

State and Tribes in Persia 1919-1925

**A case study
On
Political Role of the Great Tribes in
Southern Persia**

Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors
der Philosophie (Dr. Phil.)
Freie Universität Berlin
Otto-Suhr-Institut für Politikwissenschaften
Fachbereich Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften

vorgelegt von:

Javad Karandish

Berlin, Januar 2003

Published 2011

1. Erstgutachter: Herr Prof. Dr. Wolf-Dieter Narr
2. Zweitgutachter: Herr Prof. Dr. Friedemann Büttner

Disputationsdatum: 18.11.2003

PART I: GENERAL BACKGROUND 11

INTRODUCTION	12
1. THE STATEMENT OF A PROBLEM.....	12
1.1. Persia After the War.....	15
2. THE RELEVANT QUESTIONINGS	16
3. THEORETICAL BASIS.....	17
4. THE METHOD OF RESEARCH	20
5. THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION	21
6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUBJECT	23
6.1. The Years of Transition	24
7. AN OVERVIEW ON SOURCES	25
7.1. The Primary Sources:.....	25
7.1.1. The British Documents:	26
7.1.2. Memoirs andTtravel Accounts:.....	28
7.2. Persian Sources	29
7.2.1. The Persian Documents	30
7.2.2. The Persian memoirs.....	31
7.3. Secondary Literature:.....	33
7.3.1. Political and Historical Studies	33
7.3.2. Studies on nomad Tribes.....	35
7.3.3. Researches on oil History in Persia.....	40
8. SUMMARY	44
I. NOMAD TRIBES IN PERSIA.....	46
1.1. Basic Geography of Persia.....	46
1.1.1. Location and Frontiers	46
1.2. Physical Geography	46
1.2. 1. Precipitation	47
1.3. Human Geography	48
1.3.1. Pastoral Tribes andPastures	49
1.3.2. Great Powers and TribalCchieftains	53
1.4. Central Zagros and Khuzestan Tribes	53
1.4.1. Bakhtiyari Tribe (Origin and History)	54
1.4.2. Leadership in Bakhtiyari Tribe	55
1.4.3. The Family Rivalry	56
1.4.4. Bakhtiyari Road and Oil	57

1.4.5.	Bakhtiyaris in Revolution 1905-1911	57
1.4.6.	Security of the Oil Fields	58
1.5.	Population of Khuzestan	58
1.5.1.	Arab Tribes of Khuzestan	59
1.5.2.	Khuzestan's Governors and Chieftains	60
1.5.3.	British and the Chieftains of Mohaysen.....	61
1.5.4.	Sheikh Khaz'al the Governor of Mohammareh	61
1.5.5.	British and Sheikh Khaz'al	62
1.6.	The Great Tribes of Fars	63
1.6.1.	Qashqa'i Tribes of Fars.....	63
1.6.2.	The Confederation of Khamseh Tribes	64
1.6.3.	Governor-General of Fars and Two Chieftains.....	67
1.7.	British and Southern Tribes	67
1.7.1.	Southern Tribal Chieftains and the War.....	69
1.7.2.	British in Khuzestan During the War.....	70
1.7.3.	Bakhtiyaris and Khaz'al During the War.....	73
1.7.4.	Tribal Chieftains of Fars and the War.....	80
1.8.	Summary	87
 II. QAJAR PERSIA IN MODERN HISTORY		90
2.1.	Persia and Great Powers in 1796-1914.....	90
2.2.	Persians and the Modern Europe.....	92
2.3.	Persia and the Great War	93
2.3.1.	Persia and the Belligerents in 1914-1917.....	94
2.3.2.	The German Missions in Persia	96
2.4.	From Russian Revolutions to Armistice	103
2.4.1.	Persia in the Years 1917-1918	103
2.5.	Persia After the War.....	108
2.5.1.	Persia and Paris Peace Conference	108
2.5.2.	The Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919.....	109
2.5.3.	The Moderate Cabinet.....	114
2.6.	The Persian Cossack Coup.....	116
2.6.1.	Towards an Administration Reform.....	118
2.6.2.	The Successive Persian Cabinets	119
2.6.3.	Reza Khan and Sir Percy Loraine	121
2.6.4.	Reza Khan in Summer-Autumn 1923	121
2.7.	Reza Khan the Prime Minister	123

2.7.1.	The President of the Republic ?	124
2.7.2.	Towards Khuzestan	124
2.8.	The Change of Dynasty	125
2.9.	Summary	126

PART II. POWER STRUGGLE 127

III. THE GREAT TRIBES IN FARS IN 1919-1921 128

3.1.	Fars and the Great War	128
3.2.	Fars After the Anglo-Qashqa'i War	128
3.2.1.	British and Sowlat-al Dowleh in 1919	130
3.2.2.	British and the S.P.R.	131
3.3.	Farmanfarma and the New Ilkhani	133
3.4.	Fars and Events in the North 1920	135
3.4.1.	The Fall of Farmanfarma	136
3.5.	Mossadeq, New Governor-General of Fars	139
3.5.1.	Sowlat al-Dowleh returned to Power	140
3.5.2.	Mossadeq and the Coup Regime	143
3.6.	Governor-General of the Coup Regime	145
3.6.1.	Qavam al Molk and New Governor-General	145
3.7.	Summary	149

IV: THE EVENTS OF FARS IN 1921-1922 150

4.1.	Fars After the Fall of Coup Cabinet	150
4.2.	Dissolution of South Persia Rifles	151
4.2.1.	Qavam al-Molk and South Persia Rifles	154
4.3.	Sowlat al-Dowleh and British Legation	155
4.3.1.	New Alliance Against Sowlat al-Dowleh	157
4.4.	In Search of Oil in the Province of Fars	160
4.4.1.	Negotiation with Kashkuli Khans	161
4.5.	Attempts of Ilkhani of Qashqa'i	162
4.5.1.	The Second Thought	163
4.6.	Hayat Dawudi and Kashkuli Agreements	165
4.6.1.	Resident Director and Ilkhani Correspondences	166
4.6.2.	Ilkhani and Kashkuli Agreement	167
4.7.	Persian Government and the Agreement	170
4.8.	Government's Tribal Policy in Fars	172

4.9.	The Letter of British Legation.....	176
4.10.	Towards a New Solution.....	179
4.11.	New Round of Confrontation.....	183
4.12.	Reza Khan and Sowlat al-Dowleh	187
4.13.	Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and New Agreement.....	189
4.14.	A new Attempt Against Sowlat	191
4.15.	Summary	193
V : KHUZESTAN.....		194
5.1.	British in Khuzestan During the War.....	194
5.1.1.	Administration of North Khuzestan	194
5.1.2.	Southern Khuzestan During the War	195
5.2.	Khuzestan After the War.....	196
5.3.	Khaz'al Expectation.....	196
5.3.1.	Norman in the Yacht	197
5.3.2.	Khaz'al and Arms Deal.....	198
5.3.3.	Mediation in Khaz'al's Taxation	199
5.4.	Consolidation of North Khuzestan.....	202
5.5.	Wilson and the Future of Khuzestan.....	204
5.5.1.	Evacuation From Khuzestan	205
5.6.	Summary	208
VI: BAKHTIYARIS IN 1919-1920.....		210
6.1.	Sardar Zafar the Ilkhani in 1917-1919	210
6.1.1.	Sardar Zafar and Ilkhaniship in 1919.....	213
6.2.	A New Ilkhani for Bakhtiyari in 1920	215
6.2.1.	The Choice of Ilkhani	217
6.3.	Bakhtiyari Khans and Bolsheviks	218
6.3.1.	Younger Khans and Social Reforms	221
6.4.	British and New Circumstances in Persia	222
6.5.	Ahmad Shah remained in Tehran.....	225
6.6.	Norman's View on Bakhtiyari Khans	228
6.7.	Summary	231
VII: BAKHTIYARIS AND SOUTHERN CONFEDERATION		233
7.1.	The Southern Consulates and Bolsheviks.....	233

7.2.	The Changes in Bakhtiyari.....	235
7.3.	ThePast Activities	241
7.3.1.	Noel’s View on Bakhtiyari Tribe.....	244
7.3.2.	Proposals of Noel and Smart.....	247
7.4.	A Defence Plan of the South.....	249
7.5.	Opposition From Ahvaz.....	251
7.6.	The Old Differences.....	255
7.7.	The New Solution ?.....	258
7.7.1.	Director Respond	262
7.8.	Senior Khans in Correspondence.....	268
7.9.	Summary	276

PART III. TOWARDS THE CENTRALISATION..... 277

VIII: CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND THE SOUTH 278

8.1.	PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION IN PERSIA	278
8.1.1.	PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION IN 1800-1920.....	278
8.2.	A MODERN ARMY AND PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION.....	279
8.3.	BEGIN OF CONSOLIDATION IN THE SOUTH.....	280
8.4.	Bakhtiyari Khans and Kohgiluyeh.....	282
8.5.	Taxation of Southern Khuzestan	285
8.6.	Dissension or Alliance in Southern Persia ?	289
8.7.	A Military Detachment and soMmany Discussions.....	292
8.8.	A Detachment in Bakhtiyari land.....	293
8.9.	From Threat to Action.....	295
8.10.	Shalil Incident in Bakhtiyari	300
8.11.	A Loose Confederation in the South?	303
8.12.	Public, Press and Shalil Incident.....	307
8.13.	Towards a Conciliatory policy	308
8.14.	Sheikh Khaz’al arms Purchasing	310
8.15.	Summary	315

IX: THE MINISTER OF WAR IN THE SOUTH 317

9.1.	THE AFFAIRS OF BAKHTIYARI.....	317
9.1.1.	INVESTIGATION MISSION.....	318
9.2.	THE MINISTER OF WAR IN ISFAHAN.....	321
9.3.	EN ROUTE TO THE PROVINCE OF FARS	324

9.3.1.	EN ROUTE TO BUSHEHR	325
9.3.2.	THE VISIT OF BUSHEHR	326
9.4.	THE SHAH AND THE MINISTER OF WAR IN SHIRAZ	330
9.5.	BRITISH CONSULATES AND REZA KHAN.....	333
9.6.	THE HIGH COMMISSIONER OF BAGHDAD	334
9.7.	THE RETURN OF AHMAD SHAH TO TEHRAN.....	335
9.8.	AHMAD SHAH AND BAKHTIYARI KHANS	339
9.9.	BAKHTIYARI KHANS AND COMPENSATION	340
9.9.1.	MEDIATION OF THE LEGATION.....	345
9.10.	ANNUAL TAXATION OF BAKHTIYARIS	353
9.11.	SUMMERY.....	356
X: THE SOUTH AND SECURITY		358
10.1.	VIEWS ON SECURITY QUESTION	358
10.1.1.	BRITISH OFFICERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF.....	358
10.1.2.	BRITISH FOREIGN SECRETARY	359
10.1.3.	BRITISH MINISTER IN TEHRAN.....	361
10.2.	FIRST STEPS ON FRIENDLY RELATIONS.....	362
10.2.1.	A MORE CLEAR DEFINITION.....	364
10.2.2.	TRANQUILLITY IN KHUZESTAN	365
10.2.3.	BRITISH TROOPS IN BUSHEHR	366
10.3.	A DETACHMENT TOWARDS SHUSHTAR	367
10.3.1.	THE WRITTEN ASSURANCE	371
10.4.	THE BIDKARZ CONFLICT	372
10.5.	REZA KHAN AND CONSOLIDATION OF POWER	378
10.5.1.	INTERNAL POWER STRUGGLE	378
10.6.	REZA KHAN AND SIR P. LORAINE	379
10.7.	LORAINE AND THE SOUTHERN QUESTION	381
10.7.1.	LORAINE IN KHUZESTAN.....	383
10.7.2.	SECURITY OF THE OIL-FIELDS	385
10.7.3.	DEFENCE COMMITTEE.....	386
10.7.4.	AN OIL SESSION	387
10.7.5.	LORAINE - WILSON DISCUSSION	388
10.8.	RESULT OF LORAINE'S JOURNEY	390
10.9.	SUMMARY	392
XI: THE SOUTH BETWEEN TWO AUTUMNS 1923-1924		394
11.1.	KHUZESTAN IN AUTUMN 1923	394

11.2.	KHAZ'AL IN AUTUMN 1923	395
11.2.1.	KHAZ'AL AND TAXATION.....	395
11.3.	BAKHTIYARI KHANS IN AUTUMN 1923.....	400
11.3.1.	THE FUTURE OF CHAHAR LANG TRIBES.....	401
11.3.2.	CHAHAR LANG QUESTION.....	406
11.4.	ARMY AND THE TWO CHIEFTAINS IN FARS.....	408
11.5.	MORE HARMONY IN 1924.....	413
11.6.	GOVERNMENT AND THE TRIBES IN 1924.....	414
11.6.1.	KHAZ'AL IN WINTER AND SPRING 1924	415
11.6.2.	BAKHTIYARIS IN WINTER AND SPRING 1924	418
11.6.3.	THE GUARDS OF HONOUR.....	419
11.7.	THE ARMY AND TRIBES IN FARS.....	421
11.8.	SUMMARY	422
XII:	INSURRECTION IN THE SOUTH	424
12.1.	REBELLION IN KHUZESTAN 1924	424
12.2.	BRITISH RESPOND.....	431
12.2.1.	OIL COMPANY AND KHAZ'AL	433
12.3.	RESHUFFLE OF PERSIAN CABINET.....	435
12.4.	DECLARATION OF REBELLION	435
12.5.	ISVESTIA AND KHUZESTAN'S AFFAIRS	442
12.6.	MAJLES AND KHAZ'AL.....	443
12.7.	QASHQA'I, KHAMSEH AND REBELLION.....	445
12.8.	BRITISH POLITICAL RESIDENT	446
12.9.	PERSIAN FORCES IN THE SOUTH	448
12.10.	BAKHTIYARI KHANS AND REBELLION	450
12.11.	TOWARDS AHVAZ	452
12.12.	RETURN OF BRITISH MINISTER	453
12.13.	REZA KHAN IN SHIRAZ.....	455
12.14.	REZA KHAN AND PEACOCK THRONE	463
12.15.	CONSOLIDATION OF POSITION.....	465
12.16.	DISARMAMENT AND TRIBAL CHIEFTAINS.....	465
12.16.1.	TRIBAL CHIEFTAINS IN FARS 1925	466
12.16.2.	BAKHTIYARI KHANS IN 1925.....	469
12.16.3.	KHUZESTAN AND SHEIKH KHAZ'AL IN 1925	471
12.17.	BRITISH POLICY IN PERSIA 1925	476
12.18.	SUMMARY	478

XIII. CONCLUSION	480
XIV. APPENDIX	507
XV. REFERENCES	511
XVI. A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	564
XVII. ABBREVIATION	FEHLER! TEXTMARKE NICHT DEFINIERT.

