constitutes the major form of struggle. At the beginning, it has a dominantly agitational aspect. Politically, the guerrilla struggle in the city, either for a movement as a whole or for the guerrilla struggle in the countryside, plays a vital and crucial role. However, urban guerrillas can exist specifically in Teheran and to a lesser extent in a few other major cities. Thus, considering the vital principle of dispersing the forces of the enemy and in this regard noting that the military aspect of the struggle will rapidly and increasingly gain importance; it is the duty of the revolutionary groups to start their political-military work wherever it seems expedient considering the enemy's military potential, the technical and tactical possibilities of

our own forces, the social and economic conditions of the people, and the geographical conditions. (1970:55)

Unlike the strategy of national liberation that called for unity with the national bourgeoisie, Ahmadzade argued that the so-called national bourgeoisie has no longer a revolutionary and progressive role. He concludes that despite the revolutions democratic character in the first stage “struggle with the imperialist dominion, i.e. the world capital, has some elements of struggle with the capital itself”. Therefore some elements of a socialist revolution are also born in this struggle. “This anti-imperialist struggle is starting to grow up while the struggle is going on”. So the national bourgeoisie essentially cannot be constant in such a struggle and because of the historical conditions of its existence and its relations with the foreign capital are wavering and unable to mobilize the masses. He even took a step further and talked about its absolution: “the national bourgeoisie has weakened under the pressure of the foreign capital before it grows at all, it is missing the possibility of class organization and will finally die away gradually”. On the role and position of the petty-bourgeoisie, he writes that “because of the material conditions of its production, it can never constitute an independent political power, so it should either be led by a proletariat or give itself to the bourgeoisie” (1970: 12-15).

During the eight years, between 1971-1979, the Fada'iyan came under severe attacks by the regime security forces. Almost all the founding members and top cadres—three hundred people—were executed, while

a further three hundred are estimated to have been killed in clashes with the forces of the regime.¹¹⁹

By late 1975, the Feda'iyān had suffered such heavy losses that they began to reconsider their tactics and were divided into two factions. The majority, led by Ashraf, defended the strategy of guerrilla warfare until they sparked off a mass uprising. The minority, who had been drawn to the Tudeh thinking in the course of discussion with other prisoners, advocated a political approach instead of armed confrontations, especially among factory workers, demanding also unity with the Tudeh party. In mid-1976, this group joined to the Tudeh and denounced the theory of armed struggle as a deviation from Marxism.

That the Iranian left played a significant role in the 1979 revolution is irrefutable. In fact, it was the left guerrilla groups—principally, the Feda'iyān—who carried out the armed insurrections and defeated the Shah's Imperial Guard on 9-11 February. However, the left failed to play a hegemonic role in the mass movement, or to influence its revolutionary outcome. As a result of their heroic reputation, the left

¹¹⁹ Those who were killed either in prison execution, under torture, or in shoot-outs with the security forces included Jazani, Ahmadzadeh, Pouyan, and Ashraf. The Feda'iyān, on the other hand, had succeeded in replenishing its heavy losses, carrying out a series of clandestine operations: holding up five banks, assassinating two police informers, an industrialist some of whose workers had been shot during a strike in 1971, and the chief military prosecutor; and bombing the embassies of Britain, Oman, and the United States, the offices of International Telephone and Telegraph, Trans World Airlines, and the Iran-American Society, and the police headquarters in Tehran, Tabriz, Rasht, Gorgan, Mashad, and Abadan.

began to enjoy an unprecedented following and positive image only after the Islamic Republic came into existence. The history of left movement in Iran has been marked with mistakes, tragedies, and setbacks. But it is as yet untested. The socialist discourse is widespread in Iranian society. The left still remains a considerable political force to be reckoned with in the political arena of Iran.

7. Conclusions

Let me begin my conclusion by saying that Iran failed in the 1960s and the 1970s to experience a transformation similar to those of Southern European countries: with a strong social democratic movement defending democracy and civil rights; maintaining a check against the revival of traditionalist forces; and creating a relatively even distribution of economic gains. The developmental model adopted in Iran did not penetrate deep—in terms of the dissolution of traditional social structures and the gradual marketization of agricultural petty producers—and the economic growth was faltering. The state, which appeared to have completed its transformation into a capitalist one, was handicapped by its very own authoritarian form whose rules were far from being settled or universally accepted. In giving way to clientelism, the state rapidly lost its ability to fulfill its accumulation function vis-à-vis the bourgeoisie. Its legitimacy already eroded in the eyes of the social groups excluded from the clientelistic equation, who began to develop anti-capitalist sentiment and disinclined to endorse to state power as such.

7.1 State and Accumulation

The starting point of our analysis has been the idea that the persistence of the simple commodity production and its articulation to capital during the twentieth century in Iran, provide some key elements in explaining the emergence of the authoritarian state form

as well as the nature of economic development in this period. The fundamental postulate of this study has been that the most important presupposition for capitalist development is the ability of the bourgeoisie to expand its power and hegemony over all societal levels by causing the disintegration of the antagonistic modes of production. We argued that because of its historical weakness, the peripheral capitalist class cannot exercise class domination through economic and ideological hegemony, and is thus forced to resort to the mediation of the state. In this situation, the state assumes a crucial role in establishing the prior and essential conditions for the development of modern industrial capitalism. To do this, the state had to become autonomous from the fundamental classes, especially from those connected with earlier regimes of accumulation, and from the popular masses. To break the old balance, and to use the state to create managerial personnel who can play the part of the ruling classes within a new regime of accumulation, the Pahlavi state developed into an alien force not only vis-à-vis the subordinate classes but also the fundamental classes as well, even while maintaining the long-term interest of the latter.

