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Political parties appeared on the scene when actions of an erstwhile political system attained a point of complexity that needed the introduction of a new political setup. Usually, political parties emerge when different classes of society become aware of their own interests, and the people of a country want the right to take part in political issues. The nineteenth century was an important phase in Iranian history, wherein political, social and economic corruption were the most obvious problem that Iranians faced. Tremendous increases of such problems have been the reason for the occurrence of all revolutions and reforms in Iran.

With the allied occupation of Iran and the exile of Reza Shah, social chaos increased in the 1940s. Also, as a result of the Second World War, and because of the lack of a steady government, the country was led to anarchy. This problem offended Iranians more when they became aware of the degree and speed of development in the western countries. When Iranian intellectuals came into direct contact with western countries, they tried to regenerate the political structure of their own country to bring about political stability. After Reza Shah, especially between 1942 and 1954, there came a unique historical opportunity for Iranian elites to form a democratic political structure, whereas during the reign of Reza Shah, political parties and other active groups had been inactive. A lenient political condition, favorable to the emergence of different political parties and groups, was the allied occupation of Iran and the exile of Reza Shah in 1941. It was a time when suddenly a flood of new ideas gushed forth in Iran. After his fall, Iran witnessed a progressive shift from traditional social organization to modern forms.

This period witnessed a fast growth in new political parties, worker’s unions, guilds, voluntary societies and many other associations. Some of the active political
parties were well organized and able to attract an important section of city workers, modern minor bourgeoisie, and elite.

However, the nature of party and political groups in Iran was different from those in the west. In Iran, common to all the political groups was the ideology. This ideology was mainly Marxist, Nationalist and Islamist.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter tries to conceptualize the idea of political party. The first section discusses the concept of political party. Usually, political parties are defined by their goals, activities, behavior and also by their functions in a society. A brief history of the concept of political party has also been discussed here. Traditionally, political parties appeared on the scene when the actions of an erstwhile political system attained a point of complexity that needed the introduction of a new political setup. The next section provides a brief introduction of the different types of political parties and systems, growth of political parties in Iran and their functions have been dealt with. This chapter also indicates that this study is guided by five objectives:

1) Introducing and identifying political parties which were socially active during 1942 to 1954 in Iran.

2) Recognizing political and social personalities who were active in organizing political domains. The study will also look into the durability and decline of newly formed political parties.

3) The cause of rise and flourishing of political parties and their social role in the above mentioned period of time.

4) Finding reasons of defeat of political parties and their relations with the masses.
5) Studying negative as well as positive response of society towards the formation of political parties.

In the concluding section, this chapter explains the methodology used in this research. The method applied in this study is the documentary method. Documentary research involves the use of texts and documents as source materials. Documentary research is one of the three major types of social researches and has been the most widely used of the three throughout the history of sociology and other social sciences. It has been the principal method—indeed, sometimes the only one—followed by leading sociologists.

This study is based on research from numerous books of different writers with diverse thoughts. Even though most historical events related to political parties were similar in Iran, but to reach a better conclusion and more precise evaluation, the years between 1942-1954 have been chosen for study, the reason being favorable conditions for existence of political parties. After twenty years of Reza Shah's Suppression, these years were a unique historical opportunity to establish different political parties.

**Chapter 2: Literature Review**

The first portion of this chapter deals with the theoretical perspective. It is not possible to review all theorists and writers who have studied the evolution and functions of political parties; therefore some important and selected viewpoints of significant theorists were taken up for study. In this regard this section has been divided into three parts. The first part of this section has a discussion of political parties from the perspective of structuralism. The second part of the section is concerned with political parties from the perspective of functionalism. The last part of this section analyses political parties on the basis of their economic structure. Then there is an explanation of the theoretical framework. This research discusses the
reach, utility, and inadequacies of the perspectives adopted in the study of political parties. While using the structuralist perspective, this study tries to prove that social, political, economic, and cultural structures during 1942-1954 were responsible for the instability of political parties in Iran. Political system in this period of time had a totalitarian or authoritarian structure in Iran.

The last part of this chapter attempts to give a brief account of literature being written on the failure of political parties in Iran. This study was designed with a view to examine reasons of failure of political parties in Iran between 1942-1954.

A comprehensive review of literature is essential for any good research endeavor as it provides background information to aid in the designing and analyzing research work. A large number of studies have examined the various dimensions of political parties in Iran. Previous studies on this issue could be a valuable source of guidance for testing as well as providing probable explanation. Thus these findings were of tremendous help. An attempt is made here to give a brief account of literature for reasons failure of political parties in Iran.

Chapter 3: Socio-economic and Political Conditions Prevailing in Iran on the Eve of Pahlavi Dynasty

The aim of this chapter is to illustrate the importance of twentieth century as a critical period in Iranian history. In this era, for the first time Iranians of different social classes joined to challenge the uncontested arbitrary rule of the Qajar dynasty. This sentiment caused the Constitutional Movement which is considered to be the beginning of Iranian modern history. In association with this movement, in 1921, with the help of British officers, a self-made military man named Reza Khan orchestrated a coup that demolished the powers of the ruling Qajar king, and founded the Pahlavi Dynasty. In addition this chapter explores in detail the social and political factors that
had an impact on Iranian society. These factors contributed to the domination of foreign states over Iranian affairs, which in return gave rise to anti-Western feelings, the chronic problem of despotism in Iran, and the social and economic backwardness of the country. During the reign of the Pahlavi dynasty, Iranians found themselves under the rule of a strong and powerful ruling authority; it was hard to find the emergence of any other voice from any part of the country. In spite of previous dictatorships, there was no way out from his modern despotism. Neither the people nor any organization remained untouched by Reza Shah's oppressive rule. With the abdication of Reza Shah in 1941, Iranian people once again became free. A few social and political activists tried to recognize the roots of dictatorship in Iranian society, with the purpose of stopping its reoccurrence.

In the end, this chapter illustrates the different views about political parties in Iran which includes opponent, proponent and clergy views towards political parties' formulation in Iran.

Chapter 4: Political Parties of Iran between 1942 and 1954

This chapter attempts to introduce those most important parties which existed during 1942-1954 in Iran. Soon after the second meeting of the parliament in 1908, the followers and supporters of the government, which were in majority, were named "moderates", and the non-supporting minority called themselves "democrats". Actually, these terms did not refer to political parties, but was based on parliament members' supporting or opposing the regime measures.

After twenty years of Reza Shah's suppression, in 1941 a large number of parties came up in Iran; most of them had little effect on the political scene therefore they quickly disappeared from view; others had a deeper influence, both ideologically and organizationally, and have contributed to the contemporary Iranian political style.
These parties were mostly based on some ideological background and differences. For some of them it was Islam, for some it was Nationalism and for others it was Marxism.

Parties which were ideologically based had a more lasting effect on the political arena, both in terms of ideology and political administration. They can be divided into four groups. According to political leanings, Tudeh party and Democratic Party of Azerbaijan were of the left; and the National Will Party, Democratic Party of Iran and Justice (Adalat) Party which comprised Conservatives, and pro-British notables were of the right. There were also some Nationalist parties like Pan Iranist, National Front Party and Sumka party. Some religious parties also existed such as Society of the Devotees of Islam (Jam’iyat-e Fada’iyan-e Islam) and Warriors of Islam Party.

**Chapter 5: Conclusion**

Considering the importance of developing political parties in Iranian history, this research attempts to provide necessary information and discussions, which in turn helps us to understand the reasons of their formation and activities.

For this purpose, an analysis of four political phases and their relations to the political awareness of Iranian population has been done. Then utilizing the existing documents and references, the role and aims of the ruling class, intellectuals, foreign powers, have been emphasized. Also socio economic conditions in the formation of political parties such as left-wing, right-wing, nationalist and religious parties have been studied.

Important point is that the nature of political parties in Iran was different from the western countries. In Iran the most important feature of all parties was the ideology.
Usually this ideology was Marxist, Nationalist or Islamic. And occasionally, in special times, political awareness gives birth to political parties.

Given the importance of political parties in helping political structure to sustain and maintain a democratic growth, the findings of this study reveal the factors responsible for the failure of political parties in Iran. Some of these are as following:

- Political parties in the west were born and created by its history, while political parties in Asia as well as Iran are of much more recent origin and, have not benefitted from decades of parliamentary experience. However, in Iran political, economic and socio-cultural context were fundamentally different from western societies.

- Another problem of political parties in Iran at that time was eastern autocracy and absolute rule of the sovereign. There was a constant tension between the central government and other political parties. When the central government was weak, political parties had less chance for development, and when it got stronger, it suppressed the political parties. Therefore, parties in such situation could not play effectual roles in a society.

- Like most third world countries, in Iran also, the authority did not distribute power within other political parties and groups. On the other hand the government tried to weaken parties, especially those which opposed them.

- Another reason for failure political parties in Iran was that most parties had close association with foreign power doctrinaires. From left wing the Tudeh Party openly proclaimed its adherence to communism and along with the Democrat Party of Azerbaijan was supported by Soviet Union. On the other hand, from right wing, parties such as the National Will party, with liberal democrat ideas, was perceived to be somewhat close to the British.
During that time in Iran there was no friendly relationship between political parties, and most of them were competing with each other. For example, all of the right wing parties had their base in response to the growth of the Tudeh party. The Tudeh party was seen as Soviet sponsored, and thus left-wing and right-wing had not only internal clashes but also rivaled in the context of international politics.

Most of those parties had no roots among the people and they were dependent on individuals. On the other hand, the aim of appearance of a lot of political parties was to support a few politicians, and their political activities were good excuse for continuation of these political parties. Most of such political parties were mainly dependent upon their founders and it was obvious after the death or resignation of these patrons, that each political parties would gradually disappear from the political scenario. For example, Democrat Party of Iran was basically a selective party, not rooted among a majority of people, whose speedy development was due to support from Qavam Ulsaltana. Consequently with Qavam's resignation as Prime Minister, his party disappeared too. Its members realized that Democrat Party of Iran was similar in structure and goals to Sayyid Ziya's National Will Party.

This study highlights the importance of emerging political parties in Iranian history; and has collected necessary information and discussions which help us to understand the reasons of their formation and activities in order to fill the vacuum, that existed in this domain. This study has made an effort to include everything relevant to the research area though there is still a lot of an area to be covered. New studies can bring out more results and thus this study should not be treated as a final arbiter on the topic. Although this research was carefully prepared, I am still aware of
some of the limitations and shortcomings. The study was both specially and
temporally bound to only Iran, and that too a specific period of time of Iranian
political history. The present research is sociological as much as it is related to the
politics of the country. Many new facts and details related to the intentions of the past
rulers and politicians may get revealed with the passage of time; therefore the reasons
of some events that occurred in the concerned time period of the research may come
out of the bosom of the history. There is a lot of scope to conduct research related to
this field. Future researchers can conduct more detailed analysis of political parties in
Iranian society.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
**Introduction**

This chapter attempts to conceptualize the idea of political party. In the first section of the chapter, the concept of political party has been explained. The chapter then proceeds to present a brief history of the concept of political party. A brief introduction of the different types of political parties and party system is discussed followed by their functions. In the concluding section, this chapter explains objectives of this study and the methodology used.

### 1.1. Political Parties: Concept and Characteristics

In political sociology, there are some key terms like political party, democracy and representation. Democracy and representation are impossible concepts without the idea of political parties. Usually political parties have been defined by their goals, activities, behaviour and also by their functions in a society.

Hess (1994: 15) perceived political parties as:

"Groups of people who have joined forces to pursue their common political and social goals. Parties have been formed in all societies and states where the population actively participates in the political process. They enable the people thus organized—the party members—to articulate their political will and strive for the realization of their political aims as a group".

According to Heywood (2002: 248), "A political party is a group of people that is organized for the purpose of winning government power, by electoral or other means. Parties are often confused with interest groups". Heywood identifies four characteristics that distinguish parties from other organized groups. He believes that political parties:

- aim to exercise government power by winning political office (small parties may use elections more to gain a platform than to win power);
are organized bodies with a formal ‘card-carrying’ membership. This distinguishes them from broader and more diffuse social movements;
- typically adopt a broad issue focus, addressing each of the major areas of government policy (small parties, however, may have a single-issue focus, thus resembling interest groups); and
- are united by shared political preferences and a general ideological identity.

Edmund Burke defines: "Party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavors, the national interest, upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed" (Maor, 1997: 3).

Neumann (1956: 403) defines a political party as: "the articulate organization of society’s active political agents, those who are concerned with the control of governmental power and who compete for popular support with another group or groups holding divergent views. As such, it is the great intermediary which links social forces and ideologies to official governmental institutions and relates them to political action within the larger political community".

Sartori (2005: 57) believes that a party is a group that "presents at elections, and is capable of placing, through elections, candidates for public office". For Sartori, the electoral process—wherein a party competes under its official label—is taken as a discriminatory tool between parties and interest groups. Thus, the occurrence of an election suffices to distinguish the single party from those political groups that do not have recourse to ‘electoral rituals’.

James Madison defines a party as "a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community" (Maor, 1997: 4).
Dowse and Hughes (1972: 7) defines political parties as "associations formally organized with the explicit and declared purpose of acquiring and, maintaining legal control, either singly or in coalition with other similar associations, over the personnel and the policy of the government of an actual or prospective state".

In Maor's opinion (1997: 106), "A party is created from groups and individuals who feel the need to direct groups and peoples, who feel the need to direct a specific conception regarding political government and, who manifest the will to direct the evolution of the global society in a specific way".

After going through all the definitions of these theorists and thinkers which have been mentioned above, we can simply say that a political party is an organized group of people with at least a set of similar political goals and ideas, and in order to achieve these desired goals and ideals, parties try to gather the support of the common masses through democratic means; or through other means, whatever the political setup of the place may be. Their primary objective is to make their own members occupy powerful places as public representatives and ministers in the parliament.

1.2. Political Parties in Historical Context and the Origin of Political Parties

Before the emergence of political parties, it was generally thought that the ultimate power—including political power—resides with God. A king was thought to be second to the heavenly deity on this earth, and kingship has always been considered as hereditary. A king was surrounded by a group of his trusted followers, all belonging to elite class, landed gentry and rich businessmen, who never wanted to lose their political power. In some European countries, in the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries, people tried to confront old beliefs of political authority.

Traditionally, political parties appeared on the scene when actions of an erstwhile political system attained a point of complexity that needed a change or the
introduction of a new political setup. Political parties emerge when different classes of
society get aware of their own interests, and a lot of people of a country want the right
to take part in political issues.

"The emergence of political parties can be traced back to eighteenth-century
England. Following the 1688 revolution which established parliamentary rule, the
English middle classes captured political and economic power. They then began to
organize themselves into groupings led by prominent members of their class in order to
control the state and promote their own ideological aims. In the course of the eighteenth
century, two main political groups emerged in England: the Whigs and the Tories. The
Whigs represented the interests of traders and manufacturers and favoured free trade,
low taxes, growth of cities, and an aggressive foreign policy. They also supported the
expansion of personal liberties and opposed privileges of the aristocracy. The Tories,
on the other hand, represented old landed families and other large property owners.
They favoured protectionist trade policies and preservation of traditional ways of life.
They wanted to restrict political power to the wealthy and propertied classes. These two
groups were the forerunners of the modern Liberal and Conservative parties. As British
society developed, more and more citizens gained the right to vote and participate in
politics, and political issues became more complex" (Audit, 1998: 11).

Keverenge says (2007: 17), "In other European countries as in England, the rise
of the middle class, the expansion of representative democracy, and the opening up of
forums for political discussion and participation were the main catalysts for formation
of political parties. Thus, early forms of political parties arose in France on the eve of
the 1789 revolution and, in Germany, at the time the 1848 revolution. The emergence
of political parties in other countries generally followed a similar pattern".
Throughout the 19th century the idea of political parties was rather vague. But certain concepts were emerging. A party was a part, and not the whole of the civil society. It was formed on the basis of common/ shared opinions and aims and concerned politics, that is, state power. Also, if there was one party, there must be at least another. In short, the state was considered larger than a party and a civil society was larger than the state. A party was to operate within the general normative structure of the state and the civil society. The state should not engross the civil society and the party should not engross the state. A party seeking to engross the civil society was out of the question. At the same time, a certain amount of political autonomy was allowed to the parties to conduct their own affairs.

Nowadays, in most countries political parties are the main creators of political systems, though there are some exceptions. In some Middle East countries because of their monarchies, traditional and religious political systems are not officially permitted. In other countries like China, there is just one-party communist state. Keeping in view the last two centuries, we can expect that political parties will survive, and it will direct political actions toward improvement of political systems in most countries.

Though, it is very difficult to forecast the future of political parties because of impact of globalization and liberalization of economy these days. This expansion declares a warning not only to government dominions but also to actual party contributions.

1.3. Party Systems

The party system is an idea in political sociology related to the government systems and it is through political parties that a democratic setup is maintained in a state. The concept is that political parties have an essential place in modern states; their key function is to run the government and to control elections.
"A party system is important in determining exactly how political parties play the political game. Party systems influence greatly the way parties operate and how effective they can be in addressing the demands and articulating interests of the electorate. In some countries party systems are profoundly institutionalized and robust, while in others, they are less institutionalized and fragmented" (Matlosa, 2007: 37).

There are a variety of types of political party systems in between the two radical situations where political parties according to law are illegal and where there are so many small and useless parties, that becomes difficult to arrange political systems according to one single measure.

There are basically four known political party systems. The main aspects which differentiate them from one another is the number of parties present or allowed to exist in a political setup, the relation of the parties with each other and the structure of the parties.

**One-party systems**

A single-party state, one-party system or single-party system is a kind of political setup in which only one party governs and is allowed, legally, to exist.

Single-party system can produce an autocratic or dictatorial government. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, and changes in the form of governing in Eastern Europe, the number of single-party systems has been significantly reduced, though in countries such as North Korea, China and Cuba, one party system is still dominant.

**Dominant party systems**

A dominant-party system is a political party system where only one party can practically form the government, even if there are a number of other political parties. This happens usually by itself or in an alliance government, as all other parties are not
so powerful; for example, in Japan, since the end of the American occupation, the Liberal Party has won almost every common election.