Part I: General Background

Introduction

1. The Statement of a Problem

Pastoral nomad tribes played an important role in the Persian society throughout the history (1). It was their political and the military functions, especially the great tribes, which made the position of tribal chieftains significant. In fact, the effect of pastoral nomad tribes as a whole on the Persian society was beyond the size of their population. The political and military structure of the tribes caused the tribesmen under the leadership of their chieftains were able to defend of themselves against the neighbours and rival tribes as well as settlers or even expand their territory. The history of Persia indicates that the rise, maintenance and the fall of the many of dynasties was highly depended on the nomad tribes. Also the majority founders of dynasties were tribal in origin (2).

The purpose of this study is to examine the power of nomad tribes in the political situation of Persia during 1919-1925. It will begin with a short review of nomadism and nomad tribes' political role in Persia since early history.

The archaeological resources and historical records presented the following timeline of nomad tribes that ruled the Iranian plateau for almost four thousand years. In the second millennium BC, the pastoral tribes of mountain-chain of Zagros captured the plain of Mesopotamia and ruled there for many centuries. At the same time, Aryan tribes migrated from the north into Central Asia, Caucasus and the Iranian plateau.

The Medes which was one of the branches of Iranian tribes settled down in the west and the Persian tribes in the south-west of the Iranian plateau. The Greek historians, Herodotus and Xenophanes, recorded that the Medes and Persian tribes were settled and agriculturist. Meanwhile a part of them continued to be nomads and pastoralists. The chiefs of Medes and Persian tribes founded two successive dynasties, who ruled in a vast area for about four centuries (701-330 BC). "Parthians", another branch of Iranian tribes, who resided on the north east of Persia, they founded a dynasty in 250 BC and remained in power for almost five centuries until 224 AD. The Parthians Empire was the main rival of Seleucid and Roman Empires in west Asia. Then, the Sassanid dynasty came to power in 224 AD and stayed in power until 653 AD. They

were originally city dwellers, but related to the nomad tribes of Fars as well. Also some of the Parthian aristocrat clans joined the new dynasty. Sassanid remained in power for over four centuries and was the rival of Roman and Byzantine Empires.

The Persian Empire was invaded by Muslim Arabs in the seventh century. As a result of this invasion, several Arab tribes settled in Persia. They resided throughout the country mainly in the south and the east. Most of them integrated in the Persian society and a good number of them reached the high-ranking political and military positions and were in power until recently (3).

From eleven to fourteen centuries Persia continuously confronted with the invasions and migrations of Turkish and Mongol tribes. They formed the following dynasties: Saljuqid in eleven-twelve centuries, Kharazmshahid in twelve-thirteen centuries, the Mongol Ilkhanid in thirteen- fourteen centuries and Timurid in fourteen-fifteen centuries. Finally, in the fifteenth century two Turkish dynasties, Aq-qoyunlu and Qara-qoyunlu were founded in Azerbaijan. They were nomad in origin and their territory comprised of today's western Persia, Caucasus, eastern Anatolia and northern Iraq.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Safavid came to power in Persia. They were city dwellers, but they came to the power with the assistance of tribal chiefs of the tribes and tribal horsemen. After the fall of Safavid by the Pashtun tribes of Kandahar in 1722, Persia suffered of internal power struggles between the tribal chieftains. The Pashtun tribes remained in power for only a few years. They were defeated by Nader of Afshar tribe of Khorassan. He founded a new dynasty in 1730, but he was assassinated by certain tribal chieftains in 1747.

Then, a chief of the Zand tribe of Laks came to the power and established the Zand dynasty in 1750. The founder of Zand dynasty ruled for almost thirty years (1750-1779), but his successors could not hold the power due to internal family rivalries and the appearance of a strong tribal rival in the north of the country. At the end Aqa Mohammad Khan, the chief of the Qajar tribe took the power. The Qajars ruled for more than hundred thirty years. They were the last tribal dynasty in Persia.

This review presents the following fact that in the second millennium from the arrival of Turkish tribes into the Iranian plateau in eleven century until the fall of Qajars in 1925, the dynasties that subsequently came to power in Persia, with one exception

were tribal in origin. The Safavid dynasty was the only one which ruled in Persia without having the tribal background.

The military potential of tribes placed the chiefs of great tribes in a high position and they enjoyed of great influence in the Royal Court and provincial level. An important part of the Persian military forces was nomad cavalry detachments throughout the history. The tribal levies under the command of their chiefs participated in the army. In many areas the chiefs of tribes arranged the road guards and the local security.

Since the 18th century the tribesmen were gradually equipped with fire arms. This change increased the power of tribesmen and the tribal chieftains. In the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, there were still more than one-fourth of the population in Persia or over two and half millions' nomads and semi-nomads, who scattered throughout the country.

The ruling clans of the tribes were an important section of the ruling class in Persia. In addition to their tribes, the chieftains of great tribes ruled over a vast non-tribal area in provincial level (4). They had a great influence over the cities and controlled the commercial routes.

In the first half of the 19th century Persia confronted with the military campaign of two modern states: Russia and Great Britain. After the victory of the two great powers, they expanded their political and commercial activities in Persia. The two great powers recognised the military and political importance of nomad tribes and tribal chieftains in Persia.

Russia and Britain opened friendly relation with the tribal chieftains in the north and the south. The Russian and British enterprise began their economic activities in the north and south-west region in the second half of the 19th century and developed their relations with the tribal chieftains and in certain circumstances some of the tribal chieftains were encouraged against the Central Government (5).

At the beginning of the 20th century, a British Oil Company started searching for oil in Bakhtiyari and Khuzestan based on a concession. The Oil Company concluded Agreements in 1905 & 1909 with the tribal chieftains of Bakhtiyari and Mohaysen with the assistant of the British Government's representatives in Persia including organising the Watch Guards to keep secure the oil fields, oil-pipes, installations and refinery of the Company. The agreements were concluded without the knowledge and permission of the Persian Government.

British and Russian Governments, who expanded their influence in Asia in the 19th century, in conventions of 1907 and 1915, divided Asian countries including Persia into sphere of influence. The two colonial powers stationed their forces in Persia and expanded their relations with some other tribal chieftains. With the outbreak of the First World War, Persia became the theatre of War by the belligerents. The two sides endeavoured to persuade the tribal forces to join them. The chiefs of the tribes were divided between the two sides. The great tribes received even heavy artillery and the tribal chieftains became stronger (6).

1.1. Persia after the War

With the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, Russian forces evacuated the Persian soil, but after the War, British forces did not evacuate Persia and remained there. British Government intended to bring the Persian administration and army under British supervision through an advisory system. For the reason, the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 was concluded. At this juncture a number of the southern tribal chieftains, who equipped their tribes with the British arms and assisted British forces in the War, they were still well armed and the tribal chieftains enjoyed of a considerable power in the presence of British forces in the country (7).

According to the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 the Joint Military and Financial Commissions were set up in 1920 to study the organisation of a modern army and to implement the administration and financial reforms in Persia. The report of the Joint Military Commission considered the nomad tribes as the main internal source of insecurity.

With regard to the internal and international oppositions to the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919, the Joint Commissions and the implementation of the Agreement was postponed and under international pressure British forces gradually in 1921-1922 evacuated the Persian soil and local forces under British Command were disbanded.

The coup d'état of Persian Cossack in 21 February 1921 fulfilled the military vacuum. After the coup, the Persian Cabinets took steps to implement the necessary administration reforms and to organise a uniform army. The Commander of the Persian

Cossacks organised a modern army based on available modern forces in Persia. It was intended to replace the uniform army to the traditional and modern forces.

The Persian Cossack, then Army Officers had a negative view about the nomad tribes. In less than five years the tribal forces were severity suppressed by the army in Persia and the authority of Central Government was re-establish even in remote areas (8). The army pacified first the tribes in the north and north-west provinces in 1921 and 1922. Then the Persian Government prepared to finish this process in the south-west and south-east of Persia. The Persian Government came into negotiation with the British (9). At the end of the year 1924, the Persian army brought to an end the tribal crisis in the province Khuzestan, where the oil-pipe and oil refinery installed.

During the years 1924-25, the Persian army started to disarm the tribes throughout the country and dismissed most of the chieftains from tribal Governorship. The tribal chieftain lost their political and military position and the tribesmen were brought under the local commanders. The resistance in certain tribal areas was finally broken by the army, whereas the nomad and semi-nomad tribes had still potentially a considerable military warlike (10). It was the first part of the project on settlement of the nomads in Persia in 1921-1941 (11). The tribal and centralization policy of the Persian Government in those years shaped the Political, social and military process of modern Persia throughout the 20th century.

2. The Relevant Questionings

With regard to the historical power of tribal chieftains in Persia, the central question is: how a small army could break the power of nomad tribes with a relatively high percentage of warlike potential in a very short time?

There are additional questions on this subject. Why the chiefs of the great tribes couldn't form a stable alliance? Which limitations had the pre-modern form organisation of nomad tribe on confrontation with a modern army? Why did the Persian Army Commanders determine to crash the power of tribal chieftain in 1919-1925? Would the army of a modern state-nation let the existence of paramilitary tribes in the country? Which were the view and the policy of the Persian civil administration and the political wing of the Government on tribal question in the years 1919-1925?

With regard to the British Government and the Oil Company relation with several lesser and great tribal chieftains in Persia particularly in the south, which tribal policy followed British Government during the years 1919-1925? Which purpose followed the Anglo-Persian Military Commission on tribal question in 1920 and what was the reaction of British Government to the centralisation policy of the Persian Government in southern Persia, where the British had vital interests and which tribal policy did British follow in 1919-1921?

2. Theoretical Basis

The following theses would be discussed on this subject :

- A) The social structure of nomad and semi-nomad tribes has a military form. The tribes were, therefore, potentially in a position to provide fighting force to defend of tribal territory or even raiding to other areas.**

In daily life of the pastoral tribe faced many perils due to their nomadic way of life. The nomad people had to defend of their tribes against natural hazards as well as the rival tribes and the settlers. Horse breeding was prevalent in the tribes and since childhood the tribesmen used to riding and shooting. Due to their long experience, the tribesmen were skilful in riding and shooting. The warlike potential of tribesmen was much higher than villagers and city dwellers.

The social organisation of a nomad tribe is almost similar to the army organisation. An extended family as the smallest social unit was able to secure tranquilly and defend of its members. A social unit consisted of several nuclear families under the leadership of father or a brother. Each tent of a nuclear family provided at least a warlike in the social group.

A number of extended families, who reside not far from each other and usually had a kinship relation, form a greater units under a greater leadership. A tribal chief is at the top of the hierarchy and pyramid of the tribe. The power of the tribal leadership in hierarchy system consolidated through a genealogical patrilineal decent and real or supposition relationship in tribal level.

A tribe base on affinity relation, common land and pasture as well as political and administration co-operation bring a strong solidarity among the tribesmen to fight with a high motion against the outside aggression. The tribesmen are ready to fight for their interests and even invaded the neighbour rival tribe or village and town settlers. Due to this military potentiality, the chiefs of the nomad tribes enjoy of high political position in the provinces and state level.

In pre-capitalist time there was always struggle between the Central Government and the nomad tribes. The nomad chieftains challenged the power of the Central Government. Military campaign was the respond to the tribal unrest. The Central Government came out often as the conqueror of the war with a change in the leadership of the tribe. Sometimes we are the witness of tribal partition and transfer of a section of the tribe into another province. For two reasons this process never came to an end. First of all the nomadic way of life continued to exist. Secondly, most of the frontiers were guarded by the nomad tribes without expense for the Central Government.

B) In the process of the modern nation-state's building, there would be no place for the semi-independent tribal chieftains. For the reason the Persian Army did not tolerate the existence of the tribal unites in the country.

In modern time, the state organises a uniform professional army. The first responsibility of the army in a modern society is to secure the tranquillity in the society and to guarantee the security of the commercial routes. The defence of the border of the country against foreign invasion is the next responsibility of the army. The nomad tribes cannot do very much against the invasion of the army of foreign powers. The army is the sole military power in the country and there would be no place for any other force outside the state.

After about three decades of chaos, the Persian Government prepared to establish the uniform modern Army as the monopoly of force in the country. From the Persian Government view point the foreign force as well as the tribal force in the years 1896-1925 weakened the position of the Central Government and causing the natural state in Persia. The establishment of the Persian Army as the monopoly of military force, the

evacuation of the foreign forces as well as the suppression, disarmament of the tribes would bring to an end the natural state in Persia.

There was additional problem in this relation in the south Persia. British Government financed and armed some of the southern tribes for the safety of British interests and British policy. The Persian Army would achieve to the monopoly of power in the south if the Persian Government would succeed to break the relations British and those tribal chieftains. The Persian Government negotiated with the British on this subject and asked British Government to follow a new approach in her policy in Persia. The events at the end of 1924 indicate that the southern tribes lost the foreign support. They could not resist to the monopoly power of the Persian Army.

Despite the fact that the modern Persian army was not so efficient and well-equipped as the army in developed states, but still it had more military capability than the nomad tribes. First of all it was a professional and permanent army and was equipped with various modern arms. The use of heavy arms and artillery as well as modern transport and telecommunication developed in the Persian Army.

The uniform army received various training including military training and the use of modern arms. The army put aeroplane in circulation for the military and telecommunication purposes. For the reason, the Persian army had the military superiority to pastoral nomad tribes in the country. Additionally, the modern army had an arsenal and produced itself a part of necessary arms and ammunition.

The army had the political support of Parliament, Press and the public particularly the settlers, who expected the army to guarantee the internal security of the country. The Persian particularly the settlers suffered from foreign forces and the tribal unrest. For almost three decades disorder and highway robbery prevailed in the country. Security found priority in the eyes of the citizens. With the victory of the army in suppression the tribal unrest the Commander of the Persian Army gain a stronger position against his rivals in the army and in his oppositions in the Persian Parliament.

- C) Persia was in Transformation process in the years 1919-1925 from pastoral nomadism towards agriculture. From a traditional city with traditional social structure towards a new society with new middle class and modern labour groups.**

Traditionally, there were three forms of living and community in Persia; nomadic way of life rural life and city dwelling. Three main productions were pastoralism, cultivation, craft and manual industry. The political and military power was in the hand of the ruling families of the nomad tribes, courtier families and great landlords.

During the years 1921-1925, a uniform modern army were organised, the modern police force expanded and a road guard was formed. The Persian Army succeeded to secure the tranquillity in the commercial routes and the country as a whole. The Army Officers consolidated their position throughout the country. The nomad chieftains lost their political and military power. The Qajar dynasty, tribal in origin, lost their power. The Commander of the Persian Army became the new Shah through a constituent Assembly and the founder of a new dynasty.

An over centralised Government developed. The modern civil and military administration expanded. A modern and educated middle class as well as working class shaped in the cities. The primary, secondary and high levels, expanded and a modern judicial system developed and came into practice.

In Transformation process a new political and military elite came to existence. The military officers and the civil servants formed the new educated middle class. The cities became the centre of attention. There was a trend towards urbanisation. The Persian Government began to modernise the capital and the major cities.

The Commanders of the Army became the autocratic power in the country and most of his military officers in the provinces ruled from the position of power. The authoritarian regime ignored the constitutional law. An ambivalent process in modernisation of Persia.