7.2 State and Class

The development of the authoritarian state during the period 1953-77 antagonized and excluded a great number of indigenous classes from state power. The Pahlavi state thus became the personal/institutional embodiment of a historically peculiar form of the class alliance/compromise that lacked any solid bases. It was based upon a

system of political exclusion of the ongoing activated popular social classes by closing the democratic channels of the access to the government.

The distinctive feature of the Pahlavi state was its limited capability of promoting both growth and welfare and, therefore, was marked by its authoritarian developmentalist regime, which is reform oriented and enjoys a high degree of autonomy from vested elite interests. Despite their growth, the new middle class, whose technocratic and managerial abilities were essential to both private and public bureaucracies, was excluded from taking part in the state's decision-making. The state's mode of governance, which was based on the supreme patron – the Shah considerably antagonized the new middle class. More critical for the disintegration of the Pahlavi state was the withdrawal of support by the new middle class, since they lacked political power and denied any meaningful political participation. The traditional petty bourgeoisie, who mainly concentrated in the bazaar – centers of small commodity production and exchange in the urban areas, was also antagonized by the Shah's regime from the early 1960s. This class comprised three closely-knit groups. Its core group was bazaaris with almost half a million merchants, shopkeepers, traders, and workshop owners.

Another prominent class crucial to the Iranian social structure and Shah's overthrow was the urban working class, in particular, the oil workers. They were in a classically strategic position to affect national politics via the strike weapon. The total number of working-class people in Iran would probably exceed four million. The state sought to achieve industrial peace with the working class without politically

activating them. This turned out to be a fiasco, since industrial peace would have implied the existence of independent working-class organization. After the coup of 1953, the Shah decisively crushed the existing unions, instead creating state-run unions whose principle object were securing the political and ideological positions of the regime. However, the Iranian working class was not only excluded from the political participation but also was subjected to physical repression and political oppression in the work places.

7.3 Revolutionary Situations

Rapid industrial growth between 1963 and 1977 was the weak cement which had held the political spectrum within manageable limits. The cohesion through the market, however, exhibited its fragility in crucially depending on the performance of the economy. When the expectations of ever-rising material wealth were becoming clearly frustrated, the economy could not continue in the role of guarantor of social cohesion, and instead revealed itself as the source of conflict. The crack in the governing group began by August 1977, when the Shah replaced the largely corrupt and bureaucratic Cabinet of Amir Abbas Hovaida, who had headed the government for the previous twelve years, with the mainly technocratic government of Jamshid Amouzegar, who headed the more 'progressive wing' of the Resurgence party. This change, though too little, encouraged the opposition to raise its voice, allowing more and more of the accumulated grievances of the past came to the surface.

The revolutionary process went through several steadily stages before openly calling for the establishment of either a republic or an Islamic republic. Until mid-1977, the opposition focused its energies on indoor activities. The turning point began on November 19, when, in a series of poetry recitals, attended by some 10,000 students, organized by the Writers' Association, the police attempted to disband the tenth session. As a result, the students overflowed into streets, clashing with the police, in which one student was killed, over seventy were injured, and some one hundred were arrested.

Another event, which proved to be major turning point in bringing about the revolutionary situations, was the publication of an article, written under a pseudonym in the daily newspaper *Ittilaat* that mounted an attack against the anti-regime clergy, calling them "black reactionaries" and accusing Khomeini of black (i.e. British) imperialism, who in his youth had worked as a British spy and, to top it all, had written erotic Sufi poetry. The article outraged the 'holy' city of Qum, leading to large street demonstrations.

Thus, trying to stop the opposition by force, the government reinforced the revolutionary situation, and by launching reforms, the government strengthened simply the opposition on one hand, and weakened the state on the other hand. When the Shah tried to compromise with the leader of moderate opposition, he discovered to his disappointment that these leaders had no longer the capability to contain popular movements. "These popular movements have been led, staffed, and supported not by the most downtrodden and oppressed member of society, but by people who, while having plenty to fight for and against, also had something to fight with"(Aya 1990: 37).

7.4 Revolutionary Contenders

To bring about social-revolutionary outcomes, revolutionary situations are not enough, two factors are needed: revolutionary vanguard had to seize power, and set out to remake society. So no vanguard, no revolution. This is because people do not automatically mobilize for collective action, no matter how revolutionary intention they may have. They need to have some kind of organization, offices of a directing, formal or informal, to channel discontent and enable action. A decisive factor in endowing people with tactical power, thus, is the intervention of outside agencies, i.e. opposition parties and/or revolutionary armies, that crack apart established power domains by superior firepower—as well as through coalition with group near the centers of power, including alliances improvised on the age-old rule that the enemy of one's enemy is one's friend.

Given that the dominant political struggle against the Shah came from secular nationalist and leftist forces, combined with the successive wave of secularization in the past two decade, the ulama saw that a state that would come out of the fall Shah, could not be based on religious legitimation, leading to total decline of the ulama power and resources. The militant secularism of the Reza Shah came to signify political control over religious life by bureaucrats, rather than separation of religion and state. The corollary of such an understanding of the relationship between religion and the state, together with the secular and democratic commitment of the National Front and the left, threatened the religious establishment. At this conjunction, the ulama were convinced that the alliance with the Shah

against the menace of democracy and secularism is the their best option in order to restore the status of the Islam in the society

But in the post-1953 period, the situation began to change. The more the Shah insisted on his secular antireligious ideology, the less his critics applauded him. The explicit ideology to which the Shah's reforms referred to was nationalism. And the more nationalism became a modernizing ideology, especially the more was applied in the direction of reforming the population to prepare them for the new model state, the less nationalism was appealed to in formulating an oppositional claim in struggle against the state. For politically repressed people, whatever the state ideology was that ideology was not right.