Two-party systems

Sometimes, multiparty systems are so thoroughly dominated by two parties that they effectively become two party systems, as none of the parties has any real chance of forming a government, or in most cases, having an impact on government policies. This has been the case in the United States for most of its history. The Democratic and Republican parties remain in power in the national and state legislatures, as well as local politics in most of the states. Other parties are free to compete but they are rarely able to elect representatives even at the local levels.

"The chances of other parties becoming important in two-party systems vary from place to place. In the United States, the Republican and Democratic parties are so entrenched at all levels of the political process that only a major upheaval could open up the political space to meaningful participation by another party. In Britain, however, which was effectively a two-party state (Conservative and Labor) for forty years following the Second World War, dissatisfaction with polarized politics led in the 1980s, to the formation of the Liberal Democratic Party, which now has a substantial following" (Keverenge, 2007: 12).

Multiparty systems

Multiparty system is a system in which there are many political parties which try to gain control over the government in a country. Multiparty system is commonly found in democratic countries. A multiparty system creates an environment where it is possible for even smaller and newly established parties to exist besides the already established big political parties.
"Under this system, all parties have an opportunity to run for elections. The party that wins the most constituencies (in parliamentary system) or the most votes (in proportional representation) forms the government. Although rules differ from country to country, a coalition government can sometimes be formed if no single party gains an outright majority of seats in the legislature. In a coalition, two or more parties agree to form a government together in order to command majority support in the legislature. In some multiparty system as in South Africa, candidates not affiliated to any party (independent candidates) are also allowed to stand for elections. In Kenya, however candidates have to be nominated by a registered political party" (Ibid. 2007: 12).

1.4. Party Types

For nearly a century, political scientists have developed typologies and models of political parties in an effort to capture the essential features of partisan organizations that were the objects of their analysis. The result is that literature, today, contains various categories of party types, some of which have acquired the status of classics and have been used by scholars for decades (e.g. Duverger, 1954; Kirchheime, 1966; Neumann, 1954; Gunther & Diamond, 2003).

Political scientists have expanded ideas of different perfect types of political parties in order to compare them with each other. Gunther and Diamond (2003: 172) have distinguished between five families of political parties: elite-based parties, mass-based parties, ethnicity based parties, electoralist parties and movement parties.

Elite parties

Elite parties take shape as an alliance of elite members, especially in circumstances where a personal political idea can be preserved without the support of considerable people. An elite party can take shape within the parliament and its political power originates from its members.
According to Gunther and Diamond (2003: 175), ‘elite-based’ parties are those whose principal organizational structures are minimal and based upon established elites and related interpersonal networks within a specific geographic area. Deference to the authority of these elites is a feature shared by the two species of parties that fall within this ‘genus’. Such parties do not have ambitions of hegemony, and are tolerant and collaborative towards one another within a parliamentary regime. The first party type to emerge was, the traditional local notable party. This early-to-mid nineteenth century development emerged at a time of sharply limited suffrage in semi-democratic regimes. Given that the right to vote and hold office was restricted in most of these countries to males owning substantial property, this competitive game was limited to the upper socio-economic strata. French conservative parties in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, and several conservative parties in Brazil today, are examples of this variety of elite party.

**Mass-based parties**

Mass-based parties have a protected association and it is organized in the same as a pyramid, like hierarchically-organized levels. Members of such parties align themselves more with party principles, than with a few powerful members of the party. They have an intangible link with the party, independent of any personal association with the party heads. The decisions in such parties are taken only after the collective consensus of its members, and the necessary funds for party management are raised by contributions made by affiliated members.

Gunther and Diamond (2003: 178) believed that mass-based parties have deep roots in literature, as well as in the nineteenth and early twentieth century history of Europe. The mass-based party emerged as a manifestation of political mobilization of the working class in many European polities. Organizationally, they are characterized
by a large base of dues-paying members who remain active in party affairs even during periods between elections. In an effort to disseminate the party’s ideology and establish an active membership base, the party seeks to penetrate into a number of spheres of social life. Affiliated trade unions, religious and other social organizations serve not only as political allies (helping to mobilize supporters at election time), but for the projection of the objectives of the party from the electoral-parliamentary arena into a variety of spheres of social life. Supportive organizations including party newspapers, recreational clubs, and networks of local party branches are established nationwide. These organizational networks not only serve as a framework for mobilization at election time, but also provide subsidiary benefits to party members, such as opportunities for fraternization and recreation.

**Ethnicity-based parties**

An ethnicity-based party is a party that identifies itself as a defender of only one specific ethnic category. The central scheme of gathering support from voters is done in the same manner.

Gunther and Diamond (2003: 183) in their paper suggest that parties based on ethnicity typically lack the extensive and elaborate organization of mass-based parties. What distinguishes them, however, are their political and electoral logics. Their goals and strategies are narrower: to promote the interests of a particular ethnic group, or coalition of groups. Their objectives do not typically include secession or a high level of decision-making and administrative autonomy from the existing state. Instead, they are content to use existing state structures to channel benefits towards their ally defined electoral clientele. The electoral logic of an ethnic party is to harden and mobilize its ethnic base with exclusive and often polarizing appeals to ethnic group opportunity and threat.
Electoralist parties

Gunther and Diamond (2003: 185) believe that at election time, Electoralist parties spring into action to perform what is unequivocally their primary function: conduct of the campaign. They utilize 'modern' campaign techniques (stressing television and the mass-communications media over the mobilization of party members and affiliated organizations), and rely heavily on professionals who can skilfully carry out such campaigns. The personal attraction of the party’s candidates is an important criterion for nomination at the expense of other considerations, such as length of service to, or formal organizational position within the party. Electoralist parties differ in some important respects that significantly affect their behaviour and, in turn, the quality of democracy.

Movement parties

According to Gunther and Diamond (2003: 188) there is another type of partisan organization that straddles the conceptual space between ‘party’ and ‘movement’. These are moment based parties; of which the most prominent examples in Western Europe today, are of two types: left-libertarian parties and post-industrial extreme right parties. However, this genus of party types should be regarded as 'open ended', since its fluid organizational characteristics may be manifested in a wide variety of ways in other parts of the world or over the course of history.

1.5. Functions of Political Parties

Aldrich writes that in the contemporary world, democracy is unworkable without having any political parties (Aldrich, 1995: 3). Because of their functions the parties have become a crucial factor in stabilizing the state. In modern and democratic societies, fighting to gain power usually is the perfect function of political parties. Mostly, political parties, present programmes that the society can decide to support or
refuse. It is the party leaders and members who decide upon special policies and rules while sticking together and sharing their ideas, in addition to, taking suggestions from their society. The basic aim is to present these ideas to the government for the good of the citizens. Political parties perform certain functions necessary for running the political system. It is feasible to organize these functions under the following titles.

**The governing function**

Without political parties, this multifaceted modern civilization would become unmanageable. Political parties make easier the creation of governments. They also give stability to the government; particularly if members of the authority belong to a party.

Political parties usually collaborate between the two main areas of government: the legislative body and the administrative. Parties provide a very important opposition and criticism, from within as well as out of government.

**The electoral function**

Election in democratic societies is dependent on political parties. Political parties generally select candidates at elections. They offer funds and services for election campaigns. Recent electoral investigation has discovered that the common man has some problems in making the right selection in elections because complication of matters and the diversity of choices confuse voters. For this reason, one of the strange functions of political parties is to make politics more reachable to citizens.

Political parties need to organize the vote bank to get votes and also to protect the election of their candidate to parliament or other public office. On other hand, all political parties try to find ways to persuade voters that their candidates are more reliable than those of its rivals. They set up policies which the voter is required to
support. Parties supply a tag with which the electorate can identify and take responsibility, since the voter is capable of holding them accountable for policy achievements or disappointments.

**The representative function**

Political parties facilitate the formation of ideas of people to be understood and they guarantee that issues of social concern in the political scheme. They are the main input mechanisms that guarantee the fulfilment of the needs and desires of the society. This kind of function is, one of the basic and essential functions of a party.

**The policy, or goal setting, function**

While performing their representative functions, political parties try to create some policies. They are one of the agencies through which people of a country try to attain their joint goal. While doing this, political parties gather support of the common people and through this, they ultimately gain political power. This helps them, get into the parliamentary system of a specific state and there, they make and implement the policies they had promised the common masses. Political parties also introduce ideas and matters; they clear other goals for the society in ways that could improve the chances for selecting those values.

**The recruitment and participation function**

In modern and democratic societies most political campaigners are members of parties. In these countries political parties perform the main function of giving confidence to people to become political activists. They are in charge of supplying to the states their political principals. Leaders gain office because of their high profiles and participants in a presidential selection are generally political party leaders. In the parliamentary system the head of the majority in parliament usually becomes prime minister and other place of duty are generally filled by most important party members.
Sometimes, political parties offer a training class for policy makers, and equip them with information and skills. Otherwise, in societies where political parties are powerless, power is generally in the hands of traditional leaders like that of military institutions or ruling families.

1.6. Growth of Political Parties in Iran

In 1941 the allied occupation of Iran changed the authoritarian rule of Reza Shah to constitutional government. When allied forces were busy fighting war in Russia their main concern was to protect their source line, therefore, they did not show any interest in local political developments in Iran with the exception of preventing conditions from getting dangerous for them. They entered Iran and the people were relieved from the earlier restrictions on free speech and free discussion which they had experienced under the regime of their earlier dictator. It was, unexpectedly, a positive change after the twenty years of Reza Khan’s repression. Voices for establishing democracy were raised from the intellectual elite corners of Iran, as they saw the world drastically changing. The continuously changing government in those days added to the uncertainty by unsystematic repression of the opponent media. To appear, from this stage, apparently unharmed is witness to the political wisdom of Iranian leaders; it also shows the nature of Iranian politics.

"In 1941 there were no political parties in Iran, or any possibility of continuity with those of the previous period of constitutional government from 1906 to 1921. Of course, many of the old politicians still survived, but the conditions they knew had passed away, in Iran as well as in the world outside. Nevertheless, it was to these old men that the Allies turned, rather than to the young and enthusiastic - but untried - products of Reza Shah's educational system. This traditionalism, once established, set the tone of Iranian politics even after the Allies had gone. The 300-odd vacancies in
some 24 cabinets between August 1941 and November 1948 were filled with few exceptions from a clique of 70 or 80 politicians, all over fifty years of age, and many over sixty" (Elwell-Sutton, 1949: 46).

Political parties in Iran were created after its emergence from political reconstruction. In the twentieth century, the creation and growth of political parties in Iran became the main feature of country's political modernization.

"The situation in the Majlis (Parliament) was nearly as unorganized. The elections for the 13th Majlis were already under way when Reza Shah abdicated. When it met in November 1941, it was found to contain virtually the same men as its predecessor, appointed by the late Shah at the height of his power. The only new departure was the formation of "fractions" which, it was carefully explained, were not parties, but simply groups of deputies with similar ideas who proposed to discuss political questions together. These "fractions" continued to play an important part in the manoeuvres of the Majlis, but they bore little relation to developments in the country as a whole, where political parties, unrepresented in the Majlis, were being organized in a variety of ways" (Ibid. 1949: 46).

Many parties emerged in Iran during the phase of the dynastic change and social upheaval. This phase was the period when Kaiserism was undermined, or, an interim between two autocracies, when political circumstances were relatively loose. Many of Iran's political parties were influenced by western bourgeois politics, oriental proletarian politics, Iranian monarchism and Islamism. So far, there existed no mature modern political party (Lei, 2007).

Thus, increased Iranian contact with the West in the nineteenth century made Iranian elites encourage the renovation of political structure. In the Second Constitutional Assembly, for the first time political parties officially began their
activities. The twelve years period—from 1942 to 1954—after the collapse of Reza Shah’s regime, up to the coup of 28 July 1954, was a fertile period for political activities.

1.7. Objectives of the Study

This study is guided by five objectives:

1) Introduction and identification of political parties which were socially active during 1942 to 1954 in Iran.

2) Recognition of political and social personalities active in organizing the political domains. The study will also look into the durability and decline of newly formed political parties.

3) Cause of rise and flourishing of political parties and their social role in the said period of time.

4) Find reasons of defeat of political parties and their relations with the masses.

5) Study the negative as well as positive responses of society towards the formation of political parties.

1.8. Methodology of the Research

The method applied in this study is documentary method. "The use of documentary methods refers to the analysis of documents that contain information about the phenomenon we wish to study. These documents vary greatly. Some are primary documents, or eye-witness accounts written by people who experienced the particular event or behaviour. Others are secondary documents by people who were not present on the scene but who received the information necessary to compile the document by interviewing eyewitnesses or by reading primary documents. Although there may be some "grave" areas in the primary-secondary distinction, the difference between the two is generally clear (Bailey, 1994: 294)."
According to Scott, "A document is an artefact which has, as its central feature, an inscribed text. Simply put, a document is a written text. Documents are produced by individuals and groups in the course of their everyday practices and are geared exclusively for their own immediate practical needs" (Scott, 1990: 5).

Documentary research involves use of texts and documents as source materials: government publications, newspapers, certificates, census publications, novels, film and video, paintings, personal photographs, diaries and innumerable other written, visual and pictorial sources in paper, electronic, or other 'hard copy' form. Along with surveys and ethnography, documentary research is one of the three major types of social research and, arguably, has been the most widely used of the three throughout the history of sociology and other social sciences.

"The general principals of handling documentary sources are no different from those applied to other areas of social research. In all cases data must be handled scientifically, though each source requires a different approach" (Mogalakwe, 2006: 224-225).

Scott (1990: 1-2) has formulated certain control criteria for handling documentary sources. These are authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning. Authenticity refers to whether the evidence is genuine and forms an impeccable course; credibility refers to whether the evidence is typical of its kind, representativeness refers to whether the documents consulted are representative of the totality of the relevant documents, and meaning refers to whether the evidence is clear and comprehensible.

This research is based on using numerous books from different writers with diverse thoughts. Even though most of the historical events related to political parties were similar in Iran, but for the better conclusion and more precise evaluation, it has
been chosen between the years of 1942-1954. Because: Firstly, favourable conditions for existence of political parties have been prepared at this period of time. After twenty years of Reza Shah Suppression, these years were a unique historical opportunity to found different political parties.

Secondly, during these years as compared to other periods, a lot of political parties were organized, and Iran witnessed a vast expansion of political parties.
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CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW
Introduction

This chapter has been divided into different divisions and subdivisions. The first portion deals with the theoretical perspective. It discusses political parties from the perspective of structuralism, functionalism, and economic structure. The next section explains the theoretical framework; while the final section gives a brief account of literature being written on the failure of political parties in Iran.

2.1. Theoretical Perspective:

It is not possible to review all theorists and writers who have studied the evolution and functions of political parties; therefore it is better to concentrate on some of the important and selected viewpoints of some significant theorists. In this regard we have, here, scrutinized the approaches related to political parties along with their conceptualization and widening of related paradigms.

Political parties from the perspective of Structuralism

The first studies of political parties were carried out by structuralists. Structuralism emerged in the 1960s, and was based on the work of Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). Saussure's work was oriented towards understanding the structures underlying languages. Structuralism also influenced anthropology and Marxism. In the former case, the work of Claude Levi-Strauss (1908-2009) exhibits this influence. Levi-Strauss extended structuralism to anthropology, focusing on communication. He reinterpreted social phenomena for their effects on communication. Structural Marxism took from structuralism an interest in the historical origins of structures, but continued to focus on social and economic structures (Ritzer, 2002: 595). In the study of political party from the structuralism perspective, party organization has an important role. The relationship between the party's organization and other systems in the society such as political, economic and social systems has a...
great importance. Robert Michels, a German sociologist, is famous for the study of the leadership of left-wing democratic parties. He was interested in the ways in which organizational dynamics inhibit the realization of radical objectives with particular reference to the Social Democratic Party in Germany. He concluded that all organizations have oligarchical tendencies, a proposition which he formulated as an 'iron law of oligarchy', which states that 'it is the organization which gives birth to the domination of the elected over the electors, of the mandatories over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators. According to Michels (2009: 189), as a political party grows and becomes more bureaucratic, it is increasingly dominated by officials who are committed to internal organizational goals, rather than social change, and by middle-class intellectuals who pursue their own personal objectives which are usually different from those of the party rank-and-file.

**Political parties from the perspective of Functionalism**

Another type of study of political parties was done by researchers who analysed the "role" and "function" of these parties. Functionalism is one of the core perspectives of sociology. The functionalist perspective evolved from the work of Emile Durkheim, though it was shaped by Harvard sociologist Talcott Parsons during the mid-20th Century. According to Bohm & Vogel (2001: 78), functionalism can be explained through one simple premise: "the world is a system of interrelated parts, and each part makes a necessary contribution to the vitality of the system". Functionalism could be explained as the most simplified and unsuccessful of sociological schools and serves as the most conservative of sociological schools of thought.

Functionalists have paid particular attention on to the party's role in society, especially with connection to the political system. These studies include a significant
percentage of existing research about political parties and seek to answer just one question: what is the function of a party in society?

It must be said that the word "function" can be used both specially and generally. According to the first, it only covers party activities, but in the second case, in addition to direct performance, it also includes results and indirect effects of party activities.

**Economic analysis of political parties**

This analysis is more familiar to political theorists. It seeks to explain political parties as a market based fact. Max Weber was the first sociologist who offered economic analysis of political parties. He was much concerned with the power of bureaucracy in modern political parties. Weber discusses political parties in his political writings as well as in his sociology.

Weber defines a party as: "The term party will be employed to designate associations, membership of which rests on formal free recruitment. The goal to which its activities are devoted is to secure power within an organization for its leaders to attain ideal or material advantages for its active members" (Swedberg, 2005: 194).