4. The Method of Research

There is less published information about tribal affairs in Persia, but due to the important of southern Persia in British policy, British Government opened several consulates in the Persian Gulf Ports and Persia, where the political and military officials watched closely and reported the political development in Persia and the situation of southern tribes to London and India. With regard to slow changing in Anglo-Persian relations and British tribal policy in the southern Persia 1919-1925, it is necessary to

follow step by step the events, the beliefs, the ideas, actions and reactions of the tribal chieftains, Persian authorities in the region and in Tehran as well as British authorities in southern Persia, in Tehran and London in order to know the reasons behind the policies.

The British Consulates in the south built a political structure in southern Persia for more than two decades to secure British interests. This method was challenged by the British Minister and the other British representatives, who resided in Tehran. They were of opinion that the condition after the war proves that the colonial method does not secure British interests in this corner of the world. The arguments and the discussions between British in Persia, India and Great Britain gave a clearer picture of the situation in Persia and make a better understanding the situation of tribes and tribal chieftains. For the mentioned reasons, with a dense description method and the use of these documents in comparison to other sources as well as Persian documents and the memoirs of the Persian politicians, one can reach to a better understanding of the circumstances and can explain the questions and analyse the gradual political changes in the region.

5. The Subject of Discussion

This work is divided into three parts. In the first part, the general backgrounds are discussed. In the introduction chapter it will be discussed about the statement of problem, the relevant questioning, the subjects of discussion, the years 1919-1925 and an overview on the sources, In chapter one there is a discussion on definition of nomad tribe and nomadic way of life and then a description on the origin and historical background of great tribes of the southern Persia. The second chapter is devoted to an analysis and a short study of general political history and the Persian foreign relations with Major European powers since the beginning of the 19th century in which strongly affected on the internal relation of Persia.

In the part two, chapters 3-7, it will be discussed the political and the military situation of four great tribes in the south and southern Persia after the War in the years 1919-1922, when the British-Indian forces as well as the forces under British command, were still present throughout the Persia. In chapters three and four will be discussed the affairs of two great tribes of the Fars province. Chapter five is devoted to the situation

of Khuzestan and the chief of Mohaysen. The following chapters, six and seven, is a study on the political and social process in Bakhtiyari tribe.

Chapter three is about the events in the province of Fars, the Qashqa'i and Khamseh tribes in 1919-1920. The occupation of Gilan province by the Russian Bolshevik, the resignation of the Persian Cabinet as well as the Governor-General of Fars and the return of the Ex-Ilkhani of Qashqa'i to power in December 1920. Chapter four is about the differences between the Oil Company and the chief of the Qashqa'i tribe. Additionally, it will discuss the question of dissolve of the S.P.R. in Fars and the efforts of the chief of Khamseh tribes in retaining a part of the force. Chapter five related to Khuzestan-Bakhtiyari subjects: The situation of Khuzestan in the year 1919-1921, the future of Khuzestan and the expectation of Sheikh Khaz'al from the British Government for his future.

In chapter six it will be discussed the internal relation between the Bakhtiyari tribe and the Bakhtiyari Khans in 1919-1920, the relation of the Khans and the Central Government and the relation of the Khans and the British Government and the Oil Company. Finally, there are some references to the joint campaign of the S.P.R. and Bakhtiyari force against the rebels around Isfahan. Chapter seven is devoted to the process of formation a Bakhtiyari police force in 1921 and formation a southern confederacy of great tribes

The third part contains the process of centralisation policy and the gradual re-establishing the authority of Central Government in the south in the year 1922-1925 after the withdrawal of British forces from the Persian soil. The effort of Minister of War to station the Persian troops in the southern cities is another subject of study in the third part. Security of the roads and the cities was the desire of Persian settlers. British Government and the Oil Company, however, made objection to the station of a small Persian detachment in the oil province of Khuzestan. The Persian Parliament, press and public, who supported the station of the military forces throughout the country, asking the reasons of Persian Government's delay in Khuzestan and expected the Persian Government to send the regular troops to Khuzestan,

The Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al had agreed to provide the watch guard to protect the oil fields, installations, oil-pipes and refinery since 1905. The Oil Company in search of new oil fields was in touch with other tribal chieftains. Reza Khan had to deal with the British Government and Oil Company on this matter and to

hold the responsibility to secure the current of oil. The oil question decelerated the centralisation process in the south. Finally, the Persian Cabinet and the British Legation reached to understanding after some time, and the process of centralisation continued in the south.

Chapter eight is devoted to the first efforts of the Qavam al-Saltaneh's Cabinet in spring and summer 1922, who intended to send a small force to northern Khuzestan. This move was opposed strongly by the British Legation, the Khans of Bakhtiyari and Sheikh Khaz'al. The Persian troops were attacked in a night raid in near Shalil in Bakhtiyari land at the end of July 1922. Chapter nine is a discussion on the journey of the Minister of War to the south at the end of the year 1922 and a study on expansion of the military personnel and garrisons in the south. It will follow the accusation of Bakhtiyari khans in participating in Shalil incident, Bakhtiyari compensation and the payment of tribal taxation and the mediation of British Minister.

Chapter ten is about the negotiations on Anglo-Persian relations and the joint efforts in Khuzestan. The journey of the British Minister to the south and his discussions with the Directors of the Oil Company as well as Sheikh Khaz'al on the new situation in Tehran and the station of the army detachments in Bakhtiyari, Khuzestan and Fars. In chapter eleven it will be discuss the situation of Khuzestan, Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari as well as the situation of Fars and the two great tribes in the first year of Reza Khan's premiership.

Chapter twelve is on insurrection of Sheikh Khaz'al, some of the Bakhtiyari and Kohgiluyeh Khans as well as some of Lor tribes and Vali of Posht-kuh in respond to centralisation policy of Reza Khan. Their official proclamation of rebellion against Reza Khan, the Prime Minister, at the end of summer and autumn 1924, caused the acceleration and forceful arrival of the Persian army into Khuzestan and Bakhtiyari oil fields in December the same year. Then it will be discussed the disarmament of tribes and the situation of tribal chieftains in Fars, Bakhtiyari and Khuzestan in 1925. Finally, will be the conclusion.

6. Significance of the Subject

This short period, 1919-1925, practically shaped the political process of Persia in the following decades. The question of nomad tribes and the tribal chieftains was one of the most important subjects in these years. It was discussed in many occasions in the cabinets, Parliament and the press. Then, the question of disarmament and the settlement of the nomad tribes came into practice. This process had a significance effect on the urban and rural life and the future of the country. For this background, it is rather important to study the question of nomad tribes in detail for a better understanding the following years and decades (12).

There were, at least, five main tribal areas and several less important tribal centres in Persia. It is almost impossible to research in detail even a short period of the history of all tribes in Persia in a case study. Additionally, the social and cultural aspects of lesser tribes may be important and interesting, but there is less historical information about small tribes. The local events had also little affection on state level. For the reasons this study is limited to specific times, specific area and specific tribes

This study is concentrated only on the great tribes in the south-west Persia where it was the most populated tribal area in Persia and several great tribes resided there. Furthermore what distinguished the southern tribal area from the other areas was its strategically location close to the Persian Gulf and the discovery of oil under the pasture land of southern great tribes.

A material in which was vital and strategically important to the British Navy and British Empire. Security of the south-west area was, therefore, tremendously important in international and national level. A political solution to the complicated question of southern tribes in 1919-1925 was very essential for future of Persia as a whole.

6.1. The Years of Transition

Beside that the short period 1919-1925 was one of the most important times in the Persian history. These years can be regarded as the transitional years in modern Persia; (a) from a weak Central Government in 1896-1918 towards a strong centralised Government in 1926-1941. (b) From the Anglo-Russian occupation and their efforts on partition of Persia 1907-1917 towards the integration of the country. (c) From domination of the tribal chieftains in the provinces towards the domination of Military

Commanders. (d) From strengthening of tribal chieftains position towards the disarmament of the tribes and the political powerlessness of tribal chieftains. (e) From the Qajar dynasty nomad in origin to foundation of Pahlavi dynasty a military family in origin. (f) From nomadism towards settlement and cultivation. (g) From rural and nomadic way of life towards urbanisation and development of cities. The Persian society began a transformation process.

7. An Overview on Sources

This study is based on British and Persian official documents as well as diaries, memoirs and travel accounts as the primary sources. The Political and historical studies on modern Persia, anthropological and historical studies on nomad tribes as well as studies on history of the Persian oil are the main secondary literature in this study.

7.1. The Primary Sources:

The internal life of nomads and local tribal events paid less the attention of historians and writers in the city. Inside the tribes, with few exceptions of the last two centuries, few memoirs of tribal chieftains are known to the public. There are, however, certain official correspondences between the Persian Government and the tribal chieftains in which they have begun to be published in recent years in Persia. In the second half of the 19th century the Persian Government arranged a series of geographical and ethnographical studies on certain important cities and provinces (13).

The authors of these series compiled the works in which they are still among the most reliable sources on provincial and nomad studies. Fars Nameh (the book of Fars) written by Hassan Fassai and Safar Nameh-e Khuzestan (the traveller account of Khuzestan) written by Abd al-Ghafar Najm al-Molk are two important books of this geographical series. A historical section of Fars Nameh is translated by Herbert Buss, Kiel University (14).

In the 19th century many European travellers came to Persia. They describe in their travel accounts and memoirs about the nature, the social relations and the life in the cities of Persia. They also refer to the political and historical events. Some of them

mention of the role of tribes in the Persian society and nomadic way of life. The number of British who visited Persia and published their articles and travel accounts are more than the other Europeans nations.

Some of these articles and books are: Travels in Luristan and Arabistan (1845) by Baron C.A. De Bode ; Persia and Persian Question (1891) by George Curzon ; A Lady Doctor in Bakhtiari Land (1921) by Elizabeth Ross; “Mohammerah“ in Revue du Monde Musulman (1908) by L. Massignon ; Du Khurassan au Pay des Bakhtiaris (1909) by H.R. D’Allemagne ; Reise im Südwestlichen Persien (1879) by Houtum Schindler; Eine Reise durch Luristan, Arabistan und Fars (1907) by Ernst Hertzfeld.

7.1.1. The British Documents:

Since the opening of Suez Canal in 1870, British developed their commercial and economic activities in Persia (15). They increased also their political and military activities in Persia and the Persian Gulf (16). Then, in 20th century British started their activities in Oil Industry in southern Persia.

British political officers were sent to southern Persia by the Government of India to study the military and political situation. Then, in addition to Bushehr general consulate, British Government opened several consulates, Vice-Consulates and agents in southern cities and towns. The representatives of the British Government dispatched hundreds’ reports on Persian affairs. In these reports there are information’s and minutes in which related to southern tribal chieftains.

A considerable number of official and demi-official reports, articles and monographs are now available in British archive or printed in the British Geographical Journals. There is also variety information about the southern and central nomad tribes in these reports. Military Reports on S.W. Persia (1885) by Colonel Mark Bell. Military Reports on S.W. Persia during the years 1909-1916 by Arnold Wilson. Gazetteers of the Persian Gulf (1908-1915) by John Lorimer are among the mentioned category.

The British enterprises namely the A.P.O.C. dispatched daily reports on the situation in Khuzestan and Persian affairs. In these reports there are information and minutes in which related to southern tribal chieftains. The rich archive of the British Petroleum (A.P.O.C.) is still closed to researchers. Certain reports of the Oil Company

are available in the archive of Foreign Office. There are many quotations and references to the archive material of the Oil Company in the official history of British Petroleum published in 80s and 90s.

The main primary sources in this study are the unpublished official documents of British Government available in Public Record Office and Indian Office Library in London. These documents can be trace mainly in various files of Foreign Office, India Office Papers and the Cabinet files. Additionally, there are some papers related to Persia in Colonial Office, Air Office, Admiralty and the War Office. The copies of these papers are often available in Foreign Office files.

There are, however, several codes numbers of important letters that could not be traced and few papers are still close to the public. British consulate in Shiraz was one of the important Consulates in southern Persia, but the archive of this Consulate is not open to the public. Some of the reports of this consulate can be found in other files.

It may be useful to be pointed out that the available information in British archive is more about the subject or personalities who related to the British interests or their activities affected on British interests. These personalities were judged mainly from the view point of British interests. Sheikh Khaz'al was praised for his loyalty to the British policy in Persia. There is, however, no question and discussion of his relations with his tribesmen or with the other Arab chieftains in Khuzestan. Sowlat al-Dowleh, who remained relatively independent from British policy, was criticised often for his manner by the British authorities. They regarded him as untrustworthy.

The British Consulates in southern Persia were administrated and financed by the British Government in India. The members of the southern and eastern Consulates were political officers, who were trained in India. Sir Clarmont Skrine, who was Consul and general Consuls in eastern cities of Persia (1916-1942), has pointed out in his memoirs that the British official and officers of India trained with a colonial view.

The Persian Gulf school of India shaped during the years that Lord George Curzon, an expert on Persian affairs, was the viceroy of India (1898-1905). These Officers and Officials came to expand British Empire and British Colonies in the Persian Gulf. The return of Lord Curzon to the British politics and his participation in the War Cabinet in 1915 and in Foreign Office 1915- 1924, strengthened the position and the policy of the Persian Gulf School in British Foreign policy.

Sir Percy Cox, the Political Resident in Bushehr (1909-1918), British Minister in Tehran (1918-1920) and High Commissioner in Baghdad (1920-1923) and his acting, Sir. Arnold Wilson, then the Resident Director of the A.P.O.C. in Khuzestan (1921-1929) as well as the other British Officers in southern Consulates in Persia followed an expansion policy before, during and after the War. The Persians resisted to the British policy. They received the international support: Germany and Soviet Russia in Brest-Litovsk in 1918, the United States of America, France and Italy in Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and afterwards.

The British Representatives in Tehran, Herman Norman 1920-1921 and Sir Percy Loraine 1921-1926 realised that the conditions in Persia has changed. They suggested to Foreign Office a new approach in British policy in Persia due to internal and international conditions.

As a result of fundamental and visible differences on British general and tribal policy in Persia between the British Legation in Tehran 1920-1925 on the one hand and the southern Consulates on the other hand, British authorities discussed for many years on British vital interests and British general and tribal policy in Persia in new circumstances. They had to make their arguments precise and open. In exchange of views, revealed certain untold on personalities and the real background of British policy in Persia. Additionally, various subjects namely the role of tribal chieftains and the social relation of tribes in oil area also were discussed.

From the view of the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine, Reza Khan, the Persian Minister of War, was the only person who prepares to perform certain reforms and secure the country against possible Bolsheviks aggression and British interests would be safe guarded by a strong Persian Government in Tehran. Herbert Chick, the British consul in Shiraz, considered Reza Khan as a dictator whose local commanders make the life difficult and uncertain for the residents of Fars and their actions would weaken the position of British in the south. British Documents of the years, 1919-1925 are particularly interesting due to different views and diverse approaches of British authorities on Persian affairs and their internal discussion.