This led the ulama to unite against the Shah. It may therefore be argued that the modernist zeal of the Shah became uniquely instrumental in coalescing the various elements of popular culture into an Islamic-populism reaction. The drift towards populist rhetoric has been materially reinforced by a social structure dominated by small producer, which did not allow either a liberal-bourgeois or a social democratic ideology to develop in a pure form. In terms of the articulation of their ideologies with popular demands, the ulama faced much less difficulty than the left and liberal-nationalist forces. Despite their attempts, the two major political forces commonly referred to as the left and the liberal remained unable to present clearly differentiated images to the public. While the religious movement riding on the social mobility of an era of rapid development, introduced identifiable revolutionary Islamic discourse which clearly borrowed from populism, but the populist tenor remained dominant.

The Islamic discourse in its populist rhetoric emerged as a radical projects for renovating state and society against the Shah's reactionary violence. These Islamic-populist projects by which the Iranian revolution is identified and remembered have been imposed on popular movements by certain of their coalition partners, often by revolutionary intellectuals; otherwise ordinary people's notion of utopia being their own idea of existing society minus its most disagreeable and oppressive features. Khomeinism, as a form of populism and not fundamentalism, was an important factor fashioning the revolutionary ideology of the 1979 revolution.

Khomeini created a broad coalition of social forces ranging from the bazaars and the clergy to the intelligentsia and the urban middle-classes, including the religious Liberation Movement, the secular National Front, and the new guerilla groups. Although all recognizing the leadership of Khomeini, the coalition was primarily based on tactical considerations by all sides. By adopting a religious-oriented populist strategy, Khomeini made the maximum political capital of the breakdown of government.

It was not religious revival as such that explains the words and actions of revolutionary masses, on the contrary, their radicalism was wholly tactical, and their revolutionary interventions an attempt to turn high-level political crises to their own immediate sectional advantage, taking the opportunity afforded by a breakdown of state power to reclaim property and prerogatives lately usurped by dominant groups. Such was the context within which Khomeini-National Front alliance was formed: the National Front did not exist as a solid nationwide network, it was Khomeini who invited them to join the dance, and it was Khomeini who told them that the dance was over and that the time had come for them to return home.

8. APPENDIX: Central years and dates in Iran 20th century history until 1979 revolution.

Note: The Iranian solar calendar year, which start on March 21, differs from the Gregorian calendar. In converting the Iranian year to that of Gregorian, various writers have come up with different years, which do not vary more than a year.

1904 Social Democratic Party were established in Mashhad, Tabriz and Tehran

THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION June 1905-August 1906

1906 (5.8) Mozaffar-ed-Din Shah of Qajar Dynasty signed the degree making Iran a constitutional monarchy.

(6.10) The first session of the Majles (the parliament)

(30.12) Promulgation of Iran's Constitution

First trade union in Kouchehi print shop in Tehran

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE CONSTITUTION August 1906-June 1908

1907 (8.1) Mozaffar-ed-Din Shah died

(January) Crown Prince Mohammad-Ali became Shah, and from the beginning of his reign endeavored to restore to the monarchy its absolute powers.

(10.9) Social Democratic Party called for recognition of the workers right to strike for political as well as economical objectives. The Social Democrats also protested against attempts to force striking workers back to work. The Party urged to institute free and compulsory education for all classes of society and called for the enactment of an eight-hour work day - a demand that went unheeded for the next forty years.

Supplementary Law

- 1908** (26.5) The British found oil in large quantity. Both the British and Russians had right to explore for oil, but Russian found none.
- (23.6) The return of the absolutism. Mohammad-Ali Shah forced the Majles to suspend its work.
- (22.7) Mohammad-Ali Shah bombarded the Majles and civil war broke out between the supporters of constitutionalism and absolutism.

THE PERIOD OF DISINTEGRATION 1909-1921

- 1909** (In summer) Constitutionalist win civil war and forced Mohammad-Ali Shah to flee to Czarist Russia.
- (26.6) Constitutionalist gave the throne to Mohammad-Ali Shah 13-years old son Crown Prince Ahmad. Nasser-ol-Molk became serving as regent. Iran returned to its experiment constitutional monarchy.
- Formation of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, later known as the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company and still later as British Petroleum.
- 1909-1911** The second session of the Majles
- 1911** Gendarmerie was founded.
- 1911-1914** Nasser-ol-Molk as regent governed the country without the legislative branch.
- 1914** Ahmed Shah reached the legal age of eighteen. The regent was dismissed, and elections were held for the Majles.
- 1914-1915** Third session of Majles. After the occupation of Iran 1915 by Russian, Turkish, and British force the work of Majles was suspended.