According to this perspective political parties are always a market based fact. Elections are a type of political market, in which parties offer their candidates and their policies in exchange for the votes needed to gain office. In this market, parties gain what is surely their key resource, control of public office. Just as a business can maintains itself by selling its product at an adequate price, a party able to win office has no difficulty in obtaining all the elements of a vital organization: attractive candidates, willing workers, and money givers. And, just as the economic market sends clear and unambiguous messages to the business firm concerning the success or failure of its product, the political market evaluates openly, automatically, externally, and with
exquisite numerical precision the output of the political party. Political and economic markets are, however, not identical. The political market operates much more discontinuously in accordance with the electoral cycle. The most important difference between the two kinds of markets lies in the character of what is being traded. Elections create an imbalanced market. Parties receive votes and the control of office; these are private benefits, or goods which go only to the party and to its candidates. But, parties also offer to voters, candidates and policies, benefits which reach everyone regardless of the votes cast. Thus they offer collective benefits. This is in sharp contrast to the economic market in which both sides of a transaction give and receive private or selective goods (Schlesinger, 1994: 13).

2.2. Theoretical Framework

This research highlights the reach, utility and inadequacies of the perspectives adopted in the study of political parties. In this research, using the structuralist perspective, a way is found to prove that social, political, economic, and cultural structures during 1942-1954 were the cause of instability of political parties in Iran. Political system in this period of time had a totalitarian or authoritarian structure in Iran.

Authoritarianism is characterized by a highly concentrated and centralized power maintained by political repression and the exclusion of potential challengers. It uses political parties and mass organizations to mobilize people around the goals of the state.

During the reign of Mohammad Reza Shah, significant increases in oil revenues, coincident with the centralization of the economy, compounded societal stress and imbalance. The modernization that continued throughout the Shah's rule affected the economic infrastructure but not the monarchical political structures. In this
period of time Iranian society saw many ups and downs. Emergence of political parties, and their proper behaviour in Iran could have effect on social maturity and cultural expansion, and establish quick development. Some believe that the imbalance between political and economic development is the main cause of political inefficiency of parties in Iran.

2.3. Literature Review

This study is designed to examine the reasons of the failure of political parties in Iran between 1942-1954. A comprehensive review of literature is essential for any good research endeavour as it provides background information to aid in designing and analyzing. A large number of studies have examined various dimensions of political parties in Iran. Previous studies on this issue can be a valuable source of guidance for testing as well as providing probable explanation. A brief account of literature of failure of political parties in Iran is being taken up here.

Alijani (2006) in his study points out some reasons for the lack of development among the parties in Iran:

1) Eastern autocracy and sovereign of absolute rule.
2) Lack of confidence and intention of being away from a group.
3) Lack of persistence, and being unadjusted.
4) Excessive attention to cultural elements, especially religious factors.
5) Overdependence of economy on oil and the dependence of people on the government but not vice versa.

He also believes that dominant political and economical systems in the third world do not intend to share power with institutions such as parties and civic structure. Indeed they regard non-governmental parties and groups as their rivals.
He asserts that the economic system is effective only when parties and civic organizations are formed and empowered. He investigates the internal issues of parties.

Asayesh (2010) in his article says that development of political parties in Iran has exceeded the time limit of almost one century, but these political parties could not perform significant role in Iranian political system. In this article he examines how these hindrances impede the party development process in Iran.

Further, he adds that the availability of funds stands out as one of the crucial factors to improve any political party. Political parties in Iran, however, lack such substantial support. Also the, people are not interested in becoming members of parties because they oblige them to pay subscription fee as there is no public funding for political parties. He says another problem of parties in Iran is the electoral system. Political parties actually are electoral machines in Iran; the electoral system is not dependent on the party system, and the candidates with the highest standings are not considered members of political parties.

His research shows that another problem of political parties in Iran is the lack of publication authority and press. Most presses belong to the government and according to constitution; governance cannot allow establishment of private T.V. Channels.

Finally, he mentions other obstacles such as political culture, rentier state, power centralization, civil society and separation between elite groups and masses.

Agha-Alikhani (2006) discusses important issues. Upside down formation of parties, insufficient education among parties' members, ignorance towards elites, rotation and new individuals in parties are the main reasons which inhibit effective roles of parties. He also mentions other problems faced by parties like the lack of thought among the parties, and paying more attention to individual interests than to group interests.
Another academic work by Bagheri-Khouzani (2005) points out the relationship between power centralization and inefficiency of political parties in Iran. He suggests that when the central government is weak, the development of other political parties can be considerable, but when it gets stronger, it suppresses the other parties. Therefore, they cannot play effective roles in a society. He maintains that the imbalance between political and economic development is the main cause of political inefficiency of parties in Iran.

Delavari (1998) studied and noted problems of political parties before the Islamic Republic of Iran, some of which include:

1) There has been a reverse relationship between authority and consolidation of government and the freedom and activities of political parties.
2) The emergence of a great number of political parties that support a politician, and their activities which ensure their continuation are dependent on that individual.
3) All these parties are supported by a few numbers of intellectual individuals from the capital and some other big cities in Iran.
4) Most of these parties lack internal integration and include many different branches among themselves.
5) There is no friendly relationship between political parties and groups.

A quick look at the problems mentioned by Delavari show that the obstacles mentioned above have hindered the development of political parties after the Islamic Revolution, particularly in the period of Khatami’s presidency.

Zibakalam (1997) carried out a study and divided the historical roots of failing parties in Iran into three parts; authority, function of religious institution and, negligible infrastructural changes in Iranian society.
Katoozian (1981) in his study also becomes historical reasons for inconsistency of political parties in Iran. He believes that internal problems such as the limitation of private possession and unsafe economy were among the main obstacles in the development of parties in Iran.

He asserts that capitalism like feudalism is a privilege that government bestows to wealthy people such as owners of big companies. The central government has this power to take these privileges back from them. Therefore, lack of confidence of people in the political system and lack of interest for having a long term schedule for investment in various economical and political dimensions cause inconsistency of political parties.

Bashirieh (1997) believes that the first priority of Iranian society was to bring about drastic changes in governmental structure. In such cases, the people and society were revised automatically. He adds that development of political participation and emergence of parties requires some basic changes in the traditional society, including the appearance of new social groups, the development of public opinion, and other processes related to social and economic renovation. These changes could initiate the condition for the development of parties and political participation.

Amirahmadi (1996) in his study estimates that the earlier relationship between Iranian government and civic society was not transparent and well-developed. Moreover, the government was not responsible for issues of the society. One reason for this was the presence of tyranny in Iran and the lack of intermediate organizations like parties.

From the viewpoint of Irani (1998), establishment of democracy is a long and time consuming process. He says that political power and structure of government in
the Islamic Republic of Iran can be regarded as another obstacle in the way of democratic institutions in Iran.

Badei (1997) argues that one of the problems of political parties in the third world is separation between the elite and the masses. This gap is a huge obstacle in creating political participation, which in turn leads to establishment of an arbitrary government. It is also an obstacle for the formation of civic institutions such as political parties, NGOs etc.

Razzaghi (1996) summarizes preventive factors for political life and condition of parties in Iran. These factors include:

a) Patriarchy
b) Conspiracy theory
c) Lack of tolerance
d) Violence
e) Political apathy
f) Political distrust.

Khamaei (2000) conducted a study on "Culture, Politics and Social Transformation" and believes that a major obstacles for parties in Iran was government interference in their affairs.

Rakel (2009) says the Iranian Islamic revolution brought forth a political system based on a combination of institutions that derive their legitimacy from Islamic law and republican institutions legitimized by the people. As there were no legal political parties in the Islamic Republic of Iran, political factions represented varying ideological and material interests of members of the political elite and their supporters. Rakel analyzed the rivalries between political factions and related state institutions and the impact of dynamics of factionalism on domestic (economic and socio-cultural) and
foreign policy formulation. She showed that tensions inherent in the structure of state
institutions and factional rivalries slowed down the process of democracy and
economic reforms in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Salamati (2005) in his paper "Pathology of Parties Institutions in Iran" states the
reason for inconsistency among the political parties as the lack of organization suitable
to Iranian society.

Dehghani (2003) discusses electoral problems in Iran. In this article, he explains
that the electoral system in Iran did not affect the development of parties. The author
mentions that in democratic systems of the world individuals were not able to put up
their candidature haphazardly, and they should be introduced by a party or special
commission. According to him, there were many parties in Iran which appeared to be
somewhat organized, but they lacked the important features of a powerful and true
party. Not even one percent of people had heard of their names so far.

Tajik (2008) conducted a study on "Obstacle of parties in Iran" and proposed
that autocracy and chaos were two temporary and obstructive elements that caused
experiences to be disregarded during political competitions. He added that the lack of
developed political culture was a basic element that prohibited political activities and
gaining experiences.

According to Burnell & Randall (2005), there are a great variety and number of
political parties in developing countries but, there has also been a tendency to study
them in terms of western experience. By the 1980s the consensus was that their
political role was marginal, although since then there has been a growing emphasis on
their role in democracy.

This case study considers the main features and sub-types of political parties in
developing countries; it explores their interaction in party systems; and examines the
way parties relate to their social base and civil society organizations. It also analyses political role of the parties, in particular their contribution to the building of democracy.

Naghibzade (2008) in his book discusses the history of political parties in Iran. He tries with help of sociological approaches and various theories to discuss the different political parties in Iranian society.

According to him new political parties are distinct with strong elements of the previous one. These new political parties were created during election days and after that, most of them become inactive. These parties in Iran never did anything in transparency of political spaces. They did not perform duties obliged to them such as sovereignty, performance and role in regulating the political system.

The writers of the above mentioned books concentrated on issues such as the development of realistic perception of parties, trend of emergence of political parties and parties in that period besides throwing light on issues such as party class, and ideology, multiparty systems, weak political culture and typology of pressure groups.

Aminzadeh (2008) in his article discusses the victory of the constitutional movement in Iran in the year 1906. He claims that in the history of democratic activities, Iranian constitutional movement can be considered as first of its kind in the Islamic world and Asia. He adds that, today, after a century of the constitutional movement of Iran and thirty years after the Islamic Revolution one of the Greatest Social Revolutions in the World in 1979, there are still serious worries about the level of strong democratic foundations in the country.

According to him, one of the main factors for such worries is the lack of strong civil and political institutions, as well as instability, non professional and weak organization of the political parties.
In this article he tries, to answer the question as to why political parties in Iran were not strongly rooted during the constitutional movement, and the reasons why such a big uprising practically did not find its proper position in the political structure and ended in a dissolution. He says it was an attempt that paved ground for further endeavours and in examining and studying the performance of parties in Iran during the last hundred years.

Rezaei (2006) in his book tries to make the reader familiar with various aspects of a political party. He presents the role, function and behaviour of political parties with documented examples of different communities, and generally focuses on topics such as appearance and development of political parties, position, role and function of parties in political systems, their structure and classification criteria. According to the author political parties were a form of organized social forces and came into existence under certain social conditions. In the traditional political system there is no relevance of parties because in such a society different groups cannot have a role in power and their power are included only in limited areas. A party, basically, is a modern product.

Bahar (1940) was the one of the first writers who wrote a book about political parties in Iran and their role in the political trends of the time. His intention for writing this book was to inform the youth of past events.

The content of this book were limited to 1923-1925 events and probably has some errors. The highlight of his work was accurate analysis and interpretation of the performance of political parties at that time.

Another valuable feature of this book was his proposed to introduce roles of newspapers and journalist on the political scene.
Masoudniya (2007) in his study says increased Iranian contact with the west in the nineteenth century caused some Iranian elites to encourage the renewal of political structure to gain political power.

He considers that, for the first time in the Second Constitutional Assembly, political parties officially began their activities. Despite constitutional continuity in a period of seventy-two years, activities of parties in Iran did not institutionalize before the Islamic revolution and only during the periods of contemporary history were the political parties active.

He says that the twelve-year period (1941-53), of Reza Shah's regime till the time it collapsed coup was one of the phases when activities of political parties were prosperous.

His main focus was on identifying the factors that were the grounds of activity of political parties in Iran during these years and their functions.

The purposes of writing the paper was to answer these two pivotal questions; firstly the general formation and functioning of political parties, and secondly, the problems that faced Esfahan during their twelve years rule. It was based on three components: social gaps, the government (power structure), and analysis of international politics.

Etehadieh (1977) studied the appearance and evolution of political parties that had a parliamentary origin. She discussed factors affecting strength and weakness of political parties. She paid special attention to the role and features of parliament, but did not take into consideration other factors such as socio economic status of parties.

Tabrizinya (1992) in a study collected assumptions, discussions, and reasons for the defeat of political parties in Iran; including explanation for each and every factor. In his book, however, he has not considered certain periods. Moreover, he has not
contextualized his study in the socio-political atmosphere of that era, but instead made
generalizations on his own part. As a result he has not mentioned the agents or factors
that led to the failure of political parties.

The primary purpose of Paulson’s (2005) study is to present the movement
frames used by the Tudeh (Masses) and the National Front parties in Iran, which
organized the most successful social movement in the post- World War II period (1941-
1953). The frames introduced by the Tudeh party were the most innovative during this
period. Likewise, frames used by the National Front, a rival of the Tudeh, also had
considerable resonance to the Iranian public. Both organizations shared the goal of
limiting the authority of the Pahlavi monarchy and the military that supported it.

The Tudeh, the first national communist party in Iran, introduced the concept of
class consciousness into the Iranian political discourse. Modern discussions of social
class in Iran, now adopted by socialist-oriented Islamic parties, are variations of the
themes that the Tudeh introduced.

Zibakalam & Bagheri-Dehabadi (2009) in their study say that in close relation
to socio–political parties and functions, the publication and function of different
official organs can be regarded as one of the major issues of contemporary Iran which
has not received due attention. The publication of such organs, which dates back to
Iran's constitutional revolution, has had a number of functions quite distinguishable
from those of mainstream journalism in the country.

Knowledge of functions of such publications can efficiently enhance our
understanding of current socio–political changes and trends in contemporary Iran. This
article, after close consideration of the emergence of "organ publication" both in Iran
and abroad presented a survey of the functions of such publication with regard to three
major spheres of activity, critical thinking, socio–political issues, and political parties.
Lei (2007) in his study considers that there was close relation between the development and system of political parties and political modernization. Iran's political parties were formed before its political modernization. During the 20th century, the formation, development and evolvement of Iran's political parties and system went through a very flexible course, which became the major embodiment and content of the country's political modernization; and thereby promoted its development. Many parties came into existence in Iran during the phase of dynastic change and social upheaval. This was the period when Kaiserism was undermined, or, interim between two autocracies, when political circumstances were relatively weak. The directions of Iran's parties were in accord with the diversity of the political culture, many of Iran's political parties were influenced by the western bourgeois politics, oriental proletarian politics, Iranian monarchism and Islamism. So far, there has no mature modem political party come forth in Iran. Therefore, we can review the staggering and intricate steps of Iran's political modernization as well.

Naghibzadeh & Soleymani (2010), in their article, explores and access activities of political parties in Iran after the Islamic revolution. It believed that formation of political parties was a result of political modernization in Iran after the revolution. The authors further examined this modernization on the basis of Huntington's theory about modernization, including stages of faction creation (factionalism), polarization, extension and Institutionalization. The development of parties in Iran was in extension stage, and had not yet entered the Institutionalization level. The process of party creation which mostly got no bigger than their primary founders was a proof of this.

Akhavan-Kazemi (2007) in his study says, that political culture includes a set of outlooks and values which shape political processes and life. The type and extent of socialization and political participation varies depending on the subjective and, passive
or civic nature of political culture. On this basis, and significant influence of political culture in the performance and efficiency of political parties and attitudes towards party system, this paper studied the type of interaction between these two variables, particularly the adverse impact of certain parameters of Iranian political culture on the question of party system. The author has addressed the main cause of the inefficiency of Iranian political parties from the perspective of political culture.

Modir-Sanei (2000) in his research, after using a theoretical approach and some definitions about political parties and identification of political groups, says that political parties in Iran, according to classic and formal definitions of political parties, face some problems. In his work, some of these political groups and parties which exist in contemporary Iran are discussed. He studies the four historical periods of party formation in Iran and their effects on the formation and activities of political parties in Iran. Finally, in his research, positive functioning of parties and its effects on political development are explained.

Most findings of this research correspond with the results of the review of literature on the subject of failure of political parties in Iran. Studies carried out by various scholars also established that emergence of political parties and their proper behaviour in political scene in Iran had its effect on the political awareness of the people. The first priority in Iranian society was to bring about a drastic change in government structure and, in such case, the people and society got changed automatically. The development of political participation and emergence of parties required some basic changes in the traditional society, including the appearance of new social groups, the development of public opinion, and other processes related to social and economic renovation. These changes could initiate the conditions for the development of parties and political participation.
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CHAPTER 3

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS PREVAILING IN IRAN ON THE EVE OF PAHLAVI DYNASTY
Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to illustrate the importance of twentieth century as a critical period in Iranian history. In this era, for the first time, Iranians from different social classes came together to challenge the uncontested arbitrary rule of the Qajar dynasty. This sentiment brought about the Constitutional Movement which is considered to be the beginning of Iranian modern history. In association with this movement, in 1921, with the help of British officers, a self-made military man named Reza Khan orchestrated a coup that demolished the powers of the ruling Qajar king and founded the Pahlavi Dynasty. In addition to this, the chapter explores, in detail, the social and political factors that had an impact on the Iranian society. These factors contributed to the domination of foreign states over Iranian affairs, which gave rise to anti-Western feelings, the chronic problem of despotism in Iran, and led to social and economic backwardness of the country. In the end, this chapter illustrates different views about political parties in Iran: the opponent, proponent and clergy views towards formulation of political parties in Iran.

3.1. The 1906 Constitutional Movement

The Iranian Constitutional Movement was the first incident of its kind in Asia. The movement paved the way for great change in Iran. It generated new opportunities and opened up ostensibly unlimited possibilities for Iran's future. A lot of diverse sections of society fought for the movement, and changed society. Until that time, the government system in Iran was an autocratic monarchy, in which authority was passed down from father to son. There was no parliament and Iranian people had no right in determining the political issues of the government. The Shari’a courts, which were defended by the king, who was viewed as the “shadow of Allah,” would consider
people's complaints and penalize lawbreakers according to understanding of religious laws.

"By the end of the nineteenth century, Iranian intellectuals felt the need for a national constitution which would limit the power of the Qajar kings. People from all different classes of Iranian society, including the clergy, secular intellectuals, and merchants, supported this constitutional movement. Their inclination to question the arbitrary rule of the monarchy sparked a process of change that enabled Western ideas of constitutionalism, social democracy, and communism to take hold in the political arena" (Borougerdi, 2006: 1).