7.1.2. Memoirs and Travel Accounts:

In addition to official and non-official British reports, there are several travel accounts and factual books as well as geographical and ethnological articles of the war 1914-1918 and afterwards, in which they were written by German, French, American diplomats and passengers, who gave a different picture of Anglo-Persian policy in Persia, the Persian Government and the Persian movements. This perspective makes it possible to have a multilateral and more accurate picture of the Persian society in an international scope. The below works are among the most famous written of these years: Morgan Shuster (1912), *the Strangling of Persia*; Arthur Millspaugh (1925), *the American Task in Persia*. Oskar von Niedermayer (1936), *Im Weltkrieg vor Indiens Toren*; Wilhelm Litten (1920), *Persien von der Penetration pacifique zum Protektorat 1860-1919*, Emil Lesueur (1922) *Les anglais en perse*; James Balfour (1922), *Regent Happening in Persia*; Hassan Area (1964) *Under Five Shah*, Elizabeth Ross (1921) *A lady Doctor in Bakhtiari*.

7.2. Persian Sources

A part of the official Persian correspondences and documents about the years 1921-1941 have been in recent years, published. Few of the papers are related to tribal affairs in the south-west of Persia. More information on this subject is available in autobiographies, memoirs, traveller accounts and dairies of Persian journalists, politicians, diplomats, military commanders and non-officials.

The letters between the Persian Government and the tribal chieftains are mainly on security and taxation. Most of the memoirs are from the personalities who participated in the Persian administration and army in southern provinces. The security and integrity of the country were the major questions and the only power who was authorised to come into any agreements with the other countries was Central Government.

The Persian sources are useful in a comparison study. It is important to know, how the view of the Persian was on the subjects. The Persians especially those who were in opposition had different priority than British. British authorities, especially those, who were sent from India to Persia and the Persian Gulf, had a colonial view on the affairs as it was previously mentioned. The following memoirs and autobiographies are related to southern Persia.

7.2.1. The Persian Documents

In addition to the published official documents of 1914-1941, some collections of official and private correspondences of Persian politicians are published in recent years. These documents reflected the views of the Persians in the south during the War and afterwards. "Iran and the First World War", the documents of the Ministry of Interior ed.: Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: 1990. These official Documents are mainly of the War's time, but some of them related to the immediate months the War afterwards in the south and west Persia due to the presence of British forces who did not evacuate the Persian soil.

The documents of the book are divided to five sections, west, south, east, and north and miscellaneous. A part of the documents on southern section is about the rise of Qashqa'is in 1918 against the occupation of southern Persia by the British forces and the S.P.R. The views of the local Persian officials and the public of the rough behaviour of the S.P.R. mention in these reports, which are not reflected in British documents. The continuation of this process is studied in the chapter IV and V of dissertation.

Recently, a part of his documents and correspondences of Prince A.H. Farmanfarma who played an important political role in the first two decades of the 20th century of Persia are published in Tehran. "Letters and Documents of Abdol-Hosseini Mirza Farmanfarma have been in three volumes and a large number of documents are about the year 1916-1920, when he was the Governor General of Fars.

The official documents and the letters in this collection are very important for the study of political situation of Fars during the war and afterwards. There are many references in the papers of Farmanfarma to the S.P.R., the Anglo-Persian relations and British tribal policy in Fars.

"The Collected Documents, Correspondence and Memoirs of Firuz Mirza Firuz", the son of Prince A.H. Farmanfarma is also an important source on study the political situation in southern Persia. Firuz was Minister of Justice, Foreign Minister and Finance Minister in the years 1918-1928.

The first volume of this collection contains the political correspondence on Persian affairs in the last years of Qajar dynasty and one of the important sources on political situation of Fars in 1920, when Farmanfarma was the Governor-General of this

province. The private correspondence between Firuz and his father in Fars gave an accurate picture of an experienced aristocrat politician in the last years of the Qajar's rule.

7.2.2. The Persian Memoirs

Mohammad Mossadeq who succeeded to Farmanfarma in Fars in 1920-1921, writes in his: "Memoirs and sufferings of Mossadeq about the situation and the events of Fars and his approach on provincial and tribal policy. He has mentioned also of his reaction to the coup regime in Tehran and his residence among the Bakhtiyaris in summer quarter of the tribes in 1921.

Nasr-allah.S.Fatemi, a Persian politician and political scientist 1930s-1980s in his memoirs, "Reflection on the Time of Illusion", gives a picture of the Persian society prior to the coup d'état, the participation of the Bakhtiyari Khans in the Cabinets in Tehran and as governor-general in southern and central provinces of Persia, in Isfahan, Yazd, Kerman, Behbahan, Golpayegan & so on. Then, he describes the confrontation between Reza Khan, the Minister of War, 1921-1925 and the Bakhtiyari Khans.

Soleiman Behbudi, the military secretary of Reza Khan writes down in his dairy of daily visitors of Reza Khan as the Minister of War and then, the Prime Minister. Reza Khan received officially and privately many personalities and some of these meetings were unknown to the public. It gave a picture of daily political and military relations and activities of Reza Khan for some years. Behbudi mentions also some of the important events in the capital and the provinces.

There is a military report of the Persian army on Bakhtiyari tribe in which annexed to the book of Behbudi. This report examines the political and social relation in Bakhtiyari in 1923.

The memoir of Sardar Zafar, a member of ruling family of the Bakhtiyari who was appointed as Ilkhani of the tribe and the governor-general, is a source of an insider during the years of tribal power. The internal relation of tribal chieftains and the family feud can be followed in this book. Sardar Zafar refers briefly to the event after the coup.

The travel account of Khuzestan by Reza Khan, the Commander of Persian Army, describes his view on tribal affairs in Persia in general and southern chieftains in

particular. Reza Khan refers to Shalil incident and the Bakhtiyari affairs, the position of Khaz'al in Khuzestan and the Bakhtiyari relation with the British Government and finally his military solution to the tribal question. He explains his view on democracy, press, Parliament and the minority in Majles and their relations with Khaz'al as well as his campaign to Khuzestan and the re-establishment of government offices and military garrison in Khuzestan.

The memoirs and dairy of the Lieutenant General A. Amir-Ahmadi and the documents of General Mohammad Shahbakhti are mainly about the conflicts with the Lor tribe in Lorestan, but there are some references to Khuzestan and the other southern chieftains. Under the Five Shahs is an autobiography in English of General Hassan Arfa, who was a young officer in the twenties. He has the first hands experience of Central Government's tribal policy and several tribal confrontations.

One of the most informative and accurate source about Khuzestan and Khaz'al is written by Ahmad Kasravi, the chief of justice department in Khuzestan 1923-1924. Kasravi in his autobiography and also in his book: "five hundred years history of Khuzestan", describe social and political situation in northern Khuzestan as well as the role of Khaz'al in southern Khuzestan, his relation with the other chieftains, with the governor-general and the other heads of government offices in Khuzestan.

Kasravi as an eye witness followed carefully the affairs and the events in Khuzestan. He describes the gradual changes until the arrival of the army into Ahvaz and the re-establishment of the government's offices throughout the province and the beginning of military rule in Khuzestan at the end of the year 1924.

Yahya Dowlatabadi analysed the political outcome of the Reza Khan's military campaign to Khuzestan in his memoirs. A Mostowfi has an account on Khaz'al question in his memoirs: the description of my life. M.T.Bahar, poet and a man of letters and a member of minority in Majles, has mentioned in his book: a short history of political parties, about the correspondence between Sheikh Khaz'al and the leader of Minority, Seyyed Hassan Modarres. The collection of letters and speeches of Seyyed Hassan Modarres and the political memoir of Bahar are among the works in which reflect the view of minority in parliament on the question of army general politic and the tribal insurrection in the south. In their memoirs, Persians have usually a clear perspective of the matters. They made, however, less attention to calendar.

7.3. Secondary Literature:

Modern Persia has been the subject of variety of political and historical studies in recent decades. Beside that many scholars concentrated their studies on regional subjects such as nomad tribes, question. The history of Persian oil is also one of the topics that paid the attention the political scientists

7.3.1. Political and Historical Studies

Since the Second World War some aspects of political history of Modern Persia and the Persian foreign relations with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Germany and some other European countries during the years 1919-1941, the process of modernisation of Persia have been studied particularly in recent years and after the fall of Pahlavi dynasty. With the revolution 1979, the role of religion in Persia and the Islamic society during the Pahlavi regime in the years 1921-1979 found especial attention the scholars in the west. The opening of the British and the other archives to researchers, have given opportunity to scholars to give a more accurate picture and analysis on Persian relations with Great Powers 1919-1941.

A review of the works on modern Persian history indicates that the main researches have been done by Europeans, north Americans and recently Japanese as well as Persians in English, German, French, Russian, Italian and Persian languages. Here, it is worth to mention some of the authors who have devoted many years of their researches on modern Persian politics, religion and history and have written many articles and books on these subjects. In the United States: G.Lenczowski (Russia and the west in Iran 1918-1948), N.S.Fatemi (Anglo-Russian in Persia (1917-1923)), R.Ramazani (Foreign Policy of Iran 1500-1941), N. Keddie (the roots of revolution) and E. Abrahamian (Iran between the two revolutions) ; In Great Britain : L.P.Elwell-Sutton (Modern Iran), A.M. Katouzian (State and society in Iran), Fred Halliday (Iran: Dictatorship and Development)S. Cronin (The Army and the Creation of the Pahlavi State in Iran 1910-1926) ; In Germany : W. Litten (Von der “penetration pacifique” zum “ protectorate”) (U.Gehrke (Persien in der Deutschen Orientpolitik während des ersten Weltkrieges), Bert Fragner (Persische Memoirenliteratur als Quelle zur Neueren Geschichte Iran) S. Ravasani (Die Sowjetrepublik Gilan) A. Shirazi (Genesis der sozio-

ökonomischen Unterentwicklung des Iran) and A. Mahrad (Iran auf dem Weg zur Diktatur) ; In Switzerland: W. zürrer (Persien zwischen England und Russland 1918-1925) and M. Rezun (The Soviet Union and Iran) ; in Niederland: W. Floor (Industrialisation in Iran 1900-1941) ; in Russia: M. Iwanow (Die neue Gescgichte Irans) ; In France: Paul Vieille (la féodalité et d'état en Iran)Jean-Pierre Digard, Bernard Hourcade et Y. Richard, (L'Iran au xx' siecle), C. Chaqueri (L'Union Sovietique et les tentatives de soviets en Iran) and in Persia M.J.Sheikh al-Islami (the phase of Ahmad Shah, I.Zowqi (Persia and Great Powers 1900-1925), and a long list of other scholars.

One of the important and useful studies to this work is the Ph.D. dissertation of Florida Safiri: The South Persia Rifle Edinburgh 1976. She studies the situation of Fars during the Great War, British occupation and Formation of the S.P.R. in 1916, situation of tribes, their participation in the War, collaboration or opposition to the British policy and operation in Fars, their relation with Germans. Florida Safari has examined various sources, official and private documents, especially British archives.

The S.P.R. continued to exist after the war until the end of the year 1921 when the force was disbanded. Despite the fact that Safiri has referred to many documents related to the years 1919-1921, but she describes only some of the events in Fars after the war and explains very briefly about them.

“The phase of Ahmad Shah” was written by Javad Sheikh al-Islami in Persian 1980-1981. The author describes the political situation in Persia before and during the war, the childhood and youth days of Ahmad Shah. Then he concentrates his work on the study of Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919. He studies the process of the agreement 1919 mainly based on vols. IV and XIII of the official series “Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939, published 1952-1963. On contrary to majority of the Persian historians, he has a critical view of Ahmad Shah. With regards to his arguments, it appears that he is not very successful in his interpretation.

Iran and the rise of Reza Shah, by Syrus Ghani (1999) is a study on political history of Persia after the Great War 1919-1925. The Question of the Agreement 1919 and the Coup d'état 1921 are two important questions in the work of Sirus Ghani. The author has devoted half of his work to the mentioned questions. He studies also the centralisation policy of Reza Khan and discusses briefly the question of tribes in chapter ten and chapter twelve. He has a positive picture of Reza Khan the Reza Shah politics.

The latest book of M.A. Katouzian is “State and Society in Iran” (2000). He gives his interpretation of the arbitrary rule’ theory in Persia, Katouzian has discussed this subject in his previous works. More than half of this book is also devoted to a detail study of the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 and the Coup d’état 1921. Then there is a general study on political situation after the coup to the fall of Qajar and finally “ending with the establishment of Reza Shah Pahlavi’s rule in the late 1920’s”

Gordon Waterfield has written the “professional diplomat”, a biography on diplomatic life of Sir P. Loraine. He was the chief of British diplomatic mission in Persia. Eight chapters of the biography are containing the years 1921- 1926 of Loraine’s residence in Persia. There are interesting references to the private and official relations at these years. The question of Sheikh Khaz’al and future of Khuzestan was one of the important subjects in British policy. The author consulted many private letters as well as semi-official ones that have made the biography more readable.

7.3.2. Studies on Nomad Tribes

On the eve of the Second World War, in 1939, the American Anthropologist, Henry Field published his work: Contribution to the Anthropology of Persia. The study of greater tribes of central and southern Persia is a part of his project. The study of Persian nomad tribes, however, developed in the fifties. The reports and travel accounts now were shaped in scientific forms in different branches of human sciences: ethnology, sociology, anthropology, archaeology, history and political science or in an interdisciplinary form deal with the question of nomad tribes and the question of nomads’ settlement. The subject does not confine to Persia or Iranian plateau. Nomadism and the settlement of tribes in Asia and Africa, in arid and semi-arid Zone were studied in numerous symposiums. Many field studies have done by scholars on various aspects of nomadic way of life in North Africa, west Asia and Central Asia to open new dimensions in understanding of historical factor in political relations.

The question of nomad tribes in Persia and neighbouring countries was studied by French, Germans, American, British as well as Persian and native scholars. This explanation is applicable to southern Persia and consequently there are a large number of articles, books and monographs on south-west tribes. The researchers have, however,

examined mainly social and economic structure as well as anthropological and linguistic questions.

In sixties and seventies, some historical monographs on southern tribes were published. However, the question of great tribes and tribal chieftains after the First World War in 1919-1925 in the southern Persia, particularly, prior to the coup 1921, paid less the attention of the historians and even in monographs of southern great tribes have devoted only few pages to this period (17). In recent years, the history of Mamassani and Boir Ahmadi had been written in Persian in which they support the socio- ethnological studies.

There is one exception, the history of Khuzestan and the life of Sheikh Khaz'al, the chief of the Mohaysen tribe of Bani-Ka'ab. Mostafa Ansari has written his Ph.D. dissertation, "The History of Khuzestan 1878-1925", University of Chicago 1974. This is an excellent account on social and economic development in Khuzestan. He describes also the important events during the rule of Sheikh Maz'al 1881-1897 and his brother, Sheikh Khaz'al 1897-1925 in Mohammareh and southern Khuzestan. Certain of the events of the year 1919-1925 have been studied, but some of events especially those in which related to Bakhtiyari affairs have not discussed. In addition to the British documents, the author has consulted the Persian sources as well as the documents of the Persian Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

William Strunk wrote in 1977 his Ph.D. dissertation: The reign of Sheykh Khaz'al Ibn Jabir and the suppression of the principality of "Arabistan". "A study of British Imperialism in southern Iran 1897-1925", Indiana University, 1977. He analysed the political events of Khuzestan during the years of Khaz'al's rule in the southern of the province and the gradual expansion of his power in the light of British political and industrial activities in this corner of Persia. Strunk has also referred to some of the events in Bakhtiyari in which related to Khaz'al-Bakhtiyari relation. Strunk has consulted variety of British documents, and has discussed the political events in detail. He has not mentioned even of a single source in Persian language.