- 1916** 1916-1920 Iran lacked a functioning legislative branch.
- The British created the third unit of Iranian army, including six thousand men. It was called South Persia Rifles.
- 1917** October Revolution radically changed the role of Russia and Great Britain in Iran. Henceforth Russia, which had previously identified with the most reactionary elements in Iran society, became the ally of the working class, with the long-term aim of converting Iran into a Soviet-type state. On the other hand Great Britain, heretofore identified with Iran's constitutional revolution but now apprehensive of Communist influence in Iran, cooperated with the privileged classes to establish and support an autocratic monarchy.
- 1919** Bakers and the textile-shop clerks formed their own trade unions in Tehran.
- (August) Iranian government approval of a treaty making Britain responsible for Iran's financial and military affairs. Widespread opposition, however, nullified this treaty in Iran and by Britain decision to reduce its armed forces stationed abroad. The British decided instead to sponsor a "stable and strong" government in Iran rather than intervene directly in the country's affairs.
- 1920** The Edalat Committee held its first congress in Anzali, calling itself the Persian Communist Party.
- (12.12) Socialist Republic of Gilan (Azerbaijan province) was established. The province was still under Soviet occupation.

THE RISE OF REZA SHAH 1921-1925

- 1921** (21.2) Reza-Khan (commander of the Cossacks) professing allegiance to Ahmad Shah, marched into Tehran and together with Sayyed-Zia Tabataba'i, an allegedly pro-British journalist, took control of the government. He dismissed the cabinet, arrested a large number of officials, and appointed Sayyed-Zia prime minister. Within a few

month Reza Khan himself became minister of war. Although it has not yet been conclusively established that Great Britain did in fact stage-manage this coup d'état, it can be stated with certainty that soon thereafter the British government did support Reza Khan's subsequent rise to greater power.

(October) General Trade Union of the Workers of Tehran was formed (Ettehadieh-e Omoumieh Kargaran-e Tehran), and by 1922 GTU organized 8000 of Tehran's 30,000 workers. Other cities in close proximity to Russia also developed labor organizations.

1922 By the end of 1922 Reza Khan had demonstrated his capabilities as an army officer by providing Iran with two years of unprecedented internal security.

1923 (25.10) Reza Khan was elected as the prime minister.

1925 (30.10) Qajar dynasty, which had ruled Iran since the eighteenth century, was deposed.

(12.12) Reza Khan becomes the founder of the Pahlavi dynasty. Only a handful of Majles deputies, including Dr. Mohammad Mosaddeq, opposed the change of dynasties. The rest of the deputies joined hands with the army to point Iran once again toward an absolute monarchy. Predictably, as Reza Khan came to the throne in 1925, the liberties of independent institutions such as the Majles, the press, and trade unions were dealt a damaging blow.

(12.12) Amendments to the Constitution, which allowed Reza Khan became as Shah of Iran.

THE REIGN OF REZA SHAH 1926-1941

1926 Reza Shah introduced free elementary education which comprised six years of madrese-je ebteda'i, later renamed dabestan. Reza Shah's primary concern, however, seemed to focus on higher education, followed by interest in secondary schools.

1928 By 1928 Reza Shah had drawn almost all political power in to his own hands. Parliament elections. The government prepared a list of acceptable candidates for the 7th session of the Majles and took steps to prevent the election of any who were not the list. With the conclusion of the 1928 elections, the near-total abolition of the constitutional monarchy was accomplished. Just a few days before the change in dynasties, the last Communist paper Nassihat, was shut down.

National Bank of Iran was founded (Bank Melli Iran).

1929 May Day was celebrated by two thousand workers in out-town garden. The police arrested the 50 union leaders, while another fifty went into hiding.

(4.5) Oil workers suddenly struck in Abadan (in south of Iran, where Anglo-Persian Oil Company was having its oil industry). Abadan general strike commenced with nine thousand of the ten thousand workers participating. The company refused to negotiate on any of the workers demands, economic or political. With the assistance of British Marines from Iraq Iranian troops attacked, as a result twenty workers and fifteen policemen were injured, two hundred men were arrested and imprisoned. Soon after Abadan strike and other similar incidences, Reza Shah ordered the presentation of bill to the Majles outlawing communism.

1930 As more public and private factories were established, the government decided to draw up comprehensive bill dealing with industrial plants, and ILO sent an expert to Iran assist in drafting the regulations. Bill was approved by the Council of Ministers on 10 August 1936.

1931 (12.6) The anti-communist bill was approved, stated that anyone who organized or joined a group whose objective or program included opposition to Iran's constitutional monarchy or support for communism would be subject to three-to ten-year term of imprisonment.

The foreign trade monopoly law was introduced, which gave the state monopoly right over the foreign trade system.

1934 A law was issued concerning the creation of an autonomous University of Tehran with six faculties.

1937 Reza Shah entered into a regional alliance known as the Saadabad Pact, other signatories being Turkey, Iraq, and Afghanistan. This Pact was made to safeguard countries integrity against possible Soviet expansion and subversion.

THE RISE OF MOHAMMED REZA SHAH AND THE YEARS OF CONFRONTATION 1940-1950

1940 When World War broke out, Iran remained officially neutral, but the Shah, his army and his henchmen clearly wished the Germans total success. In 1940 the Allies began to issue warnings to the Iranian government-at first, in informal and private contracts, but later in formal and public notes- that, unless the activities of the German agents in Iran were curtailed, they would take a very serious view of the situation.

1941 (25.8) The Allied forces entered Iran. Political prisoners were freed: political, religious and other meetings could now be held openly: newspapers and books could be published without political censorship: women could wear the chador (vail) and go Out, if they so wished.

(16.9) Mohammad-Reza Shah (22 -years old) ascended the throne

(28.9) Reza Shah left the country with his fourth wife and eight of his children.

Tudeh Party was established.

1944 (26.7) Reza Shah died in exile in South Africa

The Majles adopt a law forbidding the government to negotiate or grant any oil concessions without prior approval and subsequent ratification of the parliament.

1949

(May) Soviet evacuation its troops form Iran.