When Iranian merchants protested and called a strike, Mozaaffarudin Shah Qajar (who ruled from 1896 to 1907) was forced to approve the people's desire to have the first parliament in Iran. It was named as the National Consultative Assembly, or Majlis-e Showray-e Melli in Persian. After this Iran became a legitimate monarchy: which means that the monarch's power was restricted, and selected members of the assembly made major decisions. Therefore, this Constitutional Movement is considered to be the beginning of Iranian contemporary legislative history.

Also, "the year 1905 marked a profound transitional juncture in political development in Iran, and Russia that would have consequential bearing on relations between the two countries. In Russia, the military defeat in the 1904-5 war against Japan coincided with the outbreak of major labour unrest and large-scale protests by disgruntled mass suffering from chronic state oppression and economic hardship, sparking a revolution that led to the introduction of a parliamentary system (the Duma). The turn of events in Russia provided further encouragement to the already seething political discontent south of the border in Iran. Subsequently, the Tsarist authorities attempted both to suppress the parliamentary movement in Russia and to assist the
Iranian autocracy in crushing the constitutional movement that broke out in Iran in 1906. Russia's opposition to the Iranian constitutional movement was aimed at preserving Russian influence in Tehran, while destroying any additional source of inspiration for reformers in Russia itself"(Bonakdarian, 2006: 27).

The Qajar kings could not admit this failure, so the next Qajar king ordered the bombardment of the assembly, and the capture and execution of a number of parliamentary members. Following this, the assembly felt insecure, as did the rest of the nation under the remaining Qajar kings.

"During this period there were many mass revolts, some for democratization of the country and other by ethnic groups seeking political autonomy. The British and the Russians, in exchange for favors, supported the corrupt Qajar kings against the wishes of the Iranian population. These foreign powers did not take decisions made by the Iranian parliament seriously and often acted based on their own self-interests. For example, when the Iranian parliament announced Iran’s neutrality during World War I, Russia and Britain ignored this national decision and sent their expeditionary forces into Iran" (kheirabadi, 2002: 45).

Through the beginning of legitimate preparations in Iran in 1906, the newly founded parliament became the main ground for contestation among constitutionalists on how best to classify, strengthen, build upon and institutionalize the new political success. The reconciliation of political order and constitutional responsibility were the cause of the differences of opinion among parliamentarians. Outside the parliament there were several political associations or societies, in which a number of people advocated fundamental or radical measures, as did a vocal group of deputies. Political radicalism was supported by the Qajar king and the royalty, who resorted to a coup although they were unsuccessful in eliminating constitutionalism.
According to Azimi, in the Second Majlis (1909-11) political orientations found clearer ideological and organizational articulation, in terms of embryonic parties, of which two groups, the Democratic (Dimukrat) Party and the Moderate (Ijtimayun-Itidaliyun) Party, were significant. A majority of the Moderates tended to appeal to the Qajar nobles, landlords, big merchants, constitutionalist ulama, secular but non-radical constitutionalists, as well as shopkeepers, trade guilds and other traditional strata. The Democrats primarily sought to cultivate the intelligentsia, while attempting to widen their appeal. The individuals who led these parliamentary groups played a crucial role in determining their direction; but modern ideas also had a considerable impact. Indeed, the significance of these groups, in particular the Democrats, was more tangible in the realm of ideology than organization. Inspired by socialist ideas, the Democrats had a radical and secular agenda, whether fully or partially articulated. It included political and civic equality of citizens, freedom of expression and organization, distribution of state land among the peasantry, regulation and improvement of peasant-landlord relations, and compulsory primary education. They opposed the privileged classes, including the ulama, as well as the imperial powers, particularly the Russians, whom they blamed for hampering socio-economic reforms in Iran. They professed commitment to parliamentarianism and gradual change. Ideologically less assertive, the Moderates also advocated reform but displayed greater responsiveness to traditional sensibilities (Azimi, 1997: 54).

None of the above mentioned parties was successful in gaining popularity among the people; they were also unable to maintain a parliamentary majority; which came in the way of development and effectiveness of the parliament.
3.2. Reza Shah: the First Pahlavi King (1925-1941)

After World War I, the Qajar reign that had ruled Iran from the late 18th century began to decline. The dynasty had failed economically and lost support. The Iranian society was ready for a major transformation. In 1925, Reza Khan, a self-made military man, after several years of consolidating his position as the country’s strongman, overthrew Ahmad Shah Qajar, the last Shah of the Qajar dynasty, and crowned himself as Reza Shah or Raza the King.

"The rise of prominence and power of Reza Khan, a hitherto unknown officer in the Cossack Brigade, reflected the urgent need among intellectuals and the political establishment to restore order within the state and rescue Iran from the dire consequences of the First World War, which despite the country's neutrality, had seen it become a battleground for the belligerents. It also reflected both Britain's dominance in Iran following the Russian Revolution, and the British desire to limit the costs of empire in the aftermath of a costly world war" (Ansari, 2006: 29).

Reza Shah’s choice of regime was constitutional monarchy instead of a republic, which most Iranian intellectuals also supported. Neighboring Turkey had just put an end to the Ottomans, a despotic dynasty, and replaced them with a republican regime, so it was natural for the people of Iran to want to replace its own despotic system with a republican one in which the people, rather than kings, would run the country. However, Iran was doomed to have another king in the name of Reza Shah.

"In a hot national debate over the merits of a constitutional monarchy versus a republican system, many leading clergy interestingly chose the monarchy. Reza Shah had made an agreement with the leading clerics that five Islamic jurists would be involved in government decision making to ensure that the government functioned
within the Islamic context. He ignored the agreement, however, as soon as he took office" (kheirabadi, 2002: 46).

Distrust in hatred among politicians was on the rise and political conditions had begun deteriorating; Reza Shah's strong point was in being a man of action. The rising aspiration for a well-built centralized power, effective leadership and political order in a country lacking a workable state construction, rendered Reza Shah indispensable. He got benefitted because of the political impasse and the fragility of the parliamentary and social management and he got better chances to dominate as dictator. Reza Shah was not ready to see anybody gain power besides him. He was against political stabilization, intellectual development, and stabilization of the parliament. He was ready to eliminate anybody he thought as a potential threat to his authority. His rule was conventional and coercive; no political parties were formed or permitted, and the character of the government was overshadowed by the character of Reza Shah, as it had been under the authority of Qajars kings.

"Early on in Reza Shah's reign and with his blessing, Abdul-Husayn Taymurtash, the influential court minister, founded the New Iran (Itrain-i naw) Party, consisting of prominent members of the elite. Fearing that the party would become a power base for the Court minister, the Shah arranged for its dissolution. Prior to his ascension to the throne, Reza Shah had taken advantage of party combinations, and wishing to promote himself as a man of progress, had shown himself sympathetic to the Socialist Party. He had also favored the "Radical Party" (hizb-i radikal) formed by Ali Akbar Davar, one of his prominent and capable aides, and consisting of "the educated and the intellectuals. Davar, however, soon abandoned his party, while Ahmad Matindaftari (prime minister from November 1939 to June 1940) did not push to realize
his plan of forming a government-sponsored party modeled on the Turkish [Republican] People’s Party” (Azimi, 1997: 58).

In complete agreement with the existing political culture, Reza Shah viewed political parties as vehicles for hostility and considered them as a cause of confusion, disagreement, and disparagement in his rule. He did not see parties as vehicles for endowing the government with controlled support or for organizing accepted support in society.

The issue of the absence of successful and large political parties in Iran worried many intellectuals. Reza Shah's dictatorship prevented the people from learning to cooperate, but after his abdication in 1941, party activity became stronger until 1953, when it was suppressed by Mohammad Reza Shah.

3.3. Mohammad Reza Shah: The Second Pahlavi King

Mohammad Reza shah Pahlavi was the last Shah of Iran who governed Iran from 1941 until he was removed by the Islamic Revolution of 1979.

Mohammad Reza Shah had neither his father's charisma nor his willpower. He was inept and at the mercy of his foreign supporters. At the same time, the Iranian assembly, under pressure from foreign countries, changed its stand and declared war in opposition to Germany. The Allied forces occupied and used Iran as a source to provide German occupied Russia with food and war equipment. At the end of the war, when Hitler’s armed forces were defeated, the Allied forces called Iran the bridge to victory.

"Foreign forces remained in Iran from 1941 to 1946. The occupation fuelled a nationalist fever for independence from European powers. After the withdrawal of foreign forces, Iran searched for a way to rid itself of European political and economic dominance and their puppet Iranian kings" (kheirabadi, 2002: 49).
During Mohammad Reza Shah's reign, activities of political parties became steadily more intense, until in August 1953, it was suddenly suppressed. But after that Iran's Shah tried to form state-sponsored parties.

**People and nationalist parties**

Mohammad Reza Shah, in April 1957, emphasized the inevitability of formation of a two-party system as a vital instrument for democracy. He suggested two party systems for Iran, following the pattern of progressive and conservative parties. According to his designs both these parties were rendered powerless against the king’s rule. Soon after the People's Party was created by Asadullah Alam (a close friend and interior minister since 1955) to operate as a progressive party of opposition. The Nationalist Party with a more conservative program was created to operate as the party of government in February 1958.

In this context Azimi says the Nationalist Party leader, Prime Minister Manuchihr Iqbal, unconvinced of the practicality of political parties or the desirability of parties sponsored by the State, had previously declared in the Majlis that his government would refrain from forming or involving itself in political parties. Iqbal had, however, to eschew his misgivings and comply with royal desires by founding the Milliyun party. He publicly declared that issues pertaining to foreign policy, defence and internal security should not be broached by political parties. It was also implicitly understood that a host of other issues, including activities and interests of the Shah and the royal family, corruption in the upper bureaucracy, key public appointments, and the granting of large contracts, would also fall outside the purview of party politics. Both parties received government subsidies and neither succeeded in gaining real credibility, even with the monarchist elite. It was not difficult to ascertain that the Shah was less than genuinely sincere about political parties (Azimi, 1997: 65).
In 1963, Mohammad Reza Shah launched his White Revolution; which he advertised as a step towards westernization and tried to provide a number of economic, social and political changes. For this, he created the New Iran Party to replace the People Party. He then put some limitation against the People Party in an obvious attempt to decree a two-party system for Iran.

**Freemasonry**

Freemasonry is usually considered as the oldest and the largest organization in the world. It is non-religious and non-political and has a lot of members in the world. The origin of Freemasonry is debatable issue. Some researchers believe that there were freemasonry organizations in Scotland as early as that late sixteenth century. It is an ideology and organization which came to Islamic world and Iran in the nineteenth century.

In this regard, Hamid Algar asserts that the role of freemasonry, as an organization and ideology, in the nineteenth century history of Islamic world has received little serious attention. Available evidence is, perhaps inevitably, fragmentary, and hardly permits any tenable general conclusion to be drawn. However, it came, in the Islamic world, an echo of the Masonic involvement in political affairs, something seen in the French, Italian and other European experience. Freemasonry had, however, affinity to certain modes of thought and social organization traditional to the Islamic world, and thereby could exert a strong, though temporary, attraction in some sections of society. Credit for the introduction of freemasonry to Iran is generally given to Mirza Malkum Khan (1834-1908), a versatile figure and the secret society he founded in Tehran in 1858. But Iranian acquaintance with freemasonry dates back, however, as early as in the reign of Fath Ali Shah Qajar, (1797-1834). Indeed, it coincides with the beginning of serious European political involvement in Iran. The first recruits to
Freemasonry were diplomats and other prominent travellers to Europe, who disseminated information in Iran concerning European lodges, however sparse and incomplete they may have been (Algar, 1970: 276).

Freemasonry was very active in the period of Mohammad Reza Shah. He tried to help this organization to improve the trustworthiness and assumptions about their immoral activities. By doing this Shah tried automatically to confirm the existing suspicious label of freemasonry as an organization infected by its foreign origin and links.

According to Azimi, the Shah welcomed the embarrassing, vulnerability of the elite, particularly those who had ventured to collaborate collectively not only to achieve mutual self-advancement, but also to seek sources of power other than the royal Court. Real or putative freemasons, particularly in the last two decades of Pahlavi rule, were, for the large part, men of questionable reputation. This helped to enhance the credibility of assumptions about their "nefarious" activities. And, some freemasons found it beneficial to stimulate the awe and fear that freemasonry inspired and utilized their networks and links to further their political and business interests. Undoubtedly Masonic links could augment nepotistic networks which inordinately and corruptly enriched themselves through public expense. It was, however, the entrenched fear and disapproval of collectivities and associations, not amenable to effective royal control, which led the Shah to condone the exposure of many of his officials without reflecting upon the implications of such a move. It led him unquestioningly to reaffirm the prevailing paranoid stereotype of freemasonry as an association intrinsically polluted by its foreign origin and links, by definition engaged in improper activities in defiance of patriotism. Not surprisingly, the anti-freemasonry publicity only helped further
undermine the credibility of the regime, since the privileged positions of actual, or, putative freemasons in the state apparatus remained unchallenged (Azimi, 1997: 67).

In Iran, freemasonry has always been seen as an extension of British imperialism. It existed in Iran prior to the Islamic Revolution of 1979, and recruited a lot of people from various political personalities, but it was banned in Iran after the Revolution.

**The Resurgence party**

In the 1970s, increasing conflict widened the gulf between Iranian government and the people. It worsened the country's economy and increased the complexities of the Iranian society. The sensitive condition forced the Shah to dissolve both the ineffective parties in 1975, and he created a new party called Iranian Nation's Resurgence Party.

The Resurgence party was designed by two groups of very divergent advisors. One group comprised young political scientists with Ph.D.s from American universities well versed in the works of Samuel Huntington, the distinguished political scientist at Harvard, these fresh returnees argued that the only way to achieve political stability in developing countries was to establish a disciplined government party. Such a party, they claimed, would become an organic link between the state and society, would enable the former to mobilize the latter, and thus, would eliminate the dangers posed by disruptive social elements. They ignored Huntington's observation that in the modern age monarchies are anachronistic.

The second group of advisers was formed by ex-communists from Shiraz who left the Tudeh party in the early 1950s- one had absconded with the party funds- and had re-entered politics under the patronage of Alam, the magnate from Sistan who was not only a minister of court but also the chairman of the People's party. This group
argued that only a Leninist-style organization could mobilize the masses, break down traditional barriers, and lead the way to a fully modern society (Abrahamian, 1982: 441).

In this regard Azimi also says, the party consisted of several establishment figures, each with his own coterie of followers; there were also several factions, two of which assumed a more formal status, namely, the Progressive (taraqqi khah) wing, and the Constructive-Liberal (libiral-i sazandah) wing, led by Jamshid Amuzgar and Hushang Ansari respectively. The party's in-built factionalism and internal rivalries prevented the emergence of unduly powerful individuals and facilitated royal control. The party was portrayed, and was seen by some of its supporters, as a channel for greater political participation. No one was given the choice not to join the party, and yet, the electorate was given the hollow luxury of choosing from among a large number of candidates who were all equally acceptable to the Shah. If popular participation was at all an important issue in the formation of the new party, the paradox that an avowedly totalitarian party should have been expected to function as an avenue of popular participation; seems not to have been grasped. Whatever its aims, the Resurgence Party, abandoned with the first murmurs of the revolution, proved to be a monumental fiasco, a fatal strategic failure on the part of the regime, fundamentally incongruent with credible participatory institutions (Azimi, 1997: 68).

This state-sponsored political party was intended to be Iran's new single party, purposefully created to assert state monopoly on political activity. In addition to this all Iranians were forced to join the same party. However, the single party system finished in 1978 when the Iranian Islamic Revolution gained ground. The political party was completely eradicated in early 1979, with the end of Pahlavi monarchy.
3.4. Socio-political Condition of Iran during the 20th Century

The Constitutional Movement of 1906 forced the Shah to declare publicly that Iran was a constitutional monarchy with lawmaking powers vested in a parliament. The Shah did not fulfil his constitutional promise, and the British and Russian intrusion became more and more perilous to the country. In 1924 a self made military officer named Reza Shah gained the power and deposed the last Qajar's king. Reza Shah started a fundamental modernization program like that of Ataturk in Turkey. Nevertheless he made very slow advancement because Iran was very poor and had been more separated from European influences that the Turkey had been.

Some of the main factors and situations that contributed to the ongoing Iranian social and political debate at that time were the social and economic backwardness of the country, the domination of foreign states over Iranian affairs (which gave rise to anti-Western feelings), and the chronic problem of despotism in Iran.

Political, social and economic backwardness

In this century, political, social and economic corruption had been the most obvious problem that Iranians faced. In 1906 the Constitutional Revolution tried to create a government based on law instead of Iran's conventional arbitrary kingship, and it resulted in the formation of a constitutional framework which assured not only lawful, but also a democratic government. Besides, in 1941, during the period of the Second World War, Allied troops entered Iran and this changed the social and political setup of the country. The same century saw events like nationalization of oil in Iran, a step towards self-governing and democracy. Nationalization of oil companies began in the late 1940s following the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company concession, or the 1933 oil agreement. This agreement was highly not accepted and the nationalization of Iranian oil rapidly became symbol for a movement to resist British interference in its politics.
In this regard Cottam says that by 1941, approximately five per cent of the population was literate, and probably somewhere between five and ten percent had some awareness of modern political process. Awareness and participation are not the same thing, however, and a major effort could be anticipated from rival political figures to communicate with, and then, to mobilize the support of this group. Included also in this public which had become politically aware during the Reza Shah Period was a group, which was well-educated and had achieved a relatively high degree of political sophistication. This group, to be referred to henceforth as the "new intellectuals," was not large, but to the vast majority of Iranians who remained politically unaware, this group was potentially very influential. Emerging from families of moderate means, often small merchants or minor bureaucrats, members of this group were frequently restive and anxious to see fundamental change (Cottam, 1968: 86).

It was in reaction to these social and economic conditions that the Socialist Theorists found its way among Iranians, particularly amidst intellectuals. They believed that socialism, as a social system, would supply the quickest way out for the existing condition. They believed that their differences with the Marxist Tudeh Party were just that, first, they were not forced to obey the Soviet Union’s commands, and second, they did not believe in materialism. In other words, for them, the Party’s socialist plan was satisfactory.