The two mentioned Ph.D. dissertations discuss more the question of Sheikh Khaza'l and the political and social process in Khuzestan. The present work follows the re-establishment of the Central Government in the south west of the country including Khuzestan in the frame of state-nation building. In these two mentioned monographs, certain questions were discussed only in relation to Sheikh Khaz'al, the chief of the

Mohaysen tribe, but from the Persian government point of view the centralisation policy related to other chieftains as well.

As far as the available sources indicate, since the beginning of the 19th century no other tribe in Persia has received so much attention as Bakhtiyari tribe. The academic research developed on Bakhtiyari in 60s. The scholars such as Jean Pierre Digard, Dieter Ehmman, David Brooks, Gene. R. Garthwaite, Allen Zagarell, Parviz Varjavand, Ali Asghar Karimi and the others have studied different aspects of life of the Bakhtiyari great tribe.

The archaeological aspect and the role of Bakhtiyari Highland pastoral life in relation to the settler communities and the old civilisation was studied by Zagarell in FU Berlin. Ehmman has an overview on pre-history and history of Bakhtiyari Highland. He has a short study on Bakhtiyari affairs in recent centuries without any especial attention to the Bakhtiyari affairs after the First World War, 1919-1925. Digard has devoted his studies to the social life and technical aspect of Bakhtiyaris. He has some analysis of political situation of Bakhtiyari leadership in his works.

Gene Garthwaite devoted his study to the history of the Bakhtiyari in recent centuries. In his Ph.D. dissertation, the Bakhtiyari Khans: Tribal Disunity in Iran 1880-1915, University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. He published a new edition of his dissertation under the title: "Khans and Shahs", U. K, 1983. He has also some articles on political history of Bakhtiyari at that time. His analyses are based on historical documents. Garthwaite analyses the position of the ruling families, their relations with the Central Government and the British commercial and industrial activities in Bakhtiyari Land. He concentrated his works mainly on the last decades of the 19th to the beginning of the Great War. In Khans and Shahs he devoted less than two pages to the Bakhtiyari Affairs between the two wars. He refers very briefly to certain question in the years 1919-1925.

In 1960, Pierre Oberling in his dissertation, Turkic Peoples of southern Iran, Columbia University, describes the Turkish families and tribes in Khuzestan, Boir Ahmadi, Fars and Kerman. In addition to the lesser Turk tribes, he describes also the history of greater tribe Qashqa'i and confederation of Khamseh. It contains almost two-third of his dissertation it may be here mentioned that as the author has also pointed out the Khamseh confederation was a mix of Turkish, Persian and Arabic speaking tribes. In addition to the books and articles and interviews, Oberling has also consulted some

of the French and English speaking daily newspapers in that days who followed the tribal events in Persia.

Some years later, Pierre Oberling published, “The Qashqa’i Nomads of Fars”, The Hague 1974; a new edition of the Qashqa’i sections of his dissertation. Oberling is the author of the first in detail English history of Qashqa’i. Oberling has not also studied the question of Qashqa’is in the years 1919-1925 in his work. He only briefly refers to the centralisation policy of the Persian Government after the Coup 1921. Oberling is the author of many articles on Turkish and non-Turkish tribes of Persia in Encyclopaedia Iranica.

In 1961, M.C.Iwanow published the book: the tribes of Fars“, Moscow 1961. He describes the social structure, sub-tribes and population Qashqa’i, Khamseh, Mamassani and Boir Ahmadi tribes. Some of the historical events related to the greater tribes of Fars, without any detail has been mentioned. The same year, the book of Fredrik Barth, Nomads of the south Persia published in Oslo and London. This research is about Baseri tribe of Khamseh confederation. He has written briefly about the formation of Khamseh Confederation and the role of Qavami family. Though, he has interviewed with Ibrahim Khan Qavam, the last chief of Khamseh tribe, but there are no references to the events of the years of his rule in 1916-1925.

After two years of field study, Dr.Habib-allah Peyman published in 1968 his work: “Il-e-Qashqa’I”, a precise description and analysis of social, economic and cultural structure of Qashqa’i nomad tribe as well as political structure and historical role of great tribe of Qashqa’i and its sub-tribes. Apparently, this is the first extended study on Qashqa’i question in Persian. The author has also studied relatively in detail the history of Qashqa’i tribe and the ruling family as well as the process of settlement and resettlement prior to the Second World War and afterwards in 1928-1968.

Gerhard Kortum has written several articles on the settlement of nomad tribes in Fars after the Land Reform in 60s-70s. He is the author of the interesting article about the function of Amaleh tribe. Richard Salzer wrote his dissertation on social organisation of Kashkuli Kuchek tribe of the Qashqa’i, 1974 University of California, Berkeley. He has studied the origins, a short history of the important events in the 19th and 20th centuries, tribal economy of the sub-tribe, and the social and political structure of Kashkuli.

Since the beginning of 1980s, Lois Beck, the American Anthropologist has written several articles and two books on various subjects related to the Qashqa'i tribes. Almost half of the book: "Qashqa'i of Iran", is devoted to the history of the tribes and the role of the ruling family of Shahilu. In other parts of the book, she examines the social anthropology as well as the political and economic transformations of the tribe in recent decades. In this study, Beck has consulted some of the documents and official printed monographs in India Office Library. In this study, the situation of Qashqa'i in the years 1919-1920 was studied as a part and continuation of the war time. The years 1921-1941 is the subject of following chapter: "Reza Shah Pahlavi and the Qashqa'i"

Beck analyses the consequence of the encroachment and interference of foreign forces, collaboration between tribes and foreign powers and the collapse of Central Government during the Great War and its political and psychological affection on the modernisation and tribal policy of Reza Khan. The views of British authorities about the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i "Sowlat al-Dowleh" after the termination of Qashqa'i War, and his settlement in Firuzabad has been discussed. Then the relation between Dr Mohammad Mossadeq, the Governor-General of Fars in 1920-1921 and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and finally, the Reza Khan-Sowlat Dowleh relation and their reaction to the Kashkuli agreement have been briefly discussed.

In recent decades, many articles, books, reports, mainly on anthropological, social and economy questions of nomad tribes, have been written by the Persian institutes and ministries or individuals Persian and non-Persian in English, Persian, French, Germans, Arabic, Turkish and other languages. Additionally, several series, handbooks and Encyclopaedias have been publishing in Iranian studies in which there are more information about the tribal life in Persia: Encyclopaedia Iranica, the Great Encyclopaedia of Islam (in Persian) and Encyclopaedia of Shi'ah (in Persian) are well known to scholars and public as well.

In the last two decades, Iraj Afshar the editor of Ayandeh, a journal on Iranian studies, introduced several official and private documents on tribal affairs in the first half of the 20th century. Kaveh Bayat, whose works are mainly on contemporary history of Persia as well as the history of tribes, has also introduced various documents on tribal affairs.

In recent years some works have been published on the history of the lesser tribes of Fars, Boir Ahmadi and Arab of Khuzestan. The history of Qashqa'i in the First

World War by Nasser Irajy has been recently published. It is a concise compile of the published works and documents in Persian. Bakhtiyari tribe and the Constitutional Revolution [1905-1909] is the title of the book written by Esfandiar Ahanjideh. The book, however, is containing the general political history of Bakhtiyari tribe in 1850-1980. Some of the events in central and southern Persia between the two Wars have been mainly reviewed and few of them were discussed. The author has used widely the memoirs of the Bakhtiyari Khans and some Persian documents.

7.3.2. The Researches on Oil History in Persia

The Persian oil fields are mainly situated in the pasture lands. The years before the war, 1914-1918, the oil pipes and the refinery were built in tribal areas as well. The A.P.O.C. developed its activities during the war and searching for oil and boring of new oil fields continued after the war throughout the south-west of Persia, from Posht-kuh to Lorestan, from Bakhtiyari to Fars, where the nomad tribes resided in winter or summer. The Oil Company negotiated and concluded agreements with the tribal chieftains for land purchasing and providing watch guard to in the first decades of the 20th century.

There were also sometimes differences and confrontation between the Company and the tribal chieftains. In 1920-1921, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i was confronted with the activities of the Oil Company in his tribal area without his knowledge. The Bakhtiyari Khans had also certain disputes with the Oil Company. The Oil Company was anxious of dispute among the tribal chieftains in the oil areas or between tribal chieftains and the Central Government. It is expected to find information and analysis about the political events in the oil fields in the history of oil in Persia. The authors have rarely mentioned of one or two important events and they are silence about the others. British authors are interested in researching on the role of the Oil Company as a giant enterprise. The Persians study the role of British Government in the A.P.O.C. activities' in Persia and the British involvement in Persian political affairs, particularly in the years 1914-1921, 1928-1933, 1950-1954. For the reason the British tribal policies in the south in which partly related to the oil activities were almost neglected by the two parties.

Few books and articles were published on the Persian oil in the first half of the 20th century. After the coup 1953 and the formation of an international consortium in 1954, the study on Persian Oil increased. "The black gold" is written by A. Lessani in

1950 in Persian. The most part of the book is about the process of the renew concession 1933 and afterwards. He endeavours to indicate that the British Government was interested in the Persian Oil from the early days. The author gives an account of British documents is quoted in the travel book of Reza Khan as a sign of interference of British consulates in Persian internal affairs.

Nasr-allah.S.Fatemi, a former member of the Persian Parliament, is the author of

“Oil Diplomacy” in 1954 published in the United States. He explains how British Government became the owner of more than fifty per cent of the shares of the A.P.O.C. base on a concession that it was granted to an individual. Fatemi has a critical view on the British Government’s foreign and oil policy in Persia. In respond to the arguments of Sir Edward Grey, the author of the partition of Persia in 1907 and 1915, that the Persian Government could not enforce law and order without employing foreign officers, he wrote: “According to Grey, since the formation of the A.P.O.C., the tribes had shown a desirable pecuniary interest in seeing that the wells were kept operating, but Grey forgot to say that this tribal encouragement and “Maharaja system“ introduced by the British in the oil provinces was undermining the very independence and integrity of the country” (18). He mentions of Khaz’al revolt in Khuzestan and the support of the British Consul of Khaz’al’s demand. The Labour Party succeeded in British election in January 1924 and had a different approach in foreign policy in Persia.

One year later, in 1955, P. L.Ellwell-sutton, a former staff of the Oil Company and then a press Attaché in the British Legation in Tehran, published the book “Persian Oil “. Apparently he uses official documents of the Oil Company, but he has not given his sources. Elwell-sutton describes the discovery of oil in Bakhtiyari land and the installation of the refinery in the island of Abadan. He mentions that the Oil Company did not ask the Persian Government for security guard in Bakhtiyari land or in Abadan. The company came into direct contact and agreement with the Bakhtiyari Khans and the chief of Mohaysen and the representatives of British Government concluded agreement with them.

In 1956, Mostafa Fateh published in Tehran his book: “Fifty years Persian oil”. He was a high Ranking Persian Official and then the Vice-Resident Director of the Oil Company. He mentions of the agreement between the Oil Company and the chiefs of the Bakhtiyari tribes on purchasing of the necessary land in Bakhtiyari region,

formation a protection guard, formation and the process of the Bakhtiyari Oil Company, as a subsidiary company of the A.P.O.C.

He describes the Agreement between the Oil Company and Sheikh Khaz'al on purchasing land in the Island of Abadan and formation a Protection Guard of refinery and the other installations of the company. There is no reference to the events after the war. Fateh only points out that with the strengthen of the Persian Government the Oil Company opened a bureau in Tehran in 1921 and a representative of the oil company resided there to deal with the Persian Government.

In recent years British Petroleum published an official history of the company. The first volume is "The History of the British Petroleum Company, the developing years 1901-1932", Cambridge 1982, by the R.W. Ferrier the archivist of the company. He writes the official view of the activities of the company. The structure and the internal relation of the Company have been discussed. He introduces the Directors and the authorities, who run the affairs of the Company in those years.

The relation of the Oil Company with the tribal chieftains in the south has been always criticized by the Persian authorities. The Persian Government was of opinion that the tribal policy of the Oil Company and the British Government undermined the integrity of Persia. Ferrier in his book endeavours to justify the policy of the Oil Company by stating that the weakness of the Persian Government was the reason for opening relation with the local chieftains.

The A.P.O.C. followed the same policy after the war and resisted to change of its policy in the years 1921-1924 even when Foreign Office recommended them in 1923-1924. Though, the book does not go into detail on political aspect of the situation after the war, but he mentions that the Directors of the A.P.O.C. were not sure of the long term stability of the Persian Government at that juncture. This argument does not touch the question of sovereignty and integrity rights of an independent country.

The other subject in which has not discussed in this book is the activities of the Oil Company in the tribal area of the province of Fars after the war. With regard to the differences in which went beyond the province of Fars and reached to the Persian Parliament, Persian Government and the British Legation and affected on the process of tribal relations in the south, it was worth to be discuss in this volume.

The author has consulted the documents available in Public Record Office as well as the archive of the British Petroleum, one of the richest source on southern Persia, but still close to the non- official researchers.

“Oil, Power and Principle- Iran’s Oil Nationalisation and its Aftermath” by M. Elm published in USA 1992. The author uses the United State and British archives. Though the main subject of the book is about the nationalisation of oil, but he has a short review of political process in first half of the 20 century and the primary activities of the Oil Company. He mentions briefly on centralisation policy of Reza Khan and the view of Sir Percy Loraine, British Minister in Tehran. In recent years, several books and articles are published on Persian Oil in Persian, English and other major European languages, but their contents are mainly on current affairs or nationalisation of oil in 1951.

In the published books and articles on modern history of Persia, the history of southern tribes and the history of Persian oil, discuss very briefly, if mention, about the southern tribes, who played an important role in those crucial years 1919-1925. The purpose of this study is to deal with this subject and fulfils the gap on this matter.

Sheikh Khaz’al was not the only tribal chief, who confronted with the re-establishment of the Central Government. The political position of other tribal chieftains was almost exactly under the same circumstances. The establishment of the Government was different from previous periods. There was no chance for the tribes and tribal chieftains to return to the previous political position. This was the practical begin of a new era in the Persian society. Administration reforms, organisation of an army, modernisation of the society as a whole and formation a nation- state was the object of the Persian intellectuals and the political elite.