(June) New ruler Mohammad-Reza Shah felt that his authority should be strengthened. First he caused the Senate to be established, because half the senators were to be appointed by him. The Senate was established formally in 1906 Constitution, but never put it in practice.

Tudeh party activity among women began in 1943 with formation of the women's organizations for party members and the women's society for party sympathizers. After 1949 these two were replaced by a unified Society of Democratic Women.

(September) Iran's First Development Plan began with an expected length of seven years.

(December) The government declared its intension to send the Iranian army to Tabriz and else where in order to "ensure of the Majlis election" in Azerbaijan province. After the reoccupation of the provincial cities, the gallant central Iranian troops inflicted mass "punishment". There was wholesale killing, burning, looting and rape. Since then 10 December, "the day of the Iranian army", has been a public holiday on which "the liberation of Azerbaijan" is celebrated with pomp and circumstances.

PERIOD OF NATIONALIST PREMIER MOSSADDEGH May 1951-August 1953

1951

New grouping calling itself the National Front emerged under the leadership of Dr. Mohammad Mosaddeq. Dr.Mosaddeq becomes prime minister.

(8.3) The nationalization of the oil industry. On February 19, Dr. Mosaddeq proposed to the oil committee of the Majles that industry be nationalized, a proposal that brought forth of extraordinary events. The British government warned that it would take "all possible steps"

to protect such a major British enterprise and hinted that it would "resist by force any effort to take over the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company.

- 1953** (August) The Shah appointed a new prime minister instead Dr. Mosaddeq, but Dr. Mosaddeq refused to recognize him and took control of the army, which had traditionally been under the direct control of the Shah. The Shah left the country. The coup d'état in which the government of Dr. Mohammad Mosaddeq was overthrown. The Shah returned to Iran.

CONSOLIDATION OF POWER 1954-63

- 1954** (30.10) Oil exports were begun by the group of companies, commonly known as the Consortium, and formally as Iranian Oil Participants Ltd., incorporated in London.

- 1956** The Second Development Plan (1956-62)

- 1957** Momammad-Reza Shah encouraged the formation of pro government party Mellion and of a loyal opposition party, Mardom. Both parties were so called Pan-Iranist ones.

State Intelligence and Security Organization (SAVAK) was established.

- 1959** The Industrial and Mining Development Bank of Iran was established.

- 1961** (9.5) Iranian autocracy entered a new stage. The Shah closed the Majles and ruled by decree through the cabinet for the next 2,5 years, after which a group of even more submissive deputies were selected and placed in the legislature.

- 1962** The Third Development Plan (1962-68)

PERIOD OF RAPID INDUSTRIALIZATION AND MODERNIZATION 1963-1977

- 1963** The years 1963-77 are characterized by an increase in authoritarian rule of the regime, facilitated by the lavish oil income.
- (9.1) The Shah announced Iran's White Revolution, which included, among others, a Land Reform Program, a Profit-Sharing Scheme for the industrial workers, and a voting and political rights for women. The national referendum endorsed it, January 26, 1963.
- 1964** Additional three points to The White Revolution Program.
- 1967** Mohammad Reza Shah coronation ceremony.
- Additional three points to The White Revolution Program.
- 1968** The Fourth Development Plan (1968-73)
- 1971** 2500-years celebration of the Iranian Empire in Persepolis
- 1973** The Fifth Development Plan (1973-78)
- Elementary education underwent a complete change.
- 1975** Additional five points to The White Revolution Program.
- Until 1975 Iran nominally had a two-party system. In 1975 the Shah announce that Iran would have a single party, membership in which was obligatory. He called it the "Resurgence party" Rastakhiz. But after mid-1970s, the Shah concluded that to ensure the continued rule of his dynasty it would be best to liberalize his regime. Liberals, nationalist, reformist and leftist forces were not able to take effective advantage of liberalization. Instead, a revolutionary movement rose to topple the Shah.

THE ISLAMIC REVOLUTION 1977-1979

- 1977** The years 1977-79 was a period of social unrest and upheaval
- 1979** The Shah fell.
- 1979** The establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

9. Bibliography

Primary Source in Persian

- Alavi, Bozorg: *Panjah-u-seh nafar*. Tehran:n.p., 1944.
- Bani Sadr, A.: *Eqtesad-e towhidi*. n.p., 1978.
- Bani Sadr, A.: *Khianat be omid*. Paris: n.p., 1982.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: *Mazhab dar Orupa*. Tehran: n.p., 1951.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: *Defa'at*. Tehran: Modarres Publications, 1971.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: *Afat-e towhid*. Houston: Book Distribution Center, 1979.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: Interview given to hamid Algar. *Naser*. February 1, 1981.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: *Bazyabi-e arzeshta*. Tehran: LMI, 1982.
- Bazargan, Mehdi: *Inqilab-i Iran dar Du Harakat*. Tehran: Mehdi Bazargan, 1984.
- Hariri, Naser: *Mosahebeh ba tarikhsazan-e Iran*. Tehran: 1979.
- Hasht sal mobarezeh-e mosalehaneh*. Tehran: Fedai Organization, 1979.
- Jami, N.: *Gozashteh cheraq-e raheh ayandeh*. Tehran:Xxnous, 1983.
- Khomeini, Ruhollah: *Kashf al-Asrar*. Tehran: n.p., 1978.
- Khomeini, Ruhollah: *Velayat-e Faqih: Hokumat-e Islami*. Tehran: n.p., 1978.

Safehati az tarikh-e mo'aser-r Iran. Vol. 5, Tehran: LMI, 1984.