But the Tudeh Party founders explained their social plan for a way out of that miserable condition. While they never described their program as scientific and revolutionary, they aimed to eliminate the dishonest and cruel rule of the feudal bourgeoisie and to create social justice and socialism in Iran.
Influence and domination of foreign

In the nineteenth century after invasions of Tsarist Russia and the occupation of Northern parts of Iran, superpower countries of the time started influencing Iran. The intervention of these powerful countries, in the first stage, affected Iran's international relations, and then its domestic politics and in the end most parts of public life. During those days the embassies of Britain and Russia interfered continuously, overtly and openly, in the appointment and removal of high ranking officials, regional rulers and even the kings of Iran. They even tried to interfere in affairs like the managing of financial, diplomatic and military services.

They involved themselves in establishing the taxation system and even engaged in mining, oil and trading agreements. This was, in spite of the fact, that, Iran was a self-governing state at that time. The Western dominance and interference gave rise to a deep-rooted sense of offense and hatred towards the Britain and Russia. In the period with which this thesis is concerned, three foreign powers were competing or cooperating to expand and maintain their presence in Iran.

"Following the signing of the Anglo-Russian Entente in 1907, Russia acted as if Iran were another conquered province, Russian troops occupied Khorasan, Azerbaijan and Gilan. Russian consulates became governing bodies and the consuls sometimes collected local taxes" (Andreeva, 2007:21).

According to Taghavi, before the Russian Revolution of 1917, the north and south of Iran were respectively exclusive domains of Russian and British influence. After the Revolution, on the basis of its communist ideology, the Soviet Union abandoned the Tsarist policy of intervention in the affairs of its weaker neighbors. More importantly, communist leaders had to concentrate on their internal affairs and suppress the rebellion supported by Western countries. Hence, the era of the ‘Great
The truth is that under Russian tutelage, a group of so-called intellectuals, mostly from aristocratic families, formed a party in the name of Iranian masses.
However, neither the inspiration behind the formation of the party with its atheistic Marxist-Leninist ideology, nor its crude imitation of Western political practice and jargon had anything to do with Iranian masses.

The opportunism and inconsistency exhibited by the Tudeh throughout its existence were a result of compliance with Kremlin policies. The Tudeh Communists tried to conceal their treacheries from their countrymen by using socialist or proletarian internationalism label, but this was a cover. Its Marxist ideology, unswerving dedication to the service of the Russian empire, willingness to convert Iran into common booty among the superpowers, its totally European origins, incompatibility with Islamic and Iranian traditions and the consequent separation from the spirit of the Iranian masses were all consistent with the Tudeh Party being a gross political oddity (Zabih, 1986: 45).

The third powerful foreign country to exercise power on Iran was the United States, which joined hands with Britain and the Soviet Union later during the Second World War. There was no negative view about United States among Iranians till that time.

According to Taghavi (2005: 43-44), despite the unsuccessful bid of American oil companies for the exploitation of oil in the north, which offended Iranian sense of patriotism, and the misbehavior of American soldiers during their presence in the country, there was no serious negative impression of the United States among Iranian people. Infact, most nationalist politicians, such as the leaders of the Iran Party, had an inclination towards the USA. Hence, Washington played the role of an intermediary in the dispute between London and Tehran over oil. However, after a while, the United States decided to take side of its main ally, Britain, and helped the latter in boycotting Iran’s oil export, in order to pressurize Iran to solve its dispute in favour of Britain.
The Iranians then were disappointed with the United States’ foreign policy and consequently, after the coup of 1953, which was planned by the CIA, the power exercised by the United States increased in Iran to the extent that it finally replaced Britain in its position as the most important foreign power in Iran.

**Despotism in Iran**

Iran, during its long history, has been governed by dictatorial governments. All of them gained power by way of armed forces, and until there emerged a stronger individual or dynasty, these governments were in charge of all aspects of people’s life in the country. Dictatorial governments imposed heavy taxes, and repressed any sign of opposition. People had respite only intervening period of change of dynasties. Even these islands of peace proved very fragile as people had to face the wrath of local governors who found themselves free to exploit people in the absence of a strong central power.

Through the Constitutional Revolution of 1906, people tried to establish a closely controlled judiciary and parliament from the period of Mozaffar al-Din Shah. The effort of his successor, Mohammad Ali Shah, to lock down the parliament was unsuccessful, when, like other Iranian people, the people of Tabriz, in the North-West of Iran, resisted his despotism and marched towards Tehran to force him to resign in favour of his son, Ahmad Shah. However, because of the intervention of Russia and the British Empire in Iranian affairs, the Constitutional Revolution in a little while, lost its force. After a while during the First World War, Iran became the battlefield for Russian and British armed forces in the fight against the Ottomans and German agents.

"For a decade Iran experienced foreign interference, disorder and insurgency in many provinces. Though there was not yet an independent judiciary, the new parliament survived, and there was at times a lively independent press. The early 1920s
saw the rise of Reza Khan, the end of the Qajars and a return to despotism. Reza Shah, a westernized secular nationalist, formed a strong military and a centralized bureaucracy, and established both secular judiciary and a secular educational system which the constitutionalists had wanted all along. In these and other ways he deprived the clerics of former monopolies and resources, though he did not go as far as his neighbour and model, Kemal Ataturk. Many of his reforms were popular, but the constitution was ignored and dissent was ruthlessly suppressed. The clerics, labelled as fanatical reactionaries, in this modernizing milieu, were furious but reduced to silence" (Mir-Hosseini and Tapper, 2006:13).

The reality is that Iranian people were sick of the long years of disorders. After the Constitutional Movement, and with the inefficient rule of the last Qajar king, people seemed to welcome Reza Khan. Unfortunately, Iranian history was repeating itself once again and Reza Khan was not any different from his predecessors. The people had no option but to choose either unconditional chaos or unlimited dictatorship.

During the reign of the Pahlavi dynasty, the whole of Iranian population found themselves under the rule of a strong and powerful ruling authority; it was hard to find the emergence of any other voice from any part of the country. In spite of previous dictatorship rules, there was no way out from his modern despotism. Neither the people nor any organization remained untouched by Reza Shah’s oppressive rule. With the abdication of Reza Shah in 1941, Iranian people and society was refreshed and, once again felt full freedom. Anyway, Iranians kept the memories of the earlier despots in their minds and were always worried in a skeptic manner about the new ruler. Therefore, some social and political activists tried to recognize the roots of dictatorship in Iranian society, with the purpose of stopping its reoccurrence.
3.5. Different Views about Political Parties in Iran

There are three different views about political parties in Iran. These are the opponent, proponent and clergy view towards formulation of political parties in Iran.

**Opponents views towards formulation of political parties in Iran**

The followers of this view believe that, in Iran, there was no need for political parties. Also, they believe that the creation of political parties was mostly an act of external forces. These analysts believed that the originators of Tudeh party were the blind followers of Moscow.

"The Tudeh Party was grounded in the Marxism imported from Russia in the Constitutional period. After the Bolshevik Revolution, socialist ideas gained a wide following among Iranian activists, who admired the Russian revolutionaries and especially Lenin (1870-1924). The February 1921 treaty signed by the Socialist government, which cancelled the previous Tzarist concessions in Iran, further increased the popularity of the new Soviet regime. The existence of pro-socialist sentiments in Iran is confirmed by many references in the literature and journalism of the 1920s and 1930s" (Gheissari, 1998: 65).

There were some thinkers who were against the formation of political parties in Iran. Among politicians who tried to address problems dealing with activities of political parties, the views of Sayyid Hasan Taqizadah—an experienced person and powerful politician—are worth mentioning here. In his writing, Taqizadah mentions that there was no better party except the old Democratic Party in Iran, neither was there any possibility for the formation of any other worthy political party in the country.

"In the view of Taqizadeh, the reasons for the impossibility of creation of real parties were as follows: firstly, the absence of a spirit of cohesion and tolerance, which militates against the easy settlement of disagreements; secondly, the fragility and the
ephemeral nature of alliances; thirdly, and most importantly, the meagreness of overall
civic-national development in Iran "a fact," Taqizadah added, which, with utmost
sorrow, shame and apology, I cannot refrain from admitting. Taqizadah identified a
fourth factor which rendered impossible the formation of parties in the European sense.
This factor, he argued, had three components: first, the state had become virtually the
an exclusive employer of the educated class, which equates party political activity with
political cliquishness aimed at collective gain. Financial dependence on the state
dissuades members of this class from personal sacrifice and struggle in pursuit of
political aims. Second, the merchant (bazari) class, the guilds and the masses cannot be
mobilized other than with demagogic means, which is contrary to the real interests of
the country. And third, even attracting member's of the educated class by promising
them personal gain or enlisting the support of the masses through emotional agitation
required the expenditure of large sums of money. But were there to appear leaders who
are patriotic and above personal gain, and who neither need to be promised jobs nor to
resort to agitation, finding money would not be impossible; the faithful of the bazaars
and the clergymen would not deny them money" (Azimi, 1997: 70).

Many of the factors pointed out by Taqizadah's describing the party's problems
themselves need clarification. Considering Iranian political culture which prevents the
appearance of workable political parties, Taqizadah does not sufficiently provide
reasons for failure of the emergence of “ideal” parties in Iran.

**Proponents views about the formulation of political parties in Iran**

Followers of this view believe that the formation of political parties in Iran was
the real political phenomenon and to understand the political structure of Iran it is
necessary to know the perspectives of these political parties about the political,
economic and cultural issues.
The issue of lack of successful and large-scale political parties in Iran has worried a lot of Iranians. In the 1940s Reza Shah's dictatorship, did not permit Iranian people from learning to cooperate; its legacy caused early division and collapse of associations, and destroyed ethical, spiritual morale of the Iranian people. In this period, successive governments did not help in people's involvement in the formation and managing of political parties. Unfortunately private interests were predominant in this intention.

Similar viewpoints are made by many other writers, as well as, Firaydun Adamiyat, the most important Iranian historian of the Constitutional Revolution. He writes: The domination of personal whims over attachment to principles revealed the weakness of civic responsibility and a defect in the cooperative spirit, in the configuration of Iranian society. Throughout the history of Iranian parliamentary politics, vindictiveness and discord plagued all political groups and associations, and ultimately prevented the consolidation and development of political institutions in the country (Adamiyat, 1961: 320).

Azimi counts some writers and thinkers who share the same viewpoint: Khalil Maliki blamed egoism and the spirit of individuality of the Iranians and their lack of sociability as accountable for the problems involved in sustaining large parties, and for the frequent appearance of many so-called parties. In his opinion the greatest challenge facing parties and associations was to combat such aspects of the Iranian character. Similar points were also made by Rizazadah Shafaq, a politician and academic, in his account of the failure of Qavam's Democratic Party. In varying degrees, such assumptions also speak of the political attitudes and practices of leading politicians. A believer in the redeeming virtues of ordinary Iranians, Mossadeq was less sure of those who aspired for leadership positions. In early 1954, reflecting upon his own experience
of party activity, the imprisoned Mossadeq despondently asserted: I am of the opinion that a large (political) party is not attainable in Iran because everyone wants to be a member of the [central] committee and the executive body Mossadeq had previously explained Iranian legislative inefficiency in terms of the absence of party politics (Azimi, 1997: 69).

Mossadeq, as a parliamentarian and prime minister, later on confessed that the reason behind the failure of his government was mainly the lack of organized support and the necessity of awareness of importance of political parties. Nevertheless, he could not tackle the rebellious situation created by the royal opposition against the development of the non-royal constitution, whereas he had a great support of his own non-royal supporters. He simply failed to systematically utilize the huge support of his followers.

Clergy's views towards the formation of the political parties in Iran

The clergy participated in the constitutional movement with huge enthusiasm. They played a key role in making the movement victorious. Although, soon after the constitutional government was installed, they began to understand the harm they had done to their own interests. The constitution accepted by the people was based upon European regulations; for the most part the Belgian constitution.

"Even though it included certain articles which guaranteed the pre-eminence of religion and the role of clergy in the society as well as politics and legislation particularly, the article of the supplementary fundamental law provided a body of clergy to supervise the legislations of the constituent assembly lest they were not in accordance with the Sharia laws, but these remained largely unpractised. Even the above mentioned article was included in the supplementary fundamental law with great opposition from secular intelligentsia of the constitutionalist movement. There was
great reluctance on their part to accept that the supervisory body of the clergy will be constituted on the advice of the clergy themselves and not by the parliament. On the whole, the constitution curtailed many prerogatives and socio-political privileges of the clergy" (Haq, 1991: 18).

Post revolution there were two different trends among the clergy. One section of them continued the traditional opposition to the Shah's regime as they previously did, while another section of them believed in non-intervention in the issues of politics and directed their powers towards social, educational, and religious reforms. They tried to bring back the reputation and influence of religion in Iranian society.

The reign of Reza Shah was the worst stage for Iranian clergy from all points of view. Reza Shah was impressed by the reforms brought about by Mustafa Kemal (He was an Ottoman and Turkish army officer, revolutionary statesman, writer, and the first President of Turkey. He is credited with being the founder of the Republic of Turkey) in Turkey. The main feature of Shah's modernization plan was the secularization of political and social organization. The first reason for doing this was putting Iran on the path of progress and controlling the power and influence of Iranian clergy.

The clergy also, like other Iranian intellectuals, became active after twenty years of Reza Shah's suppression. The clergy's anger was not only because of the bad treatment they had faced but also because they were not in favour of the latter's policy of modernization of Iran and introduction of a number of reforms. They were also angry about the Shah's policy towards religious organizations, education, and religious donations. But the clergy did not act as an organized force in the post Reza Shah period, they had divergent and opposing trends. They had not only the differences among themselves regarding the degree of activity and participation in politics and public matters but also had different ideas on a number of issues.
"With the occupation of Iran by the Allies in September 1941, which led to the
exile of Reza Shah, the clash between the Westernized groups, traditionalists and
reformists intensified relatively openly and a strong Marxist group entered into the
conflict. Given the failure of the Westernized elite in the first half of the twentieth
century, there was a new tendency towards Islamic reformism. Religious intellectuals
established various Islamic associations, including Jam'iyyat-e Khoda Parastan-e
Socialist, or the Society of Socialist Theists (led by Jalal ad-Din Ashtiani and
Mohammad Nakhshab), Anjoman-e Tabliqat-e Islami, or the Society for Promoting
Islamic Teachings (established by Mahmood Shahabi), Kanoon-e Nashr-e Haqayeq-e
Islami, or the Centre for Spreading Islamic Truth (founded by Mohammad Taqi
Shari'ati) in Mashhad, Kanoon-e Islam, or the Islamic Centre (directed by Ayatollah
Mahmood Taleqani), and Islamic associations of students, engineers and physicians.
These associations, which were primarily founded, to promote Islamic ideas, one by
one, directly or indirectly, became involved in politics. In the 1940s and 1950s, Islamic
reformism flourished in Iran. The main feature of this new trend towards Islam was a
tendency towards the politicization of Islam. In other words, Islamic reformists were
eager to involve Islam directly in the political struggle for changing Iranian society"
(Taghavi, 2005: 3).

In the years before 1941, following the tradition of quietism, the main body of
Iranian clergy continued to remain their aloof from politics. Although this time some of
the clergy, as well as Ayatollah Seyyed Abol-Qasem Kashani began actively
participating in politics. This group of clergy cannot be seen as a symbol of a sharp
change from the prevalent tradition. During the period of the establishment of the
Shi’ite Safavid Empire in Iran majority of clergy collaborated with the government.
Later on, some famous members of the clergy supported the Constitutional Revolution
of 1906, although a few of them opposed it. Such participation in politics did not necessitate an independent claim to the rule by the clergy. It was regarded as a social part of primarily religious responsibilities of the clergy.

The establishment of Jam‘iyat-e Fada’iyan-e Islam, or the Society of the Devotees of Islam, was a turning point. Mojtaba Navvab Safavi was the founder of Fada’iyan —e Islam, a movement that would have a significant role in Iranian politics and the future revolutionary movement, within his own lifetime and afterwards. In Iran, Safavi was one of the founders of the idea of an Islamic state and Islamic form of government.

At a very early age in his life, Safavi raged against the secularist policies of the Shah. He regarded Iranian clerics, who discarded a form of Islamic government guided by the Shari‘a, as apostate of Islam. Safavi was an extreme activist and militant, with an extremely fundamentalist ideology. This became very clear in 1945, when he tried to assassinate the highly influential Ahamd Kasravi.

Safavi’s primary goal was to force back the process of secularization that was started by the Shah, and to bring back Islamic values and law as the highest authority. His ideology was strictly doctrinarian and stripped of all non-Islamic scripture (Thiessen, 2009: 25).

In the historical framework of the first half of the twentieth century in Iran, and specifically after the early death of the 1906 Revolution, conventional inaction and fatalism were widespread among Iranian people. Any political activity by the name of Islam was judged as heresy by some religious leaders. For these reasons, as will be seen later, most Islamic groups were reluctant to participate in political affairs, and it took them a long time to take on board the legitimacy of political action in the name of Islam.
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CHAPTER 4

POLITICAL PARTIES OF IRAN BETWEEN 1942 AND 1954
Introduction

This chapter sheds light on the most important parties which existed in between 1942-1954 in Iran. After 1941 a large number of parties appeared in Iran, most of them had little impact on the political scene therefore they quickly disappeared from view; others had a deeper influence both ideologically and organizationally and have contributed to contemporary Iranian political style. These parties were mostly based on some ideological background and differences. For some of them it was Islam, for some it was Nationalism and for others it was Marxism.

These few ideologically based parties had a more lasting effect on the political scene, both in terms of ideology and political administration. They can be divided into four groups. According to political leanings, Tudeh party and Democratic Party of Azerbaijan were on the left; and National Will Party, Democratic Party of Iran and Adalat (Justice) party which comprised Conservatives, and pro-British notables were on the right. There were also some Nationalist parties like Pan Iranist, National Front Party and Sumka party. Besides these there were some religious parties such as Society of the Devotees of Islam (Jam’iyat-e Fada’iyan-e Islam) and Warriors of Islam Party.