8. Summary

- (1) Pastoral nomad tribes played an important political and military role in the Persian society and history.
- (2) The history of Persia indicates that the rise, maintenance and the fall of the many of dynasties was highly depended on the nomad tribes. Also the majority founders of dynasties were tribal in origin.
- (3) The ruling clans of the tribes were an important section of the Persian aristocracy. In addition to their tribes, the great chieftains ruled over a vast non-tribal area in provincial level.
- (4) An important part of the Persian military forces was nomad cavalry detachments throughout the history. The tribal levies under the command of their chiefs participated in the state army.
- (5) In the 19th century, Russia and Britain as two great powers in the region recognised the military and political importance of nomad tribes in Persia. The two powers opened relation with tribal chieftains.
- (6) In the Great War the belligerents endeavoured to persuade the tribal forces to participate in the War. The chiefs of the tribes were divided between the two sides. The great tribes received even heavy artillery and the tribal chieftains were strong as ever.
- (7) After the War, the southern tribal chieftains, who assisted British forces in the war, enjoyed of a considerable power in the presence of British forces in Persia.
- (8) The Commander of the Persian Cossacks organised a modern army based on available modern forces in Persia. In less than five years, 1921-1925, the tribal forces were severity suppressed by the army in Persia and the authority of Central Government was re-establish even in remote areas.
- (9) The short period 1919-1925 is one of the most important times in the Persian history. These years can be regarded as the transitional period in modern Persia.
- (10) Some aspects of the political history of Persia in these years, 1919-1925, has been recently studied. Despite the fact that the political and military role of nomad tribes and tribal chieftains was important, but this question, with the exception of Sheikh Khaz'al, paid less the attention of scholars and have not been fully studied.
- (11) British and Persian official documents are the main source in this study. The memoirs and travel accounts were used as the additional primary sources.

(12) Political history of Persia, the studies on Persia Oil as well as anthropological and historical studies on Persian tribes has been regarded as secondary-literature.

I. Nomad Tribes in Persia

1.1. Basic Geography of Persia

The physical geography of western Persia is related to the Iranian plateau as a whole. The physical geography and the geographical position of Persia affected directly on the existence and continuation of pastoral nomadism in Persia. For the reason here a short description of Persian geography is given, before the question of southern tribes is studied.

1.1.1. Location and Frontiers

Persia today covers an area of 1650,000 km², and consist the western part of the Iranian Plateau and its alluvial plains. Iranian Plateau lies between Tigris and Indus Rivers and between two stretches of coastal line: the Caspian Sea in the north and the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman of the Indian Ocean in the south. The Iranian plateau is placed in the south-west Asia, in the temperate zone and near to the equator, between latitude 25 and 40 N and longitude 44 and 63 E. and enjoys boundaries with Trans Caucasus and the plain of Central Asia in the north, with the Anatolian Plateau in Asia Minor and the plain of Mesopotamia in the west and with the Plateau of Pamir and the plain of Sind in the east (1).

1.2. Physical Geography

Persia is bounded by two chains of mountains, Alborz in the north and Zagros in the west. The Alborz mountain range stretches from Ararat in Armenia to Hindukosh in Afghanistan. Damavand is the highest peak of the Alborz, at a height of 5.671 m above sea level and near Tehran. The heights of the other peaks of the Alborz are between 4.000 and 3.000 m. The width of Alborz is between 60 and 130 km (2).

The chain mountain of Zagros stretches from the north-west of Persia to the south-east of Persia. Dena is the highest peak in this range, at a height of 5.000 m, in Fars. In

some places the breadth of the mountain chains in more than 200 km. Hence they act as a barrier largely preventing rainfall from reaching the centre of the plateau. Over 50% of the total land surface is mountainous and highly broken in topography. The great Zagros and Alborz mountain range together form a great V shape. The areas within the V, with its own secondary ranges begin as a high plateau and gradually levels towards the interior deserts (3).

The height of the plateau gradually declines from over 2,500 m above sea level at its outer edge to about 1,000 m at its centre (4). The two deserts of Kavir-e Lut and Kavir-e Namak occupy a large area of the plateau, extending south-east from the centre to near the Oman Sea coast. Outside the plateau are two plains formed by the alluvial deposits from the Alborz and Zagros. These are the south Caspian Littoral plain to the north of the Alborz range and Khuzestan to the south-west of the Zagros Mountains.

1.2. 1. Precipitation

The average of annual precipitation for Persia is 400 mm. It has less rainfall than the world average. However, it should not mislead because the distribution of rain is not equal for the entire country. The centre of plateau and all along the southern coast receive much less rain than the other parts (5). On the high mountains and along the Caspian Sea the mean annual precipitation is much higher than this average. The Alborz and Zagros foothills with an elevation of 1,000 to 1,850 m above sea level receive annual falls of this amount. General speaking, the rainfall decreases from north to south and from west to east except where relief of land upsets the regularity in this arrangement.

The physical shape, height and distance from equator, the location between Sahara-Arabian and Central Asia-Siberian belt and the low pressure of Mediterranean and Caspian Sea affect Persia's climate, temperature and quantity of rainfall. In general, the climate of the plateau and plains are hot and dry in summer with a mild winter and a few days rain and snow in seasons apart from summer. The mountains are mild in summer and cold and covered with snow in winter, where they are unendurable for living. The valleys are warm in summer and cold in winter, but not so cold as to render them uninhabitable. The annual snow melt from the mountains in spring irrigates the

vast pasture lands and provides streams, which flow into the valleys and plains, giving rise to human settlement in villages or cities (6).

On one side scarcity of water, scarcity of land, or both, difficulties of irrigation and limitation of cultivation, on the other side, variation of climate and availability of vast seasonal grasslands throughout the year, it has been possible to develop the stock breeding. For the reasons a portion of population of Persia has lived by pastoralism and often followed nomadic or semi-nomadic way of life.

1.3. Human Geography

The majority of the population in Persia have been always living in the northern and western regions, in the plains, valleys and foothills of the Zagros and Alborz mountains, where the water, cultivated lands and pastures exist. The vast area of semi-arid zone in eastern, southern and central Persia does not attract settlers and is less populated.

It has been estimated that after the First World War the population of Persia was over 10 million. More than 20 per cent of the population lived in the towns and cities. A quarter of population was nomads and semi-nomads, who dispersed throughout the country and about 55percentage resided in 15.000-20.000 villages and hamlets. The most important cities were Tehran, the capital, with 250.000 inhabitants, Tabriz 200.000, Mashad 100.000, Isfahan 75.000 and Shiraz 50.000.

With regard to the latest census, the population of Persia in 2002 is between 66-70 Millions. Almost two-third of the inhabitants is now city dwellers. Less than one-third of the population live in rural areas and over one per cent is still nomads and semi-nomads. The number and the population of the cities increased throughout the 20th century. As a result of centralisation policy and city dwelling, now Tehran has more than 12.000.000 population, Mashad 2.500.000, Isfahan and Tabriz between 1.500.000-2.000.000 Shiraz about 1.500.000.

Population of the cities Ahvaz, Kermanshah and Qom, reach to almost 1.000.000 and several cities have a population about or more than half million. Though, the percentage of villagers reduced from 55% to 33%, but the number of villages and the population increased to about 60.000 and 22 million (7).

The successive immigration and invasion of Iranian, then Arab and finally Turk-Mongols tribes via Central Asia, Caucasus and Arabia increased and expanded the nomadic way of life in the Iranian Plateau and affected on lingo-ethnically structure of Persia as a whole. The Persians including nomads speak west Iranian languages and dialects, Persian, Lori, Kurdish and Baluchi, as well as Turkic and Arabic.

The majority or about eighty eight per cent of the population including the majority of nomads followed the Shi'ah branch of Islam. About ten per cent of the population are Sunnites. The Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians and Baha'is are altogether less than two per cent.

A city was the centre of provincial politic and trade. Bazaar was in the centre of city, where the business and manual industries concentrated. Mosque and school situated not far from the Bazaar. The cities and towns were surrounded by the fruit and vegetable gardens. The main production in the rural area was grain, then the other agricultural products such as barely, cereals as well as fruits, and vegetables. They kept also small flock. The nomads had the main animal husbandry and agriculture as well as manual crafts situated in the second place.

There was traditionally the east-west commercial Silk Road. The ports of Bushehr and Bandar Abbas in the Persian Gulf and Anzali in the Caspian Sea connected the sea routes to the internal cities. Beside the manual craft, grain, silk, dry fruits, animals and the skins of sheep and goat were exported to other countries. Mohhammareh was developed in the 19th century and connected the Persian Gulf to Isfahan and Tehran through the Bakhtiyari land (8).

Few modern fabrics were installed in Persia in the 19th century. The numbers of fabric industry were rapidly increased in Tehran and some other cities. The oil industry developed by the A.P.O.C. in Khuzestan in 20th century and the process of industrialisation accelerated.

1.3.1. Pastoral Tribes and Pastures

The pastoral tribes of Persia were scattered throughout the country, but resided mainly in the mountainous areas where the high altitudes guarantee the existence of rich pasture lands. The main areas of nomadism were placed on the chains of Zagros in

which cover the west part of Persia stretching out to the south-east region. The Zagros chains are relatively bunched together in the north, opening up to the south (9).

The Kurd, Lor, Bakhtiyari, Qashqa'i and Khamseh tribes were the most important pastoral (keepers of sheep and goat) tribes of Zagros.

The main production of pastoral nomads was animal breeding. In general the nomads of Persia have had some cultivated lands, mostly dry farming (10). The carpet and various types of rugs weaving are the main handicrafts of the nomad tribes in which making by the tribeswomen.

1.3.1.1. Definition of the Nomad Tribe

The geographers and historians of Islamic period in their works in Persian and Arabic mention of several pastoral nomad tribes in different parts of the Iranian plateau who migrated annually to summer and winter pastures. Ibn Khaldun in the 14th century, gives a more clear definition of nomads that the “people who make their living by rearing animals ...and are obliged to move and roam in search of pastures and water”. The cement which holds such people together in a tribe the communal pride (asabiya) which springs from shared ancestry and affinity and finds expression in confederacy or alliance. Consequently these people unlike sedentary peoples, attach more importance to descent than to domicile. This definition is more general to the social scientists (11).

Anthropologists are of opinion that more or less similar characteristics can be found in other tribes, wrote Firuz Towfiq. He refers to the researches of W. Iron among the Turkmen in Persia that the tribe (il) generally depends on genealogy. “The members of a tribe perceive their community as made up of small and large patrilineal descent groups”, and “in the male line, back to the common ancestor“. The studies of Salzman in Baluchestan “confirm the importance of descent-based organisation”. And lineage is thus the main consideration, not “vicinage”. He added these remarks that the Turkmen and Baluch could not be simply generalised and taken as typical of all the tribes of Persia. These conceptual definitions do not provide adequate criteria for distinguishing tribes from other groups (12).

Dieter Ehmman realised that there is no a comprehensive word to explain the different economical activities of nomads. Additionally, he reached to conclusion that the social scientists as well as biologists studied nomadism until fifty's used the words

and idioms of their own fields without paying the attention to the outcome and vocabularies of the other fields. There is now variety of synonym words on nomadism. Ehmann characterised in his work the life of the mountain tribe "Berg Nomaden" of Bakhtiyaris in Zagros to distinguish them from the other forms of nomadism (13).

In Persia there are also many rural people who have flocks of sheep and goats. They leave their villages for high altitudes in the mountains where pasturelands are rich and they live in black tents. Nevertheless they do not belong to any tribal society. There are tribesmen who live in their villages in the winter quarters and move with their flocks towards their summer quarters in the high mountains at the end of spring and also live there under black tents (14).

In a Symposium on "Nomadismus-ein Entwicklungsproblem?" Berlin 1982, Fred Scholz formulates and defines six forms of pastoralism: VollnomadismusI, VollnomadismusII, Halbnomadismus, Bergnomadismus, Transhumanz, Almwirtschaft (15). What related to mountain nomad tribes in Persia can be defined as "a system designed to integrate the nuclear families into the tribal community, to enable them to perform functions and to secure tribe's unity".

In general, tribal organisation at the lower level is based on kinship and at higher levels on administrative and political alliance. In many tribes the structure is of a more or less uniform type of "segmentary lineage organisation" but there are also variations from one tribe to another depending on factors such the degree of tribe integration or dispersion, the source and nature of its economic activity, etc. (16).

Every tribe in Persia has an organisation and a common territory. The tribe is divided into section (Tyreh). Each section in its turn is divided into sub-sections (Tayefe). Tayefe is composed of several lineages (Oulad, Tash, Dahe, Gobak etc., depending on the tribe). A member of several camps or villages belongs to a lineage (17). Annually, the tribe migrates two times between the winter quarters in the foothills and plain and the summer quarters in high mountains.

The seasonal migration of tribe begins in fresh vegetation and pastures of spring from lowland and foothills by stages up the high hill and mountain (18). The tribe leaves the summer abode at the end of summer and the beginning of autumn. In question to the nomads in Persia, the fact is that there were and to lesser extend there are still variations of nomadic way of life in Persia.

The Arab, Baluch and Turkmen nomad and semi-nomad tribes in Persia were less than a quarter of tribal population. The mountains of Zagros with the rich pastures placed almost two-third of the pastoral nomads in Persia. The social and political structure of the pastoral nomads of Zagros, especially the great tribes were much complicated from the other tribes in Persia.

1.3.1.2. The Great Tribes of Persia

The mountain tribes of Persia distinguish from the nomads of deserts (Bedouins) and the nomads of Asiatic steppes by many factors. The tribes in Persia reside in the mountains and plain where there are rich pastures and water in summer and winter. In opposition to horizontal and long annual migration of desert and steppe nomad tribes, the mountain tribes migrates comparatively relative short and vertical. The pastoral nomads breed variation of animals and cultivate grain, wheat and barley, mostly dry farming. There are tribes in Persia in which they were considered among the most important nomad units in the world and their population reach to half million.

The most important characterisation of these great tribes in Persia is that each one has a Government system. This government has influence in all sub-tribes. At the head of pyramid is the great chief. The Bakhtiyari tribe is a perfect model of Persian nomadism (19). The authority in the great tribe was concentrated in the hand of an Ilkhani, supreme head of tribe; and an Ilbegi, as his assistant (20). The Ilkhani of the great tribe was subject to the approval, even the appointment of the Shahs (21) from the ruling family and then apportioned, at different levels of pyramid of segmentation.

The great tribes in this work are almost the same as confederation of tribes. The word confederation reminds us as a special form of political structure, whereas the chieftains of the four great tribes under study had a considerable power, but the internal political structure and social relations of each tribe contain certain differences from the others. One of the characteristic of the great tribe in Persia is that they consist of several tribes and usually made up of ethnically different tribes and sub-tribes and no tribal confederation includes the whole of an ethnic group.

The Turkish speaking confederation of Qashqa'i in Fars are consisted of six tribes and one hundred to two hundred sub-tribes, who were in origin Turk, Lor, Lak, Kurd, Arab, Persian, Korowshi and Gypsy (22). The Khamseh confederation in Fars was

consisted of three Turkish, one Persian and one Arab tribe under the chieftainship of a Persian city dweller Qavami family. The Khamseh great tribe was relatively a new confederation. For the reason the tribes did not lose their languages (23).