Shariati, Ali: *Fatemeh Fatemeh ast*. Tehran: Shabdiz, 1977.

Shariati, Ali: *Shieh*. Tehran: Hoseiniyeh Ershad, 1979.

Tarikhcheh-e Sazman-e Cherikha-ye Fedai. Tehran: fedai Organization, 1969

Primary and Secondary Sources in English

Abrahamian, Ervand: *Khomeinism: Essays on the Islamic republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Abrahamian, Ervand: *Iran Between Two Revolutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press,(1982) 1983.

Ahmadzadeh, Massoud: *Armed Struggle: Both a Strategy and a Tactic*. New York, 1976.

Alavi, Hamza: "The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh", *New Left Review*, No:74, July-August 1972: 59-81.

Alavi, Hamza: "State and Class Under Peripheral Capitalism", in Alavi, Hamza and Shanin Teodor (eds.), *Introduction to the Sociology of "Developing Societies "*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1982: 289-307.

Ale-Ahmad, Jalal: *Plagued by the West*[Gharbzadeghi]. Trans. Paul Sprachman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Algar, Hamid: *The Islamic Revolution in Iran*. London: Open press, 1983.

Amin, Samir: *Accumulation on a World Scale*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Amirahmadi, Hooshang: *Revolution and Economic Transition- The Iranian Experience*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

- Amuzegar, Jahangir: "The Iranian Economy before and after the Revolution", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol.46 No: 3, Summer 1992:413-425.
- Arjomand, Said Amir: *The Turban for the Crown: The Islamic Revolution in Iran*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Ahmad, Aziz: *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan: 1857-1964*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Akhavi, Sharough: *Religion and Politics in Contemporary Iran*. Albany: State University Press, 1980.
- Arnold, Guy: *Wars in the Third World Since 1945*. London: Cassell, 1991.
- Ashraf, Ahmad: *Mavane- eTarikhi-e Roshdeh Sarmayeh Dary Dar Iran: Dowreh-e Qajarieh*. (Historical Obstacles in the Development of Capitalism in Iran: Qajar period) Tehran: Zamineh, 1359 (1981).
- Aya, Rod: *Rethinking Revolutions and Collective Violence*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis Press, 1990.
- Bakhash, Shaul: *The Reign of the Ayatullahs: Iran and the Islamic Revolution*. New York: Basic Books Press, 1984.
- Baldwin, George: *Planning and Development in Iran*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1967.
- Banaji, Jairus: "Modes of Production in a Materialist Conception of History", *Capital & Class*, Autumn 1977: 1-44.
- Banani, Amin: *The Modernization of Iran: 1921-1941*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961.
- Bayat, Assef: *Workers & Revolution in Iran*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd., 1987.
- Beck, Lois: "Revolutionary Iran and its Tribal Peoples", in Asad, T. and Owen, R. (eds.), *The Middle East*. London: MacMillan Press, 1983: 115-126.

- Bill, J.: *The Politics of Iran: Groups, Classes, and Modernization*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1972.
- Bharier, Julian: *Economic Development in Iran 1900-1970*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Bonefeld, Werner: "The Reformulation of State Theory", in Bonefeld, W and Holloway, J. (eds.), *Post-Fordism & Social Form-A Marxist debate on the Post-Fordist State*. London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991: 35-68.
- Bonefeld, Werner & "Introduction: Post-Fordism and Social Form", in Holloway, John: Bonefeld, W and Holloway, J (eds.), *Post-Fordism & Social Form-A Marxist debate on the Post-Fordist State*. London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991: 1-7.
- Brenner, R.& "The Regulation Approach: Theory and History", Glick, M .*New Left Review* , No:188,1991: 45-119.
- Buci-Glucksmann, Christine: *Gramsci and The State*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher: *Global Formation- Structures of the World Economy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1989.
- Chehabi, Hooshang: *Iranian Politics and Religious Modernism- The Liberation Movement of Iran Under The Shah and Khomeini*. London: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 1990.
- Clarke, Simon: "Overaccumulation, Class Struggle and The Regulation Approach", in Bonefeld, W. and Holloway, J.(eds.), *Post-Fordism & Social Form – A Marxist debate on the Post-Fordist State*. London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991: 103-134.
- Cottam, R.W.: *Nationalism in Iran*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1979.
- Cottrel, Alvin: "Iran's Armed Forces under the Pahlavi Dynasty", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran under the Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: 389-432.

- Davies, James C. "The J-Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfaction As a Cause of Some Great Revolutions and a Contained Rebellion", in Hugh D. Graham and Ted R. Gurr (eds.), *Violence in America*. New York: signet, 1969:671-709.
- DeVroey, Michel: "A Regulation Approach Interpretation of The Contemporary Crisis", *Capital & Class*, No: 23, Summer 1984: 45-66.
- Eilers, Wilhelm: "Educational and Cultural Development in Iran during The Pahlavi Era", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran under the Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: 303-332.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E: "Some Reminiscences and Reflection on Fieldwork.", In Gillies, E. (ed.), *Witchcraft, Oracles, an Magic among the Azande*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976: 240-254.
- Fallaci, Oriana: "Interview with the Shah", *New Republic*, December 1976.
- Farhi, Farideh: "State Disintegration and Urban-Based Revolutionary Crisis: A Comparative Analysis Iran and Nicaragua", *Comparative Political Studies*, No: 21, 1988: 231-256.
- Fischer, Michael: *Iran: From religious Dispute to Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Fisher, W. B.: *Cambridge History of Iran*. Cambridge, Vol.1, The Land of Iran, Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Foran, John & Goodwin, Jeff: "Revolutionary outcomes in Iran and Nicaragua: Coalition Fragmentation, War, and the Limits of social transformation", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 22 No: 2, April 1993: 210-247.
- Ghods, Reza: "Iranian Nationalism and Reza Shah", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.27, No: 1, January 1991a): 35-45.