4.1. Development of Political Parties in Iran

In Iran, the rise of political parties is very recent. Soon after the second meeting of the parliament in 1908, the followers and supporters of the government, which were in majority, were named "moderates", and the non-supporting minority called themselves "democrats". Actually, these terms did not refer to political parties, but it was based on parliament members' supporting or opposing the regime measures. Some of the members of the minority tried to build reputations by trying to use political terms like liberalism, constitutionalism, nationalism, and self-sacrifice. However, in view of most people, these groups existed only during the parliament sessions and had
practically had no impact outside. But from 1928, there was no longer any person in the Iranian parliament who could be specifically identified with the democrats or with the minority.

"The Democratic Party and the Moderate Party were significant. A majority of the Moderates tended to appeal to the Qajar nobles, landlords, big merchants, constitutionalist ulama, secular but non-radical constitutionalists, as well as shopkeepers, trade guilds and such others. The Democrats primarily sought to cultivate the intelligentsia, while attempting to widen their appeal. No doubt the individuals who led these parliamentary groups played a crucial role in determining their direction, but modern ideas also had a considerable impact. Indeed, the significance of these groups, in particular the Democrats, was more tangible in the realm of ideology than organization. Inspired by socialist ideas, Democrats had a radical and secular agenda, whether fully or partially articulated. It included political and civic equality of citizens, freedom of expression and organization, the distribution of state land among the peasantry, regulation and improvement of peasant-landlord relations, and compulsory primary education. They opposed privileged classes, including the ulama, as well as the imperial powers, particularly the Russians, whom they blamed for hampering socio-economic reform in Iran. They professed commitment to parliamentarianism and gradual change. Ideologically less assertive, the Moderates also advocated reform but displayed greater responsiveness to traditional sensibilities" (Azimi, 1997: 54).

These early political parties in Iran, if they can be called so, were self-determining, as they recruited leadership from the oligarchy who were mostly literate and had a broader ideology. However, they were not usually overbearing.
In 1941, a lot of political parties appeared with nationalistic names, they tried to publish their own newspapers and send representation to the parliament from Tehran and some other big cities.

In this regard Cottam says party activity came to a standstill during the 1920's and 1930's under the authoritarian rule of Reza Shah Pahlavi; but development in terms of a growth in political awareness proceeded rapidly. Therefore, when Reza Shah abdicated in 1941 and free party activity was again possible, a much larger public existed which had potential receptivity for the appeal of political party leaders. For would-be party leaders this development offered new opportunities and new types of political parties were certain to appear (Cottam, 1968: 85).

Unfortunately, most of these political parties had little lasting effects on the political scene in Iran and they quickly disappeared from view. The fewer parties which had long lasting effect on the political scene in terms of ideology and political administration can be subdivided into four groups according to political persuasion:

Left Parties:
1- Tudeh party
2- Democratic Party of Azerbaijan

On the right, three types of parties emerged that comprised Conservatives and pro-British nobles:
1- National Will Party
2- Democrat Party of Iran
3- Justice (Adalat) Party

There were also nationalist parties which included the:
1- Pan Iran
2- Sumka
3- National front Party

Finally, there were the religious groups such as:

1- Fida'iyan-i-Islam

2- Warriors of Islam Party

4.2. Left – Wing Parties

Marxist ideology came to Iran with the expansion of industrialization and development of commercial mode of production in the late 19th and early 20th century. The social and political background of the time can be summarized as the stage of change of Iranian society from feudalism to capitalism.

At this time anti-authoritarian actions expanded considerably in the Iranian society, and a lot of people took part in the revolutionary struggle. For this reason underground political groups were created in the most important cities of Iran to organize and lead the Iranian people especially in Tabriz, Tehran and Esfahan. But among these groups and parties, the Tudeh Party of Iran and Democratic Party of Azerbaijan were very important.

Tudeh (masses) party of Iran

In 1941, and with the new conditions prevailing a lot of political prisoners were released. Among them was Dr. Arani’s communist group which was known as the Group of Fifty-Three. The foundation of the Tudeh Party of Iran was created by this communist group.

"Although a labor movement had existed in Iran as early as 1916, the real founder of the party was Dr. Arani, who absorbed his political views with his medical studies in Berlin immediately after World War I. On his return to Iran in the early 1930's, he gathered around him a group of young students and professional men whose
common ground was a hatred of dictatorship and sympathy with Marxist ideas" (Lenczowski, 1947: 35).

The Tudeh Party of Iran intended to mobilize broad sections of the working masses. The motive behind the move was to struggle for the working class and to accomplish it they used all means of open activity. The party put forward deliberate slogans reflecting the demands of the people and tried to bring together all forces in Iranian society in a united front for the common interest of all. At this time when authoritarianism was a grave threat to Iran, it was the newly-created Tudeh party which put forward the slogan of common struggle against the dictatorship.

The website of the Tudeh Party of Iran notifies that the provisional committee ratified the following programme in eight articles outlining the party's political principles:

1. To safeguard the independence and sovereignty of Iran;

2. To form a democratic regime guaranteeing individual and social rights such as freedom of speech, opinion and association;

3. To struggle against all forms of dictatorship;

4. To carry out urgently needed land reform and improve the life of peasantry and other toiling masses;

5. To reform the education system to provide compulsory and free education for all. To make provision for a free national health service;

6. To reform the tax system in the interest of the masses;

7. To carry out reforms in the fields of economy and commerce, to expand industry and mining, to improve transport facilities through construction and maintenance of road and railway networks;

8. To confiscate the property of the ex-Shah in the interests of the people.
Many other parties were formed in the aftermath of Reza Shah's downfall, but they either soon disappeared or remained isolated political groups. It was only the Tudeh Party of Iran which functioned as a party, grew rapidly and turned into a significant and influential political force.

This progress of the Tudeh Party was a result of its understanding of the conditions of Iranian society at that time. The history of the Tudeh party of Iran is full of remarkable political and organizational experiences. Members of this party were united in opposing dictatorship, but the party itself was opposed by all other parties. Like all well organized political parties the Tudeh Party of Iran tried its level best in resisting dictatorship and imperialism, but at the same time while accomplishing its mission the party also made some mistakes.

Cottam, (1968: 89-90) in describing this party, says that the fact that this party openly proclaimed its adherence to communism and its association with the Soviet Union was less of an obstacle to recruitment than might be imagined. Though most of the new intellectuals, including many members of the Tudeh, were intensely nationalistic, foreign intervention in Iran had been so common that an association with any particular foreign power could be thought of as not unpatriotic as long as the welfare of the Iranian people was foremost in mind; and many Iranian nationalists saw far less reason to favor the British than on the Soviets. The Tudeh Party can be classified as personality independent; leadership recruited mainly from the new intellectuals; rank and file recruited also largely from the new intellectuals although a major but at this time, generally an unsuccessful effort was made to attract members from other elements of society; narrowly and rigidly ideological; and authoritarian.

During those years this party accomplished many activities, for example, in 1942 it tried to publish its own newspaper, Siasat (Politics). In the first months of its
activity the Party determined to work primarily for the working class in Iran. Since the party worked for the protection of workers' rights from its birth, therefore, it was successful from the very beginning. In addition, in a short time, Party Cells were created in many industrial centres, cities and provinces. Some organizations were formed in Azerbaijan, Isfahan, Gilan, Mazandaran and Khorassan. However, the most important Party organization was in Tehran. The Tudeh Party of Iran, in 1944, fought elections and consequently eight of its members were selected, thereby creating a small party faction in the Parliament.

**Democratic party of Azerbaijan**

The Azerbaijan Society was formed to fight against discrimination, particularly related to Turkish Language used by the people of Azerbaijan province. But the Society was a weak one. Noticing the failure, the regional working group of Azerbaijan became upset with new organizational and political skills brought on by the Tudeh Party, which claimed to be people friendly. Regardless of opposition against the Society, particularly by the Tudeh Party, its reputation and popularity grew culminating in the formation of the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan under Pishavari's leadership. On the other hand, refusal of Pishavari's credentials by the Iranian parliament forced him to try to find non-parliamentary procedures.

"Democratic movement of Iranian Azerbaijan appeared because of socio-political and economic backwardness of this area, like lack of land reforms, education and health care. Although this movement could not reach its ultimate aim of correcting these issues due to its short tenure of one year in power, (1945-46) yet it revived and gave a new soul to the Azeri language that led to its acceptance among the native people. Despite the viewpoints of some of the researchers that the movement culminated with the backing of the erstwhile Soviet Union, it must be said that this was
purely based on the desire of local people. The Soviet Union initially supported the movement but because of the pressure from the central government of Iran and the Western powers (Britain and United States); it deceived the movement the time it was on the verge of success" (Khandagh, 2009: 106).

The strategy approved by Pishavari tried to reduce class differences besides trying to compel Tehran to work for the betterment of the province. On the other hand, recruitments to the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan faced a lot of problems because political dishonesty of earlier political parties had created an atmosphere of suspicion among people. These problems worsened because of the forceful repression and fear-provoking propaganda used by the central government. To counter this domination Pishavari published a twelve-point declaration in 1945, which gave details of their demands and distributed them among the people for their signatures.

The declaration held that Azerbaijan's people wanted democracy and rights like those in developed countries of that time, not just for their own region but for the whole country. They obliged themselves to obey law and revere the central government, but unfortunately the central government’s attitude towards them was very repressive. Considering the manifesto of the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan, all Azerbaijanis thought that the party could fulfill their desires like other successful political parties did erstwhile.

Maghsoudi (2003: 285), in his book gave a Twelve-point declaration which were also the demands of Democratic Party of Azerbaijan:

1- While the Democratic Party respects integrity and independence of Iran, it also seeks autonomy for Azerbaijan.

2- A provincial body would deal with cultural, economic and medical affairs.
3- Turkish will be taught in all primary schools; and national university of Azerbaijan will be established.

4- It would deal with industrial development in Azerbaijan, with the aim to reduce unemployment.

5- It would take step to increase trade.

6- Unite towards modernization of Azerbaijan.

7- Seeks lifting heavy taxes on peasants and distribution of lands amongst the landless peasants, and availability of modern equipment to them.

8- Unemployment alleviation by building factories, increasing trade, and constructing railway networks and roads.

9- Conducting free and fair elections in the province.

10- It will fight against corruption amongst civil servants.

11- Spend half of the taxes raised by the central government for internal developments of Azerbaijan, and try to reduce the amount of indirect taxes.

12- It will establish friendly relations with all democratic countries.

In 1946, the central government of Iran signed an oil agreement with the Soviet with the condition that Soviet forces would leave Iran. Of course at that time pressure of other super powers like United States and Britain was very effective. Since the Soviet Union was the only supporter of Azerbaijan Democratic Party, the party no was left on its own and couldn’t find any other support. For this reason Qavam (a politician who served as Prime Minister of Iran five times during Pahlavi dynasty) took three Tudeh members into his cabinet. In 1946, when the Iranian central government was preparing for new parliament elections, Qavam sent the Iranian central army into Azarbaijan. With no more Soviet support for the Democratic Party of Iran, the

4.3. Right – Wing Parties

All of the right wing parties had, as their agenda against the development of the Tudeh party of Iran. At the time when allied forces in Iran were against the Communist- linked Tudeh party they tried to produce a conservative ideology which was shared almost by all the right wing parties. Another factor that affected this increasing conservative tendency was that most of these political parties had close links with the Iranian Court, which in turn was enthusiastically pro-British. At that time, the Tudeh party of Iran was seen as Soviet supporter, and therefore, left wing and right wing had not only internal conflicts but also were rivals in international political issues.

In this regard Cottam says, “party typology classifies the differences between right- and left-wing parties based on some criteria: the left was personality independent, the right personality dependent; leadership recruited from the new intellectuals fairly closely and also among the rank and file membership; the left was narrowly and rigidly ideological, whereas the right, still narrow, yet did not have broader ideological appeal when compared with the Tudeh party authoritarian and non-authoritarian (Cottam, 1968: 84).

Within this general typology, we shall differentiate between the conservative and pro-British type, and the others with extreme nationalist tendencies.

National will party

The political activity of this party began with the foundation of the Vatan Party which was re-organized in mid-1944. The National Will Party was the largest and most active among the conservative parties. It had branches all over Iran including the Northern provinces, where Vatan formerly had much influence.
"In politically sophisticated circles the National Will Party was perceived to be at least as close to the British as the Tudeh Party was to the Soviets. The party's leader, Sayyid Zia al-Din Tabatabai, had become premier in 1921 after a coup d'etat perceived to have been supported by the British. When he fell from power he went into exile in the British mandate of Palestine, and was believed to have been brought back to Iran during the British and Soviet wartime occupation as part of a British effort to counter the Soviet challenge, implicit in the Tudeh Party. That, a man with such a reputation could seriously hope to gain popular support, is testimony to the astonishing Iranian acceptance of foreign interference as a fact of life that must be lived with" (Cottam, 1968: 86-87).

The president of its central committee was Riza Quli Hidayet. Sayyed Ziya was a Secretary along with Sadiq Sarmadi, the editor of Nida-ye Iran, Pasargad, and Khorshid-i Iran. In comparison to the left-wing Tudeh Party, right wing parties had a strong support from the West, the Iranian Court and its own organizations. Given all this, the National Will Party still could not last longer than two years and was dissolved by Qavam in 1945. Sayyid Ziya was imprisoned and shortly released after the Parliament elections but he was unable to revive the party.

According to Khandagh, one of the major reasons for the party's dissolution was Sayyed Ziya's inability to establish himself as the champion of nationalism; he was regarded by many as an arch-traitor and an instrument of British imperialism. In 1920-21, as editor of Raad the British ambassador in Tehran described Sayyid Ziya as a notorious anglophile. Iranians also saw Sayyed Ziya as instrumental in bringing Reza Khan to power in the 1921 coup. On his return to Iran from Palestine, he was therefore immediately suspected of working again with his old ally, a suspicion that was in fact well-founded. The American ambassador reported to Washington that Sayyid Ziya was
encouraged by the British, who also persuaded the Shah not to oppose him or his political activity. Furthermore Sayyid Ziya failed to make his party the sole defence against Communism, for he had rivals - Adalat, Qavam's Hizb-i Dimukrat-i Iran and the court, with its military supporters. Sayyid Ziya also compromised the party to an extent, by pledging different things to different classes, particularly land distribution between landowners and peasants’, promises he was unable to fulfil for a long time. The right-wing parties did not have wide appeal to the Iranian public who had recently been released from the oppression of Reza Sha's rule. Mossadeq pointed out in March 1944, the 14th Majlis: the present regime in Iran is not really one of freedom for the simple reason that it takes a long time for a nation to recover morally from the effects of a prolonged period of dictatorship. It is for the deputies to help and lead the people. Sayyid Ziya can only work when he can close the Majlis and silence the press (Khandagh, 2007: 30).

There can be many reasons behind the limited success of the National Will Party taking in account its appeal and structure. Its strong pro-British leaning, though established to counter the Soviet influence, was a stumbling block for its wider acceptance.

Cottam (2007: 87-88) has observed "while the National Will Party and the Democrat Party of Iran resembled each other closely in typology, there was a substantial difference in degree of perceived attachment, with regard to the relations with the British. Thus, Qavam was believed to be close to the British as the most aristocratic politicians were Sayyid Ziya, however, was believed to be at least as close to the British as the Soviet were to the Tudeh. Among the new intellectual class which now formed the most politically aware group within the country and was therefore a major source for appeal to recruitment, several different view-points existed. The
National Will Party inevitably limited its appeal to this group by adopting an extreme pro-British stance. While others again felt that Iran's dignity could only be restored through the restoration of lost territories; a majority of the new intellectuals rejected any close association with and foreign power (although accepting Iran's boundaries as essentially unalterable)."

It was obvious, at that time (1941-46) that the party had a great appeal for the common masses, but within a few years it lost its glory, as it failed in general organization and political awareness. The National Will Party, in this respect, can be compared with the European Fascist movement of the 1930s, which met the same fate. The reason for the fall was that it juxtaposed backward looking ideology with a modern outlook; and being a nationalist and socialist sympathizer, it was at the same time militantly-anti communist. It admired traditional values while at the same time showed a kind of dissatisfaction if its credentials were questioned. Moreover, the party did not hesitate to use aggression against its chief opponents.

This resemblance to fascism was noted by the American technical advisor Millspaugh, who was indebted to Sayyed Ziya for supporting him in the Parliament, without considering that the National Will Party lead towards fascism (Millspaugh, 1946: 78).

The National Will Party ultimately disintegrated because of two reasons, first Sayyid Ziya's personality, and second due to lack of ground support.

**Democrat party of Iran**

The Democrat party of Iran was formed by Ahmad Qavam in 1946, when he was Prime Minister. Ahmad Qavam, was believed to be close to the British as were most noble politicians; but there was a considerable difference in degree of perceived attachment.
This party counter-balanced Tudeh influence within the Parliament, especially when Qavam felt his position threatened by the presence of seven Tudeh cabinet members. For this reason he announced over the state radio in 1946 about the formation of the Democrat Party of Iran to challenge the election against the Tudeh party.

This action further emphasized the divisions existing between the Shah and the left at that time, Qavam tried to challenge both of them. Using ex-Tudeh agitators such as Ali Umid to help systematize the Democrat party of Iran, Qavam created a strong coalition of landowners and higher officials which represented the old aristocracy, who sought revenge against Reza Shah. They wanted to oust him from power and the newer middle-class that he had created.

There was one, however, serious obstacle to the program; the party called for equal franchise; which was opposed by the popular Ayatullah Kashani. The party tried in vain to find an equally impressive religious leader to advocate its own point of view but it lost considerable support over this issue.

The other problem was that the party's support from the bazaar union was waning, because it was represented by three nobles- Husayn Mirzada, Dr. Baqa'i, a Europe educated lawyer and Husayn Makki, a historian, all of who had good relationship with Kashani. Moreover, the party's link with the bazaar union was destroyed when the party was secularized following the throwing out of Hairizada from the Central Committee.