The Lor speaking Bakhtiyari Confederation is one of the Persian's most important seasonally migrant communities. They are divided into two components parts. Each part consists of several tribes and sub-tribes. The social organisation was the existence of numerous interlocked social units within the tribe, reflecting an exceptionally high degree of lineal segmentation at different levels (24). There were and to lesser extend still there are Kurdish, Turkish, Arab as well as Lor sub-tribe from Lorestan in Bakhtiyari (25). The situation of semi-nomad tribe Mohaysen-Ka'ab, who settled gradually and cultivated the land around Karun in the 19th century, was different from the great nomad tribe in Zagros. The rise of the sheikhs of Mohaysen branch related partly to the decline of the sheikhs of Ka'ab and the geographical position of Mohammareh.

1.3.2. Great Powers and Tribal Chieftains

At the beginning of the 19th century, after the defeat of Persia in confrontation with the Russian and the British forces, the two colonial powers began their political and economic penetration in Persia. Both powers realised the importance of political and military power of tribal chieftains and the semi-independent character of tribal community. They opened friendly relation with chieftains. The Persian Government had anxiety of the direct relation of the tribal chieftains with the two colonial powers, who were in a position to provide arms and ammunitions for them.

1.4. Central Zagros and Khuzestan Tribes

The south west Persia was the most populated tribal area in this country and is shaped by the mountains of Zagros, which, like parallel lines, stretch from the north-west to the south-east. Valleys and plains lie between the mountains. In Bakhtiyari land the flatter lands are less than in the province of Fars and the mountains are closer to each other. Most of the rivers originating in Zagros flow as far as the alluvial plain of Khuzestan. A few also reaches Isfahan and Fars. The rivers render the area inhabitable

(26). The south-west Persia is an area of more than 300.000 km² (without the province Isfahan).

The unique physical features and climate of the area distinguish it from central part of Persia. The political and cultural interrelations of the area in modern history, which distinguished it from northern Zagros provinces, are the bases for concentration upon this area. At beginning of the 20th century, the south-west Persia had about one-fourth of the country's population. In addition to many small and lesser tribes, five great tribes with a considerable population resided there and their chiefs had immense influence and played an important role in the history of southern Persia.

Four of them, Bakhtiyari, Qashqa'i Khamseh and Mohaysen-Banu-Kaab who were more related to each other are the subject of this study. The Bakhtiyari tribe had a population over 30.000 families, Qashqa'i tribe also over 30.000 families, Khamseh confederacy about 15.000 families and Mohaysen-Ka'ab about 10.000 families. In the first decades of the 20th century, the chief of Mohaysen tribe brought most Arab tribes in southern Khuzestan under his rule, a population between 15.000-20.000 families. The chiefs of the four tribes had a population between 100.000 and 110.000 families or between 650.000 and 700.000 persons under their rule, or about half of the tribal population and more than one-fourth of the population of the area.

In addition to four mentioned great tribes, their chieftains had influence on lesser tribes as well as the settlers. The chief of the great tribe Filie had also influence on the other tribes in Poshtkuh. The population of Poshtkuh tribes' reached to 30.000 families and he was always in alliance with the other four southern great tribe chieftains. Additionally, some other important Lor tribes in Lorestan, Boir Ahmadi and tribes of Fars, the number of tribes' people might be estimated to over 1.200.000 or half of the population of the area and one-eighth of the countries' population (27).

1.4.1. Bakhtiyari Tribe (Origin and History)

The Shi'ah' Lor speaking nomad tribe of Bakhtiyari was one of the two most important nomad tribes in southern Persia and was divided into two components parts: Haft Lang tribes and Chahar Lang tribes. The nomad tribes of Bakhtiyari organisation were almost similar to many other tribes in Persia (28). Annually, the tribe of Bakhtiyari migrates two times between the winter quarters in the Bakhtiyari foothills and the north-east districts of Khuzestan (Masjed-e-Soleyman, Shushtar, Ize and Dezful) and the

summer quarters in high mountains of Chahar Mahal (Shahr-e-kord and Borujen) and Daran. The seasonal migration of tribe begins in fresh vegetation and pastures of spring from lowland and foothills by stages up the high hill and mountain (29). The tribe leaves the summer abode at the end of summer and the beginning of autumn.

The province of Bakhtiyari is now about 11.000 km². However, many districts and areas in neighbouring provinces are resided by the Bakhtiyaris. On the eve of the 20th century, the population of Bakhtiyaris were mainly pastoral nomads. There were, also a number of semi-nomads, transhumance and settled agriculturalists. Bakhtiyari tribe consisted 30.000-40.000 families or more than 200.000 or more than two per cent of the country's population. The chiefs of Bakhtiyari extended their influence outside the Bakhtiyari country in the 19th century. They gained many estates in Lorestan, Khuzestan and Chahar Mahal. Therefore a large number of settled agriculturists and peasants came under the Bakhtiyari ruling families (30).

There are a number of tribal legends and tribal tradition thus both indicate that the group of mountain tribes now collectively known as the Bakhtiyaris are from different ethnic and diverse origin and the present name is comparatively modern (31). The circumstances of the use of the word Bakhtiyari is not clear. The legends are not satisfactory either. There is a reference in 16th century in which the governorship and tax collecting were given to certain Bakhtiyari (32). With the fall of Safavid dynasty in 1722 in Isfahan, the Bakhtiyaris participated in struggle for access to power and throne throughout the 18th century, but without success and their rebellions were suppressed.

1.4.2. Leadership in Bakhtiyari Tribe

On the first half of the 19th century the chiefs of Haft Lang lost their position and Mohammad Taqi Chahar Lang was the only chieftain who succeeded to bring most of Bakhtiyaris under his rule. During the reign of Mohammad Shah (1834-48), Mohammad Taqi Khan Chahar Lang was the most powerful Khan in Bakhtiyari (33). As a result of insurgence he lost his power and imprisoned in Tehran. In the second half of the 19th century, Hossein Qoli Khan of Zarasvand sub tribe of Haft lang-e-Bakhtiyari strengthened his power and finally he was appointed as the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari by Nasser al-Din Shah (1848-1896). During the years 1852-82 Hossein Qoli Khan

achieved to bring the whole of Bakhtiyari tribe under his jurisdiction. With the assistance of his two brothers, the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari had the function of tribal chief, tax collector, tribal arbitrate, land lord and the governor of adjacent regions.

These functions were similar to the other great tribes such as Qashqa'i confederation. Hossein Qoli Khan gained many estates in Khuzestan and Chahar Mahal by various means and he was one of the most powerful, influential and richest Ilkhani at this juncture. For this reason he was murdered in Isfahan 1882 by Prince Zell al-Soltan, the governor-general of Isfahan with the consent of his father, Nasser ad-Din Shah (34).

1.4.3. The Family Rivalry

After the death of Great Ilkhani, for almost 12 years, there were severe rivalries among three fractions of the ruling family of Bakhtiyari on Governing of the Bakhtiyari tribe. The rivalry between the Governor-General of Isfahan, Prince Zell al-Soltan and the Grand vizier Amin al-Soltan, caused a great hostility and bitter conflicts between the rival factions. The office of Ilkhani moved from one faction to another (35). Finally the two families Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani united against the Ilbegi family in 1894. They agreed to exclude the Ilbegi family from governorship of Bakhtiyari. Secondly, the eldest member of the two families would be Ilkhani and the eldest man of the other family would be Ilbegi (36).

From the two families as Ilkhani and Ilbegi, all incomes, whether from tolls on Bakhtiyari road, guard service, and so on were divided between the Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani factions. This division was recognised by the Central Government (Shah) and then by the British who concluded the contract of Bakhtiyari road in 1898 and the oil agreements of 1905 and 1909. The chiefs of Bakhtiyari extended their influence outside the Bakhtiyari country in the 19th century. They gained many estates in Lorestan, Khuzestan and Chahar Mahal. Therefore a large number of settled agriculturists and peasants came under the Bakhtiyari ruling families.

The Bakhtiyari Khans participated in the last phase of Constitutional Revolution. With the victory of constitutionalists, the Bakhtiyari Khans entered into national politics in 1909. The two factions again secretly agreed that the government's posts such as governorship and income should be divided on the some bases.

1.4.4. Bakhtiyari Road and Oil

The geographical position of Bakhtiyari land in the centre of Persia caused the attention of British authorities the importance of Bakhtiyari land. The Persian Government granted a road concession to the Bakhtiyari Khans linking Ahvaz to Isfahan and Lynch Company constructed the commercial road of Bakhtiyari and opened in 1899 (37). In 1905, the British consul in Isfahan, on behalf of concessionaire negotiated with the Bakhtiyari Khans. Then they concluded an agreement on formation a subsidiary company with 3% shares for the two rulings Bakhtiyari families, an agreement on land purchasing for the Oil Company and formation a Bakhtiyari Guard to protect the employees and the other properties of the company in the oil fields, pipelines, installations in 1905. Drilling began in the winter quarter of the Bakhtiyari in 1905.

After the discovery of oil in the Bakhtiyari winter quarter in 26 May 1908, the subsidiary Bakhtiyari Company with 3% of share for the Khans was formed in 13 April 1909 and the day after the A.P.O.C. founded (38).

1.4.5. Bakhtiyaris in Revolution 1905-1911

The Bakhtiyari Khans of ruling families under the leadership of Sardar Ass'ad II and Samsam al-Saltaneh II participated in the third phase of the Constitutional Revolution. Sardar Ass'ad received the positive gesture of the British Government in London before returning to Persia. Since the conquest of Tehran in 1909, the Bakhtiyari Khans participated in national politics. They were appointed as Prime Minister, Minister of War the Cabinets, governor-general in several provinces. Usually, the Bakhtiyari Khans and Bakhtiyari force in Tehran supported the cabinets against its opponents from outside, Mohammad Ali Shah and his brother or in the country such as Shahsavan and Turkmen tribes.

On the other hand the Khans in Tehran and as the Governor kept a large number of Bakhtiyari cavalries which it involved expense for the treasury, but they did not bring real security. Bakhtiyari Khans enjoyed and benefited from the presence of their armed tribesmen and their mischief caused many complaints until 1923 (39). After the

confrontation with Gendarmerie in Tehran 1913, the Persian Government asked the Senior Khans to send the Bakhtiyari force to the Bakhtiyari land. The Khans kept their retinues in Tehran and the force remained with the Governor-General Khans in the provinces (40). The Persian statesmen and British diplomats, both, regarded the Bakhtiyari force in a long term as an obstacle to the administration reforms.

1.4.6. Security of the Oil fields

Since the conquest of Tehran in 1909, most of the senior Bakhtiyari Khans resided in Tehran or as Governor-General went to the other provinces. In the absence of the Khans from the Bakhtiyari land, due to disunity and quarrel between the two ruling families, the question of security and tranquillity in the oil fields persuaded the British Oil Company and the British Legation to interfere on Governorship of Bakhtiyari. The agreement of 1894 reshaped in 1912. By the new arrangement of 1912, first of all the Ilkhani had almost a free hand in the tribal affairs. Secondly, the question of elderly person of the two families for Governorship of the Bakhtiyari tribe lost its important. Thirdly, the period of Ilkhani limited to a special time and finally it let the Ilkhani to choose his Ilbegi from the other family (41).

By the arrangement the period of Ilkhaniship was for five years, On March 1912 Nasser Khan, Sardar Jang of Haji Ilkhani family was appointed as Ilkhani for five years. He appointed Morteza Qoli Khan, the son of Samsam al-Saltaneh, of Ilkhani family as Ilbegi. Though, he arrangement was for five years but, due to the Great War Sardar Jang was replace by Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham as Ilkhani and Yusef Khan Amir Mojahed as Ilbegi in 1915. British supported these nominees as Ilkhani and Ilbegi to secure the tranquillity in the oil fields. By penetrating step by step, British established their influence in centre of Persia and prevent of the possible penetration of Russian in this neutral area.

1.5. Population of Khuzestan

The province of Khuzestan contains the foot-hills and the alluvial plain of Zagros mountain in the south-west of the Iranian plateau, a territory of about 60.000 km².

Albeit Khuzestan has a history over 6000 years, but ethnically and linguistically the feature of the province has changed several times due to successive invasions and immigrations of many Persians, Arab, Turk and Lor speaking nomads and semi-nomads' tribes into Khuzestan and the Iranian plateau (42).

At the beginning of the 20th century Khuzestan was mainly the home of nomad and semi-nomad Arab and Lor tribes as well as settlers. The Arab tribes resided in southern, centre and western districts of the province. In the northern and eastern districts lived the Lors of Pish-kuh, Lorestan and Bakhtiyari tribes (settled or nomad). The town of Dezful and Shushtar in the northern district were famous for their especial Persian dialects and the town of Ramhormoz was a mixture of south west Iranian dialect affiliated with many Arabic words.

Due to the annual migration of the Lor speaking nomads to the high land pastures and the annual migration of some Arab tribes on both sides of the border to Mesopotamia (today Iraq), the size of population fluctuated from summer to winter. The numbers of Arab families were over twenty thousand families or 150.000 to 200.000 persons.

The Bakhtiyari settled and nomads were more than 30.000 families and the other Lor tribes who resided seasonal or permanently in the northern Khuzestan should be less than Bakhtiyaris. There was also a very small number of Turkish speaking near Shushtar and certain sub-tribes of Kohgiluyeh and Boir Ahmadi as well as Qashqa'i sub-tribes in Khuzestan (43).

1.5.1. Arab Tribes of Khuzestan

Since the Safavid era (1500-1722) the last feature of Khuzestan has been gradually shaped and continued in the following centuries by the arrival and the immigration of many nomads and semi-nomad tribes of Lor, Arab and in small scale Turkish tribes into Khuzestan. The majority of these tribes immigrated into Khuzestan from the 15th century onwards.

The feature of Arab tribes in southern Khuzestan is based on five century interrelation between Mesopotamia and Khuzestan. The Ka'ab tribe migrated from central and southern Arabia into Mesopotamia and then into Khuzestan during the 17th

and 18th centuries. The Ka'ab was subordinated to the Afshar tribe in order to come into Khuzestan. They paid a certain amount to the Afshar chiefs annually (44).

1.5.2. Khuzestan's Governors and Chieftains

In the reign of Nasser al Din Shah (1848-1896), the Governor-General of Khuzestan had a considerable arm force and in case of any rebellion, he was reinforced by additional detachments by the Central Government. The Governors-General use to travel to Howizeh every year and the chiefs of Arab tribes came to see him and pay their annual taxes to him (45).

From the reign of Mozafar al-Din Shah (1896-1907) until the rise of Reza Khan to the throne (1925), in the absence of a strong army and Central Government, the Governor-Generals of Khuzestan lost gradually their power and territory and it was limited mainly to the town Shushtar and Dezful.

The Governor-General resided in Shushtar. The headquarters of the provincial departments were in Shushtar and some of them such as post and telegraph in Ahvaz. The territory under the Governor-General, where the machinery of Central Government was still in motion, containing the towns Shushtar and Dezful and to some extends the vicinity districts in the northern Khuzestan and it was lying immediately below the Bakhtiyari hill in the north and east, where the winter pastures and the villages of Bakhtiyaris situated.