- Ghods, Reza: "Government and Society in Iran, 1926-34" *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.27, No: 2, April 1991b): 219-230.
- Gold, D. & Wright,E.: "Recent Development in Marxist Theories of The Lo, C. & Capitalist State", *Monthly Review*, Vol.: 23, No:5, 1975: 29-43.
- Goldfrank, Walter L.: "Theories of revolution and Revolution without Theory: The Case of Mexico", *Theory and Society*, Vol. 7, 1979: 135-165.
- Goldstone, Jack A.: "Theories of Revolution: The Third Generation," *World Politics*, No: 32, 1980: 425-453.
- Gurr, Ted Robert: *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Gurr, Ted Robert: "The Revolution-Social Change Nexus", *Comparative Politics*, No: 5, 1973: 359-392.
- Halliday, Fred: *IRAN: Dictatorship and Development*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., (1979) 1980.
- Held, David: "Central Perspectives on The Modern State", in McLennan, Gregor & Held, David and Hall, Stuart (eds.), *The Idea of The Modern State*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1984: 29-79.
- Hetherington, Norriss: "Industrialization and Revolution in Iran: Forced Norris S.: Progress or Unmet Expectation?" *The Middle East Journal*, Vol.36, No:3, Summer 1982:362-373.
- Hiro, Dilip: *Iran Under the Ayatullahs*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Hirsch, Joachim: "Fordism and Post-Fordism: The Present Social Crisis and its Consequences", in Bonefeld , Werner and Holloway, John (eds.), *Post-Fordism & Social Form-Marxist debate on The Post-Fordist State*.London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd.,1991:8-34.
- Holloway, John & Picciotto, Sol: "Introduction: Towards a Materialist Theory of The State", in Holloway,J. and Picciotto,S.

- (eds.), *State and Capital-A Marxist debate*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1978: 1-31.
- Homans, George C.: *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.
- Homans, George C.: *The Nature of Social Science*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.
- Hooglund, Eric: *Land and Revolution in Iran 1960-1980*, Texas, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.
- Huntington, Samuel: *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale Universities Press, 1968.
- Issawi, Charles: *The Economic History of Iran: 1800-1914*. Chicago: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.
- Issawi, Charles: "The Iranian Economy 1925-1975", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran Under The Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: 129-166.
- Jazani, Bijan: *The Socio-economic Analysis of a Dependent Capitalist State*. London: Iran Committee, 1973.
- Jazani, Bijan: *Armed Struggle in Iran*, London: Iran Committee, 1975.
- Jessop, Bob: *The Capitalist State*. Oxford: Martin Robertson & Company Ltd., (1982) 1983.
- Jessop, Bob: *State Theory*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990a.
- Jessop, Bob: "Regulation Theories in Retrospect and Prospect", *Economy and Society*. Vol.19, No:2, May 1990b):153-216.
- Jessop, Bob: "Regulation Theory, Post-Fordism and The State: More than a Reply to Werner Bonefeld", in Bonefeld, Werner and Holloway, John (eds.), *Post-Fordism & Social Form - A Marxist debate on The State*. London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1991: 69-91.

- Johnson, Chalmers: *Revolutionary Change*. Boston: Little, Brown Press, 1966
- Karshenas, Massoud: *Oil, State and Industrialization in Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Katouzian, Homa: *The Political Economy of Modern Iran – Despotism and Pseudo-Modernism, 1926-1979*. New York: New York University Press, 1981.
- Kazancigil, Ali: "Paradigms of Modern State Formation in the Periphery". in Kazancigil, Ali (ed.), *The State in Global Perspective*. Gower: Unesco, 1986: 119-142.
- Kazemi, Farhad: *Poverty and Revolution in Iran*. New York: New York University Press, 1980.
- Keddie, Nikki R.: "The Iranian Village Before and After Land Reform", in Bernstein, H. (ed.), *Underdevelopment and Development*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1973: 152-174.
- Keddie, Nikki R.: *Roots of Revolution: An Interpretive History of Modern Iran*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1981
- Khomeini, Ruhollah: *Islam and Revolution: The Writings and Declaration of Imam Khomeini*. Translated and annotated by Hamid Algar. Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1981.
- Ladjevardi, Habib: *Labour Unions and Autocracy in Iran..* Syracuse University Press, 1985.
- Lahsaeizadeh, Abdolali: *Contemporary Rural Iran*. Aldershot: Avebury Abdolali: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1993.
- Lambton, Ann: *The Persian Land Reform 1962-1966*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Lenczowski, George: "Introduction: From Assertion of Independence to the White Revolution", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran Under The Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: xv-xxii.
- Lenin, V. I.: "The State and Revolution". *Collected Works*. Moscow: Progress, 1980: 381-492.