According to Khandagh, the initial development of the Democrat party until its coalition with the Tudeh (together with the Firqa-yi Dimukrat-i Azerbayjan, Hizb-i Iran, Irani-i Ma and Hizb-i Susyalist) in August 1946, could have followed one among several options: It could have consolidated its position among the aristocracy by adding
new aristocrats; made further inroads among the intellectual and middle classes; or could have assumed the role which the Tudeh had fulfilled among the urban working class. In fact, the Democrat party of Iran ventured into all three areas as part of its ploy of setting different classes against one another. The party appealed to the middle-classes in various ways: a great deal of work was done amongst youth, building secondary schools etc.; a women's organization flourished since many Iranian women were dissatisfied with their position. Support also came from professional classes including engineering, industrial management and technocratic classes who were unhappy with the high handedness of the Tudeh Party. The working class represented a very dangerous area of appeal, since Qavam was trying to keep peace with the Tudeh Party. In order to convince them of his support he dared not encroach upon their main field of activity the working classes. The solution to this dilemma was the coalition of the Democrat party of Iran and Tudeh Party and its controlling council of United Trade Unions. It was a very fragile alliance for the hard-liner who opposed the Court and clashed with those who urged to compromise with the Shah. There was a split between those who favored British interests and those, including, Qavam himself, who favored the US, within the Democrat party of Iran (Khandagh, 2007: 32).

Following the collapse of this coalition, labor policy changed dramatically. The previously inactive Minister of Labor and Information, Muzaffar Firuz set up a worker's organization for non-Communist wage earners which stripped the Tudeh of its major asset, the working class. The Democrat party of Iran then implemented Qavam's labor law of 1946 by negotiating higher wages from the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, and by creating a syndicate of Iranian workers run by leading anti-Communists. This represented the Democrat party's most important strategic success. Qavam's concern for the leftist security was a cause of concern to conservative Iranian pro-Western opinion,
which believed that by controlling the parliament, Qaran would sacrifice Iran's resources.

"This party was more of an association of old-guard aristocratic politicians and anti-British and non-Tudeh radical intellectuals, who at times had diverse political opinions and leanings. It is also worth noting that Mohammad-Reza Shah distrusted this party and was often suspicious that its more senior and influential members would, independent of him, enter negotiations with the representatives of one of the superpowers" (1998, Gheissari:64).

Following Qavam's fall from power in 1948, the Political Party of Iran, too, soon disintegrated.

The failure of the Democrat party of Iran highlights its three major problems. The working masses were politically unaware and, it was therefore, a very difficult and painstakingly slow task to mobilize them. Secondly, the only way to gain support of the new intellectuals was to develop a very innovative ideology. Finally the harsh measures used against the Tudeh caused demoralization amongst the party's membership. It became clear that violent means had done much damage to the party.

The Democrat Party of Iran was basically a selective party and not a people's party whose rapid development was due to army and police support. Consequently, with Qavam's resignation as Prime Minister his party also vanished. Its members realized that Democrat party of Iran was similar in structure and goals to the Sayyid Ziya's National Will Party, which had the same problem.

Justice party

This political party was founded by Ali Dashti in December, 1941. After Allied invasion in August 1941, Dashti initially appeared to support the reformist program of Reza Shah, but this support gradually dissipated following Reza Shah's abdication.
Dashti was, in fact, a bitter and vociferous critic of the monarchy because of its weak control over the territory. He subsequently, assumed a more prominent role, including formalizing his network of friends into the Justice Party. Other party leaders were Jamal Emami and Ebrahim Kaja-Nuri, a Belgian-educated journalist, lawyer, politician, essayist, and self-proclaimed psychologist. The latter served as director of the government press and propaganda bureau but resigned from his position on 16 November 1947, because of disagreement with the Prime Minister, Ahmad Qawam. Other leading personalities in the party were Faraj-Allah Bahrami, former chief secretary to Reza Shah, governor-general of Isfahan and Fars, and the 1940s minister of interior; Jamshid Alam, an influential physician and politician; and Abu’l-Qasem Amini, a Majlis deputy and governor-general of Isfahan, who later joined Qawam’s short-lived Democrat Party and who, in early April 1953, became acting court minister.

"The Justice Party was an association somewhat resembling a private club, with little organizational cohesion or collective sense of identity. Its vague ideological character consisted of center-right nationalism broadly aimed at promoting the interests or enlisting the support of the privileged and middle classes, and at attracting "deputies and other nobles" (Elwell- Sutton, 1949: 49). Like the majority of groups that emerged after the abdication of Reza Shah, the Justice Party, with about 400 members, was essentially a vehicle for serving the political objectives and ambitions of Dashti, his friends and supporters. The party program consisted mainly of general advocacy of reforms in the administration and legal and educational systems, but it also encompassed more specific objectives, like reduction of the military budget and employment of American military advisers" (Abrahamian, 1982: 192).

The Justice Party initially enjoyed the support of the newspaper Mehr-e Iran, managed by Majid Mowaqqar. In January, 1944 the party began to publish its own
newspaper, Bahram, which had been licensed in the name of Abd-al-Rahman Faramarzi, editor of Keyhan. A few months later Bahram was replaced by Neda-ye edalat, licensed in the name of Kaja-Nuri, which began publication in May-June, 1944.

"This party did not pursue a well-defined policy with respect to any government. In July 1942, it began to disagree with the government of Ali Sohayli, who had promised but failed to appoint Bahrami as minister of interior. Soon after this, the party did not hesitate in joining the opponent to Prime Minister Qawam, but it backed the bitterly contested government of Mohsen Sadr, which lasted from June to October, 1945. A clear demonstration of Adalat's limited success in the 14th Majlis can be seen with the fact that despite the help of Prime Minister Suheyli and the Minister of Interior, the party could manage 11 seats. The impact of the party was, in any case, limited within the Majlis. Thus, its seats were linked to the structure of the parliamentary bureaucracy, its working support came from union members in the factories and its white-collar elements were drawn from the ranks of senior civil servants" (Abrahamian, 1969: 120).

Just before the end of World War II the Justice Party assumed a clearer anticommmunist character and more openly identified with Western interests. For this reason, a few leading pro-western politicians including Dashti and Emami tried to bring about the evacuation of Soviet Union forces from Iranian soil and to put an end to the Soviet supported "autonomous government" in Azerbaijan and the "republic" in Kurdistan. The leading members of the party, particularly Dashti, Emami, and Kaja-Nuri, were experienced political agents and benefited from wide systems of contacts; they continued to work together informally and to play important roles in Iranian politics, as well as direct or indirect collaboration with pro-British efforts to bring down the government of Mohammad Mossadegh. They were, however, arrested by the
government of Iran and then released six months later after the formation of this party. The party, however, faded away.

4.4. Nationalist Parties

Nationalism may be best defined as "the attitude of a population which results in the members giving their supreme loyalty to a given nation" (Smith 1971: 3). Evidently, no historical cause can be analyzed without taking into consideration the circumstances that make it possible.

In Iran, nationalism has to be understood in the context of increased foreign influence in the country's internal affairs. Yet, nationalism in Iran cannot be taken as being exclusively anti-Western or anti-Imperialist, but it has to be looked in terms of the inner dynamics of Iranian culture because conflicts of class interests and the oppressive rule of autocrats significantly contributed to the rise of revolutionary movements (Salehi, 1988: 79).

Discussions concerning Iranian nationalism during the 19th century fall within the framework of national sovereignty which has been previously outlined. Some parties in Iran during that period attempted to create an Iranian "national" identity. In Iran, concepts of nationalism had been introduced during the Constitutional Revolution.

In this case, Katouzian says, in Iran, the word mellat, and later melli, was used—and continues to be used—to describe "the people" who constitute the Iranian nation. The National Assembly during the Constitutional revolution was conceived of as a majles-e shura-yi melli; or an assembly of national consultation. But mellat also retained its traditional (religious) meaning. For instance, the mellat-e Islam would refer to the community of Moslems (Katouzian, 1999: 258).
However, nationalism cannot present an acceptable explanation for historical and political developments, for the basic reason that people are encouraged by many other considerations, and their adherences are not entirely directed to the nation-state.

**Pan Iran party**

After the collapse of the Qajar dynasty, because of its corruption, and emergence of Reza Shah Pahlavi in 1925, who started presenting secular reforms for preventing the power of the clergy, Iranian nationalists had hoped that this new period would witness the establishment of democratic reforms. Although, such reforms did not take place, yet this led to the gradual rise of Pan-Iran group which included nationalist writers, teachers, students, and activists, supported by other pro-democracy groups.

In the 1940s, after the Allied’s invasion of Iran, the Pan-Iranist idea got reputation as a consequence of the extensive feeling of lack of confidence among Iranians. At that time there were armed forces from many countries present in the country, particularly in the capital, Tehran. The presence of these powerful countries in Iran in 1941, resulted in a series of student activities. One of these new nationalist groups was a secretive guerrilla group who called themselves the Revenge group. Consequently, the Pan Iranian Party was created later on, by collaboration of this Revenge group and a few other students' groups in the 1940s in the University of Tehran. This political party was the first association to formally accept the extreme Nationalist idea.

According to Cottam (1968: 90-91), "Pan Iran was more narrowly targeted. It directed its appeal to lower middle class youth, particularly high school students. At this stage of Iran's political development, this was a highly significant target group, and a number of parties or would-be parties competed for pre-eminence in the high schools."
Since young students were volatile and easily mobilized, they acted as a political force particularly in a chaotic situation. All of the groups targeting them used essentially the same ideological appeal, an intense nationalism which called not only for the ouster of the imperial West but also for the return of lost Iranian territories now located within the boundaries of each of Iran's neighbors including the Soviet Union. The appeal was statist, but anti-capitalist, anticommunist, and often anti-Semitic. The leader of the most successful of these groups was Dariush Forouhar, and the leaders were recruited from young men of the lower middle class and the fringes of the new intellectuals. The party called for free party competition but the sincerity of its call for tolerance was questionable.

Finally, the leaders of Pan Iranist Party, Mohsen Pezeshkpour and Dariush Forouhar, in 1951, had a difference of opinion as to how the party should operate, and this resulted in a division. The two groups, to a great extent, differed in their organizational structure and practice. The Pezeshkpour group, which kept the party name, believed in working inside the system of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. The Forouhar group, which accepted a new name, Nation of Iran Party, believed in working against the regime.

**Sumka**

Sumka was an Iranian neo-Nazi group formed by Davud Monshizadeh in 1952. He was a professor at Ludwig Maximilians University of Munich, who served with the SS and had been injured while fighting in Berlin. Before the foundation of this party, this name had been used unofficially to refer to those in Iran who supported and helped Adolf Hitler during the Second World War.

Irrespective of the recruitment of some people based in Iranian universities, Sumka party did not last long. It was been believed that Mohammad Reza Pahlavi
himself supported the party financially for some time. Funding was also provided indirectly by the United States government during their operation in the area.

"The group briefly attracted the support of young nationalists in Iran, with Daryoush Homayoun, who would later rise to prominence, an early member. Monshizadeh was known as something of a Hitler worshipper and was fond of many of the ways of the Nazi Party, such as their militarism and salute, as well as attempting to approximate Hitler's physical appearance" (Fardust and Dareini, 1999: 62).

For this reason, the party adopted the swastika and black shirt as part of their uniforms. Along with this, the party was known for its allegiance to the monarchy and were Pro-Shah.

In this regard, Gasiorowski says that they were firmly opposed to the rule of Mohammed Mossadegh during their brief period of influence, and the group worked alongside Fazlollah Zahedi in opposition to Mossadegh. Indeed, in 1953 they were part of a large crowd of Zahedi supporters who marched to the palace of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi demanding the ousting of Mossadegh (Gasiorowski, 1987: 270).

The party finally disappeared, even though a lot of their membership was taken by the 'Arya' group which had some pro-Nazi tendencies.

**National front party of Iran**

In the final period of relative freedom, 1950-1953, the National Front Party of Iran was formed around the leadership of Dr. Mohammad Mosaddeq. National Front can be generally considered as a nationalist party, because its policy mainly was against the interference of the Soviet Union and the West. In addition, the Pan-Iran Party was also a member of the National Front and had extreme nationalist ideas. Mohammad Mosaddeq, leader of the National Front, was supported by the nationalist groups so as to create the nation of Iran. At the same time Mosaddeq was personally a social
democrat. On the other hand, most secular nationalist leaders in Iran, and Iranian intellectuals who were liberal, and had been educated in France in the late 1940s, also helped in the formation of this party. This political party held supremacy in the Parliament of Iran for a few years till the coup of 1953.

"Soon after its founding, the National Front opposed the existing Western domination and control of Iran's natural resources, and related revenues, which began with colonialist concessions given during the Qajar Dynasty. By the mid-1940s, Iran's oil assets were owned by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, whose predecessor company bought the concession from William Knox D'Arcy" (Kinzer, 2003: 33).

D'Arcy had negotiated the concession in 1941, with Mozzafar al-Din Shah Qajar, the Shah of Persia, who granted a 60-year petroleum search concession for in a transaction in which no money changed hands (Elwell-Sutton, 1955: 15).

The aim of the National Front was nationalization of Iran's oil resources and to neutralize British control on Iran's internal affairs by establishing direct relations with the US. This party became the governing coalition when Mossadegh was elected Prime Minister. Mossadegh's minister of foreign affairs Hossein Fatemi made it obligatory that the Nationalization of Iran's oil was passed by the Parliament in March, 1953 and ratified by the Senate. Iran's Shah unwillingly signed the act and this led to British counter-moves which didn't accept nationalization of Iranian oil.

But Cottam said, the 1950-1953 period was one in which there was a rapid extension into political awareness and an even more rapid expansion of the percentage of political participants. Dr. Mossadeq and the National Front thus, can be seen as primary agents of political socialization, and the norms that those moving into the political stream accepted included liberal democratic norms. It is no accident that the man who gave leadership to the National Front and who became Iran's first really
popular leader should have espoused liberal democracy. In 1951, a potentially popular national leader needed the support, first of all, of the new intellectuals, and it is doubtful that an authoritarian leader could at that time have attracted broad support from this group. Obviously, a great many years would be required to inculcate an acceptance of the liberal-democratic governmental process in a people which had long acquiesced in authoritarianism. But in this three-year period a great many uncomprehending people accepted the liberal-democratic process simply because it was part of the political normative system of a leader and as political elite, they believed in. It is one of the ironies of this age that interventions from the liberal-democratic West cut short this experiment. The National Front can be classified as personality dependent; leadership recruited from the oligarchy, the new intellectuals and the middle-class; rank and file recruited from the entire spectrum of politically aware; ideologically broad; and non-authoritarian (until the summer of 1953, when confronted with a serious challenge from the right, it turned sharply in the authoritarian direction) (Cottam, 1968: 83-84).

In August, 1953 Shah appointed Zahedi as Prime Minister to replace Mosaddeq. He refused to step down and arrested the Shah's emissary. Mosaddeq was therefore, sentenced to three years' imprisonment for trying to overthrow the monarchy, but he was subsequently allowed to remain under house arrest in his village, Ahmad Abad, outside Tehran until his death in 1967. His minister of foreign affairs, Hosein Fatemi, was sentenced to death and executed.

4.5. Religious Groups

During the period of Qajar dynasty the clergy actively participated in the political, social and cultural issues in Iran. According to Hamid Algar, they were involved in the fight against the government. This action was not openly practiced by
the "ulama" of the Safavid period. The "ulama" who already proclaimed themselves as regents of the Imams could not recognize monarchy, which was considered illegal. The conflict between the religious and secular power continued for the whole of nineteenth century (Algar, 1973: 252).

Alban Bill also comments about this: the "ulama" power became stronger with the coming into existence of the Qajar rule. A large number of "ulama" who stayed in Najaf and Karbala came back to Iran and displayed their influence (Alban Bill, 1972: 23).

The clergy, at that time, had their own power to mobilize the Iranian population for their own purpose. They certainly had this power to compel the Iranian government to consider their advices. They aimed at ending of the misgovernment and sought a return to the Sharia.

According to Keddie, the power of the clergy became strong because of the following factors: 1) Twelve Shi'i theory, which considered all temporal rulers illegitimate and came increasingly to assert that legitimate guidance, pending the return of the "hidden" twelfth Imam is to be found in the Shi'i religious leaders. 2) The independent and untouchable position of Ottoman Iraq, beyond the reach of the Iranian government. 3) The great veneration for the clergy leaders by most Iranians, along with very close ties between the guilds and the clergy. 4) Identification of the clergy with the popular anti-foreign cause ever since the first war against Russia in the nineteenth century (Keddie, 1971: 5).

The reign of Reza Shah (1925 to 1941) was the worst stage for Iranian clergy from all points of view because soon after becoming the king, Reza Shah started strengthening his position and started modernization and westernizing of Iran.
"In 1941 Reza Shah was forced to abdicate and his son Mohammad Reza Shah ascended the throne. This led to considerable relaxation of political activity as well as freedom of expression. The clergy also became active now. Their anger was not only due to the bad treatment that had been meted out by the Shah, it was also because they were against the latter's policy of modernization of Iran and introduction of a number of reforms. They were particularly annoyed by his policy towards religious institutions, education and religious endowments" (Haq, 1991: 25).

During these years the conflict between the Westernized groups, traditionalists and reformists increased, also, a strong Marxist group entered into this conflict. Due to the failure of the Westernized elite in the first half of the twentieth century, there was a new tendency in the Iranian society towards Islamic reformism. For this reason religious intellectuals tried to establish various Islamic Parties and groups.

**Society of the devotees of Islam (the Feada'iyen- Islam)**

The Society of the Devotees of Islam, a Shiite militant group, was established in 1945. While this party had vast political impact during the years of nationalization of oil in Iran, it never got popular support, and till the end remained a small group. It had the intellectual expression to attract the younger generation of Iranian society.

The establishment of Society of Devotees of Islam was the first organized effort to move away from the long-established quietism of clergy in Iran. This party opened the way for the next generation of radical Iranian clergy, who a few years later, succeeded in putting an end to the Shah’s government and creating an Islamic government. The heritage of Society of Devotees of Islam can obviously be seen in today’s Iran; there is a great similarity between their views and those of the present government in Iran. It is necessary, here, to say that, that many younger members of
Society of Devotees of Islam later joined a Coalition of Islamic groups, and this had a great effect on the victory of Islamic Revolution in Iran.

The activities of the Society of the Devotees of Islam party's considerably ended, following the execution of its founder and leader, Seyyed Mojtaba Navvab-e Safavi in 1955.

"Seyyed Mojtaba Navvab Safavi was born in Tehran in 1924, about the same time that Reza Khan was establishing the reign of the Pahlavi monarchy. Navvab Safavi's father, Seyyed Javad Mir-Lohi, was a cleric who, according to Navvab Safavi's biographer, put the clerical robe a side under Reza Shah's anticlerical campaign and practiced law, defending the oppressed. Seyyed Mojtaba, went to Hakim Nezzami public elementary school and then to the German Technical High School, both in Tehran.

In 1942, when Iran was occupied by the Allied forces and Reza shah abdicated power, Navvab Safavi completed high school. He founded a job as a metalworker on oil company and went to Abadan in 1943. In Abadan he became involved in a worker's protest against a British manager and fled to Najaf- the centre of Shi’ite religious education- in Iraq in order to avoid arrest"(Jahanbegloo, 2004 : 72).

The foundation of Society of the Devotees of Islam was declared in 1945 in a declaration entitled ‘Religion and Revenge’, written by Navvab. In the declaration, he said that Islam was under attack, and promised to ‘avenge’ such attacks.

The Society of the Devotees of Islam's firstly started its activities against Ahmad Kassravi, whom they considered as a tool of the super powers, and thought that he was trying to found another Bahai-style religion (a religion founded by Baha Ullah in 19th century in Iran). Imami and his friends from the Society of the Devotees of
Islam assassinated Ahmad Kassravi in 1946, when he was in court on the charge of challenging Islam.

"The Fada'iyan-e Islam was the first Shiite Islamist organization to employ terrorism as a primary method of political activism. Navvab-Safavi first came to public attention in 1945 for his outspoken public lectures in Abadan castigating the “evil” anti-clericalism promoted in Ahmad Kasravi’s writings. A year later, Navvab-Safavi and two of his followers (with the blessings of Shiite religious leaders) assassinated Kasravi and the writer’s secretary. The assassination of Kasravi was hailed by some Shiite clergy as a righteous act" (Kazemi, 1980: 161).

In consideration of the political role of the Society of the Devotees of Islam, it is important to say that the Society did not act as a well-organized political force, especially in its early activities, but instead, represented a religio-political orientation with which many individuals sympathized. Naturally, those who saw themselves as the leaders of the movement were inclined to claim credit for political actions which were more the results of individual initiatives of the sympathizers than their own order.

According to Taghavi, in early 1949, Fada'iyan helped Kashani to establish his Majma’-e Mosalmanan-e Mojahid [the Association of Mojahid Muslims]. However, an attempt on the Shah’s life by an alleged member of the communist Tudeh Party led to a short-lived era of suppression of political parties and freedoms. Kashani was once again imprisoned. Fada'iyan protested against Kashani’s imprisonment, and also against a proposal for amending the Constitution which aimed to remove a provision according to which Islam was the only official religion of Iran, to give more power to Shah. Later in 1949, and particularly when the Supplementary Bill for Exploiting Petroleum, which was believed to strengthen British domination over the Iranian petroleum industry, was put up before the Parliament, opposition groups became more active in Iran. In a
parliamentary election marred by irregularity and fraud, government candidates won. Among the activities of the opposition, the most important single action that led to the annulment of the Tehran election was the assassination of Hajir, the then Minister of the Court and the former Prime Minister, by Fada’iyan-e Islam. The assassin, Hossein Imami, was executed five days later. In the revised election, Fada’iyan supported candidates endorsed by Jebhe-i Melli, or the National Front, and Ayatollah Kashani. Nonetheless, they were unhappy that some of the candidates were not ‘100 per cent Islamic and did not seek to establish an Islamic government’. Interestingly, Kashani reminded Fada’iyan that the candidates’ focus should not be on performing night prayers, but on nationalizing the petroleum industry dominated by the British. This problem shows the nature of the differences between Fada’iyan and Kashani, which developed in the later stages. Whereas Fada’iyan’s members were religious devotees and did not care about the complexities of politics, Kashani, although a religious leader, was a shrewd politician (Taghavi, 2005: 117).

In 1950, Shah’s regime tried to approve the above mentioned Supplementary Bill, which was opposed by the National Front Party and public opinion in Iran; this confrontation led to a political crisis in country. The Shah, in order to overcome this political crisis, appointed the army’s Chief of Staff, General ‘Ali Razm-Ara, as Prime Minister. In March 1951, Khalil Tahmasebi, a member of the Society of the Devotees of Islam member, killed Razm-Ara. After this assassination, fear among the pro-government Members of Parliament, along with the public support, supported by Iranian Parliament, Shah appointed the nationalist Mohammad Mossaddeq as the Prime Minister. It is a must to say here, that the assassination of Razm-Ara was supported by Kashani, and also approved by the National Front Party of Iran.
Yazdi says that the Fada'iyan's behaviour towards the nationalist forces, represented by Dr Mossadeq and the National Front, and towards other religio-political forces, represented by Ayatullah Kashani reveals important aspects of the nature of their religious and political convictions. Majid Yazdi in this regard says: Many factors seem to have been responsible for the Fada'iyan's behavior. First, their reaction to Dr Mossadeq's government was partly the reflection of political naivety and lack of sophistication on the part of the Fada'iyan who perhaps viewed the passage of the oil nationalization bill and the formation of Dr Mossadeq's government as the end of the national struggle against British imperialism. Secondly, they considered their own role in this anti-foreign struggle to be more valuable and important than that of any other group, secular as well as religious. The Fada'iyan's assassination of Hazhir, the Court Minister, forced the government to stop interfering in the Sixteenth Majlis elections, resulting in the election of Kashani and the National front members (including Mossadeq) to the parliament. The assassination of Razmara was also crucial in the passage of the oil nationalization bill. Finally, and perhaps most important, by the Fada'iyan's insistence on the implementation of Islamic laws reflected their deep religious convictions which served as a strongest motive for political action (Yazdi, 1990: 298-299).

Finally, the Society of the Devotees of Islam saw themselves as the most religiously and politically experienced group, that had made the greatest sacrifices. They thought that they were betrayed by the nationalist and other religious forces who had opposed them both. Their reconciliation with Kashani towards the end was the result of the latter's confrontation with Mossadeq, who as a nationalist leader, was not in a position to compete with Kashani for the Society of the Devotees of Islam's sympathy and support.
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Warriors of Islam party (the Mojahidane- Islam)

The Warriors of Islam party was a remarkable religious party. The Warriors of Islam was apparently led by the Shams Qanatabadi, but it was dependent on the leadership of the most successful of the politician-priests, Abol- Qassem Kashani. Actually, this party recruited its leaders from three groups of Iranian people: Shiah religious leaders, guild leaders, and street leaders. On the other hand, rank and file support was attracted from the deeply religious lower middle class.

Cotatam says: Since the great bulk of the aware, but as yet, non participating public could be classified as lower-middle class, and since the Warriors of Islam was the most successful of the parties in reaching this group, especially in the provincial centers, Kashani could reasonably believe that his political potential was next only to that of Mossadeq. However, he was dependent for success on a loose alliance with some independent political religious leaders in Tehran and in the provincial centers, and the tenuousness of this alliance was to be demonstrated in 1953 (Cottam, 1968: 90).

It is must to mention that Kashani's ideological appeal was extensive and at the same time weak. Unfortunately, at that time no real attempt was made to bring together the inherent contradictions together, which could have been solved by bringing Islam and Nationalism together. Kashani's economic and social attitudes were very conservative and his close supporters were unaware of that. They were just attracted to grand slogans of Iran and Islam.
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CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION
5.1. Conclusion

Prior to the emergence of political parties, people in the 18th century European countries tried to challenge the belief that political authority is given by God. They challenged hereditary rights and the authority of the elite classes. Usually, political parties emerge when various groups of people get aware of their particular interests, and a lot of people of a country want the right to take part in political issues.

Political parties were created in Iran after its political reconstruction. In the twentieth century, the creation and growth of political parties in Iran became the main feature of the country's political modernization; that continued throughout this period and affected economic infrastructure, but not monarchical political structure. In this situation the role of political parties and their durability in the Iranian society faced many ups and downs.

The appearance of the political parties and their proper behavior in political scene in Iran had good effect on social maturity and cultural expansion. The first priority in Iranian society was to bring about drastic change in government structure, and in such a case the people and society got changed automatically. The development of political participation and emergence of parties required some basic changes in the traditional society, including the appearance of new social groups, development of public opinion, and other processes related to social and economic renovation. These changes initiated the condition for the development of parties and political participation.

During the years 1942-1954, as a result of central government’s weakness and inefficiency, political parties witnessed vast expansion; however, as Cottam says, the history of Iranian political parties does not begin with the year 1941. Iranians have been talking of their political parties ever since the constitutional revolution of 1906. And
two political groups, the Democrats and Moderates, can lay some claim to the appellation "party" (Cottam, 2007: 84).

Unfortunately, after a coup d'etat against Mohammad Mossadegh (Prime Minister) in 1953, authoritarianism was the main affairs in Iran, with little, if any, trace of independent political parties. Even if a party existed, it was by order of the king, and this situation lasted until the Islamic Revolution of Iran.

Discussions in this research work highlight the reach, utility and inadequacies of the approaches adapted to the study of political parties. Using the approach known as structuralism, I have searched a way to prove that social, economic and cultural structures were the causes of instability of political parties in Iran between years 1942-1954.

On the other hand, considering the importance of developing political parties in Iranian history, this research has tried to provide necessary information and discussion which helps to understand the reasons of formation and activities of political parties in order to fill the vacuum, which existed in this domain.

For this purpose, I have tried to analyze four political phases and their relation to the political awareness of Iranian population. Then, utilizing the existing documents and references, I have emphasized the role and aims of the ruling class, intellectuals, foreign powers, and socio economic conditions, in the formation of political parties such as left-wing, right-wing, nationalist and religious parties.

During these years, a large number of parties appeared in Iran; most of them had little permanent effect on the political scene, and quickly disappeared from view. Others have had a deeper influence, both ideologically and organizationally and have contributed to the contemporary Iranian political style. These fewer parties had more long lasting effect on the political scenario, in terms of both ideology and political
administration, and considering only the more permanent aspects of the development of political parties in Iran, I have subdivided it into four groups: on the left were Tudeh Party of Iran and Democratic Party of Azerbaijan, on the right, three types of parties emerged comprising Conservatives, and pro-British notables such as National Will Party, Democratic Party of Iran and Justice Party and the others. There were also nationalist parties such as Pan Iran, Sumka and National Front party of Iran. Finally, there were the religious groups such as Fida'iyan-i- Islam and Warriors of Islam Party.

It is fit to record that the nature of political parties in Iran was different from that of western countries. The most important feature of all the parties in Iran was ideology. Usually this ideology was Marxist, Nationalist and Islamic. Of course sometimes, in special cases political awareness gives birth to political parties.

After mentioning the importance of political parties in helping political structure to sustain and democratic growth, the findings of this study show that the following factors had the greatest impact on the failure of political parties in Iran:

1- The political parties in the west were born and created by its history, and existing theories of political party development in Iran do not take into account this specific historical context and, generally do not pay attention at all to parties and party systems in Western developing countries. Compared to party development in the western world, political parties in regions such as Asia and Iran are of much more recent origin and typically have not benefitted from decades of parliamentary experience. However, in Iran political, economic and socio-cultural context was fundamentally different from western societies.

2- Another problem of political parties in Iran at that time was eastern autocracy and absolute rule of the sovereign. There was a constant tension between the central government and other political parties. For this reason, when the central
government was weak, the political parties had less chance for development, and when it, got stronger, it suppressed the political parties. Therefore, parties in such a situation couldn’t play effectual roles in society.

3- Like most third world countries, in Iran also, authority did not distribute power with political parties and other political groups, on the other hand government tried to weaken parties, especially those which opposed them.

4- Another reason for failure of political parties in Iran was that most parties had close association with foreign power doctrinaires. From the left wing, the Tudeh Party openly proclaimed its adherence to communism, this party and also Democrat Party of Azerbaijan was supported by Soviet Union. On the other hand, from the right wing parties, the National Will party with liberal democratic ideas was perceived to be somewhat close to the British.

5- During this time in Iran there was no friendly relationship between political parties, and most of them were competing with each other. For example, all of the right wing parties had their base in response to the growth of the Tudeh party. The Tudeh party was seen as Soviet sponsored, and thus left-wing and right-wing had not only internal clashes but also rivaled in the context of international politics.

6- Another drawback of most political parties that caused them to be unsuccessful was the lack of internal integration because these parties included many different branches among themselves. For example, the National Will Party disintegrated because of two reasons: first due to Sayyid Ziya's personality, and second lack of ground support. The Third force, a movement group that Maleki formed broke with the Tudeh Party after it supported the movement in Azerbaijan.
Political parties in Iran were not financially supported by the people and government. In the West parties were financially supported by a few merchants, industrial undertakings, and banks; besides that, political parties in western countries were dependent on private contributions to finance their activities. “While the classic mass party secures a structural flow of income from the fees paid by its members and the donations from affiliated trade unions, the cadre party generally relies on contributions from wealthy individuals or donations from private business. Government financing of the political process, if at all, occurs mainly indirectly. Public funding for political parties is a relatively recent phenomenon in European democracies” (Alexander, 1989: 211). In Iran, political parties were not supported by such substantial support sources, because there were no huge private companies here like in the developed countries. There were a few companies and banks, and they were under government control also, they were unwilling to support parties. Like other developing countries, here, people were not interested in becoming members of political parties because they forced them to pay subscription fee, and there was also no public funding for political parties.

Most of those parties had no roots among the people and they were dependent on the individual. The aim of appearance of a lot of political parties was to support a few politicians, and their political activities were good excuse for continuation of these parties. Most of these political parties were mainly dependent upon their founders, and it was obvious that after the death or resignation of their patrons, these political parties would gradually disappear from the political scenario of the country. For example, Democrat Party of Iran was basically a selective party, not rooted another majority of people, whose
rapid development was due to support from Qavam Ulsaltana. Consequently, with Qavam's resignation as Prime Minister, his party disappeared too. Its members realized that Democrat Party of Iran was similar in structure and goals to Sayyid Ziya's National Will Party, faced the same end.

9- Parties had very little activity in small towns, and all were supported by a few intellectual individuals from the capital and some big cities in Iran. Also, most political parties lacked overall organization. The most important political organizations were in Tehran, Azerbaijan, Isfahan, Gilun, Mazandaran and Khorasan.

10- Political parties have often played a marginal role in the decision making process in Iran. One of the reasons for this was the tyranny in Iran, that has a historical background and the lack of intermediate organizations like parties.

11- Political system of the time in Iran had a totalitarian structure; because of a highly centralized power, political repression and exclusion of potential challengers. During this time, relationship between Iranian government and political parties was not well-developed. Sometimes, it is important that political parties and mass organizations help achieve the goals of the state.

12- The Iranian government at that time was not totally independent, and foreign superpowers like Soviet Union, Great Britain and United States had a great influence on the Iranian government. Most times these countries supported some political parties; because the Iranian government always believed that since all parties were made by them, their activities were suspicious. The Iranian government of that time can be regarded as an obstacle in the way of formation and activity of political parties. For these reasons Iranian government tried to interfere in the internal affairs of political parties.
13- Like other third world countries, in Iran, separation between elite and mass was one of the problems of political parties. While the mass was unaware of the necessity of political parties, increased elite contact with the west in that time caused some Iranian intellectuals to persuade the regeneration of political structure to obtain the political power. This gap between elite and mass was a huge obstacle in creating political participation, and even formation of political parties.

14- There were also some other preventive factors for the condition of political parties in Iran. These factors included: political apathy, fatalism, lack of tolerance, conspiracy theory, political distrust, patriarchy, self-important ideas, superstition, Absolutism, ambivalence and obedience to their rulers, Mysticism, Sufism etc. although their value and importance according to time and place were different.

15- The combination of politics and religion has always existed in Iranian history in varying degrees, as religion has usually been the source of legitimacy for political power in this country. While Iranian society was totally religious and traditional, most parties at that time were not believed to be religious and during these years the conflict between westernized parties and traditionalist religious groups increased. Due to this there was no tendency among the Iranian society towards western model political parties.

16- Another reason of defeated political parties was that religious leaders and intellectuals had serious problems with Marxist parties because these parties, in a totally religious and traditional society, openly proclaimed their adherence to communism, and religious intellectuals were against these kinds of parties.
17- The following factors also had very important role in political parties' inefficiency at that time: insufficient education among the parties members, ignorance towards elite rotation, appearance of a lot of parties during these twelve years, while most of them had no experienced cadres, lack of confidence and intention for being away from group, having a political confusion, lack of persistence and being unadjusted, excessive attention to cultural elements especially religious factors.

18- Characteristics to Iranian elite there were also some preventive factors for the development of political parties in Iran, these factors included: lack of cooperative culture among them, expectation of submission by ordinary people, and conspiracy theory.

19- Lack of strong workers unions, guilds and many other associations which could be considered as cornerstones of political parties were other reasons for the failure of political parties at that time.

20- Finally, one of the most important causes of political parties' inefficiency was the imbalance between the growth of political parties and the growth of political culture in Iran which would cause increase demands from the political system. In addition, party organization could be activated for categorizing of these demands and transferring them to the political system.

This study highlights the importance of developing political parties in Iranian history; and has tried to provide necessary information and discussions which helps in the understanding of the reasons of their formation and activities in order to fill the vacuum, which existed in this domain. This study has tried to cover everything related to the research area but there is still a lot of research going on this topic. New studies can bring out more results and thus, the present research should not be treated as a final
arbiter on the area. The present research is as sociological as much as it is related to the politics of the country. Many new facts and details related to the intentions of the past rulers and politicians may get revealed with the passage of time; therefore the reasons of some events that occurred in the concerned time period of the research may come out of the bosom of the history. There is a lot of scope to conduct research in the related field. Future researchers can conduct more detailed analysis of political parties in Iranian society.

5.2. Limitations

Although this research was carefully prepared, I am still aware of some of the limitations and shortcomings. The present research was both specially and temporally bound to only Iran and a specific period (1942-1954) of time of Iranian social and political history.
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