- Lipietz, Alain: "Behind The Crisis: The Exhaustion of Accumulation. A 'Regulation School' Perspective on Some French Empirical Works", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 18 (1-2), 1986: 13-33.
- Lipietz, Alain: *Mirages and Miracles. The Crisis of Global Fordism*. London: Verso, 1987.
- Majd, M.G.: "On the Relationship between Land Reform and Rural-Urban Migration in Iran, 1966-1976", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 46, No:3, Summer 1992: 440-445.
- Mandel, Ernest: *Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.1972.
- Mars, Perry: "Competing Theories and Third World Political Practice", in Martin, M. and Kandal, T. (eds.), *Studies of Development and Change in The Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989: 373-398.
- Marx, Karl: *Theories of Surplus Value*. Moscow: Progress, 1971.
- McDaniel, Tim: *Autocracy, Modernization and Revolution in Russia and Iran*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Mehner, Harald: "Development and Planning in Iran after World War II", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran Under The Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: 167-199.
- Meiksins Wood, Ellen: "The Separation of the Economic and the Political in Capitalism", *New Left Review*, No: 127, May-June 1981: 66-95.
- Meiksins Wood, Ellen: *The Retreat from Class*. London: Verso, (1986) 1988.
- Melossi, Dario: *The State of Social Control: A Sociological Study of concepts of State and Social Control in the Making of Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- Miliband, Ralph: *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. (1969) 1970.

- Milos, John: "The Problem of Capitalist Development", in Gottdiener, M. and Komninos, N. (eds.), *Capitalist Development and Crisis Theory*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1989: 154-173.
- Moaddel, Mansoor *Class, Politics and Ideology in the Iranian Revolution*. New York, Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Moore, Barrington Jr.: *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Mouzelis, Nicos: *Politics in Semi-Periphery*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986
- Mouzelis, Nicos: *Post-Marxist Alternatives- The Construction of Social Orders*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1990.
- O'Connor, James: *Accumulation Crisis*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc., 1984.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo: "Tension in The Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and The Question of Democracy", in Collier, D. (ed.), *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979: 285-318.
- Orwell, George: *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Press, 1962.
- Pahlavi M. R.: *The White Revolution*. 2nd ed. Tehran: 1967.
- Pahlavi M. R.: *Answer to History*. Trans. Michael Joseph. New York: Stien and Day, 1980.
- Parsa, Misagh: *Social Origins of the Iranian Revolution*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.
- Petras, James: *Critical Perspectives on Imperialism and Social Class in The Third World*. New York, London: Monthly Review Press, 1978.
- Poulantzas, Nicos: "The Problem of The Capitalist State ", *New Left Review*, No: 58, 1969: 67-78.
- Poulantzas, Nicos: *State, Power, Socialism*. London:Verso,(1978) 1980.

- Poulantzas, Nicos: "Social Classes and The State". in Bottomore, T. (ed.) *Modern Interpretations of Marx*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981: 138-154.
- Pouyan, Amir Parviz: *On the necessity of Armed Struggle and a Refutation Of the Theory of 'Survival'*, New York: 1975
- Prebisch, Raul: "Five Stages in My Thinking on Development", in Meier, G. and Seers, D. (eds.), *Pioneers in Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1984: 175-191.
- Saikal, A.: *The Rise and Fall of The Shah*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Savory, Roger: "Social Development in Iran During The Pahlavi Era", in Lenczowski, G. (ed.), *Iran Under The Pahlavis*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978: 85-125.
- Serra, Jose: "Three Mistaken Theses Regarding the Connection Between Industrialization and Authoritarian Regimes" in Collier, D.(ed.), *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979: 99-164.
- Sewell, William Jr: "Ideologies and Social Revolutions: Reflections on the French Case." *Journal of Modern History*, No: 11, 1985:57-85
- Shari'ati, Ali: *Islamshenasi*[Islamology]. Mashad: Tous, 1347/1969.
- Shari'ati, Ali: *Marxism and other Western Fallacies: An Islamic Critique*. Trans R. campbell. Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1980.
- Shorter, Edward & Tilly C.: *Strikes in France, 1830-1968*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Skocpol, Theda: *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1979.
- Skocpol, Theda: "Rentier State and Shi'a Islam in the Iranian Revolution", *Theory and Society*, No: 11, 1982: 265-283.

- Smelser, Niel: *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press, 1963.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L.: *Theoretical Methods in Social History*. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Therborn, Göran: "The Rule of Capitalism and The Rise of Democracy", *New Left Review*, No: 105, 1987: 19-45.
- Thomas, Clive: *The Rise of the Authoritarian State in Peripheral Societies*. New York, London: Monthly Review Press, 1984.
- Tilly, Charles: "Does Modernization Breed Revolution?", *Comparative Politics*, No: 5, 1973: 425-447.
- Tilly, Charles: *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Tilly, Charles: *The Contentious French*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Trotsky, Leon: *The History of the Russian Revolution*. Trans. Max Eastman. 3 vols. In 1. London: Pluto Press, 1977.
- Walton, John: *Reluctant Rebels: Comparative Studies of Revolution And Underdevelopment*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Walton, Thomas: "Economic Development and Revolutionary Upheavals in Iran", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, No: 3, September 1980: 271-292.
- Walzer, Michael: "A Theory of Revolution." *Marxist Perspectives*, No: 2, 1979: 30-44.
- Weber, Max: *Economy and Society*. Vol.1 & Vol. 2. (Ed. by) Roth, Guenther and Wittich, Claus. Berkeley: University of California Press, (1968) 1978.
- Wright, Erik Olin: *Class, Crisis and The State*. London: Verso, 1978.
- Wright, Erik Olin: "Class Analysis, History and Emancipation", *New Left Review*, No: 202, November-December 1993: 15-36.

- Wolf, Eric R.: *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper and Row press, 1969.
- Ziemann, W. &: "The State in Peripheral Societies", in Miliband, R. Lanzendörfer, M. and Saville, J. (eds.), *The Socialist Register*. London: MerlinPress, 1977: 143-177.
- Zabih, Sepehr: *The Communist Movement in Iran*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966.