The Governor-General had only a few local town police and some thirty to forty cavalries, recruited from Lor tribes near to Shushtar. He commanded no real authority even in the suburb districts, which resided by the Lors, Bakhtiyaris and Arab tribes. Albeit the rapid urbanisation became a feature of Khuzestan in the first decades of the 20th century, even after the war, the dominant feature of the province was still tribal, mostly nomads or semi-nomads. The Bakhtiyari Khans expanded their authority on eastern and north-east Khuzestan, in Rahmhormoz, Masjed Soleiman to the gate of Shushtar and Dezful. They did not pay attention to the governor-general and did not prepare to pay their taxes to the finance department (46).

The south Khuzestan and almost all the Arab tribes of Khuzestan came one after another successfully under the rule of Sheikh Khaz'al, a hereditary ruler of

Mohammareh. He communicated directly with the Central Government. The Governor-General of Khuzestan who came from Tehran, had to come to understanding with him and the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari, otherwise he was not able to stay for a long time in Khuzestan.

The winter quarters of the tribes of Lorestan such as Sagvand, Beyranvand, Baharvand, Qale_ vand were only a few kilometres from Dezful, resided on the other side of bounders to Mesopotamia and Sheikh Khaz'al influence was rather shadowy and Vali of Posht-Kuh was able to manipulate tribal factions in north Khuzestan and close to Dezful in his own interests (47).

In fact, some years to the war, the districts of Shushtar and Dezful formed a ground the armbands of Bakhtiyari Khans and Khaz'al alternatively advanced and retreated. They, both, also subsidised their adherents in these two towns, where they were constantly involved in factional fights. As a result of these fightings caused a great insecurity of life and property (48).

1.5.3. British and the Chieftains of Mohaysen

In the second half of the 19th century the expansion trade from the Persian Gulf through Khuzestan and then via Bakhtiyari land to the centre of Persia promoted the British to open friendly relation with the governor of the frontier town of Khuzestan, the port of Mohammareh and opening British Consulates in this province one after the another. Sheikh Jabber and then his son, Sheikh Maz'al, at least in the beginning, had a cordial relation with the British authorities in the Persian Gulf.

1.5.4. Sheikh Khaz'al the Governor of Mohammareh

On the eve of the 20th century Sheikh Maz'al the hereditary Governor of Mohammareh and the chief of Mohaysen tribe of Bani- Ka'ab was killed in a complot by his brother, Sheikh Khaz'al, who succeeded to him on 2 June 1897. Khaz'al was reaffirmed in his office and received the hereditary title and Governorship of Mohammareh and frontier. He was an ambitious man and through various methods such as bribery and marriage gradually he made solid his position in southern Khuzestan.

He was only a year in office that by the suggestion of Grand Vizier and the approval of the Shah was appointed as the governor of Falahiye and therefore he becomes the chief of Ka'ab tribe as a whole. Khaz'al succeeded to gain the Governorship of Ahvaz as well as crown estates in this region through the support of his courtier friends by a series of Farmans in 1902 (49).

During the years of Constitutional Revolution 1905-1909, the years of upheaval and the weakness of Central Government, Khaz'al prepared to pay the annual taxes of the insurgents tribes chiefs to the government and to collect the taxes by his force and to appoint his partisans as the chief of the tribes. Khaz'al eliminated the chief of Howizeh, Al-e-Khamis, Bani-torof who were not ready to accept him as the master of Khuzestan. He brought also al-e-Kathir, one of the most powerful Arab tribes in Khuzestan under his rule. He removed, imprisoned and poisoned his opponents and as the result the other tribal sheikhs remained silence.

He also bought the official who was sent to the province from Tehran. The powerful rival of Khaz'al was the Bakhtiyari Khans. Otherwise he ruled over southern Khuzestan almost semi-independence. Khaz'al subsidised certain newspapers in Egypt and Iraq and also he paid to some Arab poets to be praised as the Amir of Arabistan (Khuzestan) (50).

1.5.5. British and Sheikh Khaz'al

The political and commercial importance of Khuzestan was gradually increased. As Khaz'al reaffirmed as the governor of Mohammareh in 1897, he developed further his cordial relation with the British authorities in the Persian Gulf. Khaz'al was an ambitious man and he intended to stable his future with the future of Khuzestan. British Government supported him on Mohammareh custom question 1902. Khaz'al received a confident assurance letter from the British Government. This was the first of a series of assurance letters from a series that Khaz'al received from British Government (51). The discovery of oil in 1908 in the Bakhtiyari winter pastures by the concessions syndicate, then the A.P.O.C. caused a closer association of British with Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al (52).

The British political resident in Bushehr, Sir Percy Cox and the A.P.O.C. negotiated with Khaz'al over the Oil Company's pipeline, refinery site and the guardian of oil refinery rather than with the authorities in Tehran. British Consul in Mohammareh, Arnold Wilson, became also actively involved in the negotiations. Khaz'al was anxious that the development of Khuzestan would cause the Central Government to seek for more taxes and would re-establish his authority in Khuzestan. Khaz'al received another secret assurance for the protection of his semi-independent position, but in the condition that he should fulfil his duty towards the Persian Government. He was decorated with order and "with all the ceremony of a full-dress Indian Durban, the insignia of a Knight Commander" order of the Indian Empire in 1910.

From British point of view, Sheikh Khaz'al was an important factor in tranquillity in the Persian Gulf and southern Khuzestan. The safety of trade routes and the guardian of oil installation pipeline and refinery facilitated British commercial and industrial activities in the region. He was equipped with the British arm and ammunition and received additional extended assurances and he was decorated again with new order. The official ceremonies demonstrated to the other Arab chiefs in Khuzestan the respect and support of British authorities of Sheikh Khaz'al (53).

1.6. The Great Tribes of Fars

The province of Fars had several lesser, middle size and great nomad tribes. The two confederation nomad tribes in which still a relative small portion of them follows the nomadic way of life.

1.6.1. Qashqa'i Tribes of Fars

The meaning of the word Qashqa'i is vague. It appears that the nucleus of the tribe came from the Turkish speaking clans in Central Asia who entered the Iranian plateau with the Saljuqs and Mongols. The time of immigration of many clans to Fars is not clear either. For the first time there is a clear reference to the residence of a Turkish tribe in Fars in the 15th century. The Qashqa'i tribe is a comparatively recent community

and the establishment of the tribal confederacy is not clear either. The Qashqa'i tribe was ruled by the Shahilu Turkish speaking nomad clan who was sent from Azarbaijan to Fars by the Safavid Kings. The Qashqa'i nomad tribes migrated twice in a year. Their summer quarters were north-west of Fars, south-west of Isfahan, a part of Chahar Mahal provinces. Their Winter Quarters were south-west of Fars, east of Khuzestan and a part of Kohgiluyeh and Bushehr provinces (54).

Though, the main language of Qashqa'is is Turkish and some of the sub-tribes were certainly from Turkish origin, but from the earliest historical evidence, the various groups, Turkish and non-Turkish clans of pre-Islamic to modern time, affiliated to the tribe. The Qashqa'is have not been of homogeneous origin and Qashqa'is themselves claim, in the ethno-linguistically were Turks, Kurds, Lors, Laks, Arabs, Persians, Baluch, and gypsies of Central Asia, Caucasus, Persia, and Turkey (55).

The name of Qashqa'i has been mentioned for the first time in a literary work of the 17th century. The Qashqa'i tribe as a political and military force and one of the defender tribes of southern coast have been mentioned in one of the source at the beginning of the 18th century. They were exiled to Khorassan by Nadir Shah After (1730-1747). As a result of co-operative policy of the Shahilu chiefs of Qashqa'i with Karim Khan (1750-1779), the founder of Zand dynasty, who chose Shiraz as his capital, he permitted the return of Qashqa'i from Khorassan to Fars. This strengthened the position of tribes in Fars. By appointing Isma'il Khan Shahilu as the head of Qashqa'i, Karim Khan Zand recognised the power of Shahilu clan in Fars (56).

1.6.2. The Confederation of Khamseh Tribes

Shahilu, the ruling family of Qashqa'i, succeeded to expand the size of the tribe in the 19th century. Some of the tribes, who came to Fars with Karim Khan Zand, after the overthrow of Zand dynasty, joined the Qashqa'is. Some of the Lor as well as the non-Qashqa'i Turkish tribes of Fars also affiliated the Qashqa'is. The great Qashqa'i tribe was the strongest confederation of nomad tribes in the south. Additionally, many other tribes in Fars remained in a friendly term with the chiefs of Qashqa'i.

With regard to the increasingly power of the Qashqa'i confederacy, the Prince Governor General of Fars, Hesham al-saltaneh, and the influential Qavam al-Molk

suggested formation a new confederation of tribe in Fars as a counter weight to the Qashqa'i. With the approval of Nasser al-Din Shah the Khamseh Confederation was gradually formed in 1860-1865. Ali Mohammad Khan Qavam al-Molk was appointed as the tax collector of the Baharlu, Arab and Basseri tribes and then the chief of the confederation (57).

The Confederation of Khamseh tribes consisted of five Persian, Turkish and Arab tribes. The Arab tribe came from Arabian Peninsula during the Abbasid Caliphates to Fars (58). The Turkish tribes came to Fars in the 15th century onwards (59) and the Persian came partly from Khorassan and the other part belonged to the old tribes of Fars. The summer quarters of the Khamseh confederation were north and north-east of Fars and the winter quarters of the Khamseh tribes were south and south-east of Fars (60).

Ali Mohammad Khan Qavam al-Molk the head of Qavam family and the only real rival came into conflict with the power of Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and with Khamseh confederation. He protected his caravans to and from southern port in eastern part of Fars. Qavam family were originally from a merchant of Qazvin who came to Shiraz in the last decades of the Safavid dynasty. Gradually, the family participated in social and local politics. They were recognised as merchant -aristocrat family of the Shiraz (61). In the middle of the 19th century the head of Qavam family was the hereditary Deputy Governor-General of Fars and the Mayor of Shiraz. Qavamis continually expanded their power and wealth (estates and gardens) in the Province to the 1920s similar to their rival Qashqa'i chiefs, especially in the eastern Fars.

Besides the collection of taxes and jurisdiction rights in the tribe, the two rival families were appointed as the governors of the towns in eastern and western Fars. The landlords and the peasants who lived close to or within the nomad areas and il-routes where the nomads passed through in spring and autumn depended on the goodwill of chiefs of the Qashqa'i and Khamseh tribes to prevent their tribesmen from damaging the sown fields and the villages as a whole.

The commercial road Isfahan-Shiraz and Shiraz-Bushehr were near to the Qashqa'i summer and winter quarters and Shiraz-Bandar Abbas road was within the Khamseh areas. The good will of the two rival chiefs was very important to prevent the nomads from highway robbery (62). On the eve of the 20th century, due to the weakness of the Constitutional Government in Tehran and the intervention policy of Great Powers

in Persia, the chiefs of the tribes gained a much stronger position than before throughout of the country as well as in Fars.

In the absence of a uniform and efficient armed force, the highway robbery increased and many of the petite tribes ignored the law and order. The weakness of the Central Government affected the position of the Governor-Generals, whose small and inefficient forces were not able to challenge the power of the tribal chiefs. In the south, including the province of Fars, British expanded their trade and enterprise as well as political and military activities and opened a close relation with the influential local chiefs. British Government dispatched consulate guards and stationed detachments in southern coastal ports and islands.

In the province of Fars, the Governor-Generals could only look to the good will of Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and the chief of Khamseh. He was unable to challenge the power of the two great chiefs if he would ignore their interests. In the reign of Mozafar al-Din Shah (1896-1907) Isma'il Khan, the son of Darab Khan-e-Ilbegi came to power in 1898. He was appointed first as Ilbegi and then in 1904 as the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i. He was very efficient, but at the same time he was not prepared to divide the leadership of the Qashqa'i tribe with his brothers and the wealth that this leadership entailed.

Qavamis who achieved to a more stable position in Fars after the formation of Khamseh confederacy, now confronted with a strong character as the head of Qashqa'i. For the years, 1906-1912 the Constitutional Revolution affected on the affairs of Fars and shaped new forms to the traditional political rivalry and enmity. The conflict between the constitutionalists and the supporters of the old regime widened the differences between the chiefs of Khamseh and Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i (1904-1933) (63).

Habib-allah Khan Qavam al-Molks opened a closer relation with the British consulate. Despite the presence of British-Indian troops in Shiraz in 1910, the Shiraz-Bushehr commercial road remained closed. The Kashkuli tribes of Qashqa'i under Mohammad Ali Khan made the road unsafe. Finally, the Persian Government appointed Mokhber al-Saltaneh, an experienced statesman, as the new governor general of Fars in 1912. It was hoped that he could restore the order in Fars.

1.6.3. Governor-General of Fars and Two Chieftains

On his arrival to Shiraz in 1912, the province was in turmoil. Mocher al-Saltaneh, governor general, was informed that the Khamseh confederation had rebelled against Qavam al-Molk and he did not dare to leave Shiraz to go among his tribesmen. The bandits as general and the bandits of the Qashqa'i tribe made the life insecure for the inhabitants of western Fars. Inside the city of Shiraz, no one dare to go out after sunset (64).

The Gendarmerie force had been defeated by Qashqa'i tribesmen in Siyakh, where they had lost their cannon and rifles. The Anglo-Indian force, therefore, did not dare to come out of their quarters in Shiraz. Mokhber al-Saltaneh persuaded the chief of the Qashqa'i to reconcile himself with his rival, the chief of Khamseh to bring tranquillity to Fars. He employed a number of local riflemen to strengthen the Gendarmerie. He sent a group of riflemen and Gendarmes together to sentry posts along the Shiraz-Kazerun road to secure the safety of transport and merchandise.

Sowlat al-Dowleh managed to pacify the Qashqa'is, and they migrated to their summer quarters in an orderly fashion. Qavam al-Molk also arrested the chief of Khamseh rebel, Askar Khan, who was subsequently executed by the order of the governor-general. Gradually, security returned to Fars, and the British-Indian force left the city for Bushehr (65). The Swedish officers of the Gendarmerie and British consul in Shiraz initiated a military operation against the tribesmen, without consulting the governor-general and without realising that the tribesmen live under completely different circumstances from city dwellers. They were in military operation badly defeated. In spite of their mistakes, the situation of Fars remained almost calm until the outbreak of the First World War (66).

1.7. British and Southern Tribes

British had built friendly relations with some of the southern tribal chieftains since the third decade of the 19th century, among them Mohammad Taqi Khan Chahar Lang of the Bakhtiyari tribe and the sheikh of Ka'ab tribes.

In the year 1838, the Persian Government regained the city of Herat. British considered the Persian Government policy in restoring of Herat as a threat to the British interests in India. British Navy occupied southern Persia. The Persian Government confronted with the uprising of the chief of Bakhtiyari and the Sheikh of Ka'ab tribes in Khuzestan. Persian Government accused British that they provoke the tribal chieftains against the Central Government. Persia had to withdraw from Herat and then took military campaign against the chiefs of Bakhtiyari and Ka'ab (67). After the Anglo-Persian War 1856, this relation developed with Hossein Qoli Khan the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari and the sheikh of Mohaysen.

In the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century Russian and British increased their economic and commercial activities. They developed a close relation with the tribal chieftains. For many years, British Government was interested in opening a commercial road from the mouth of the river Karun in the Persian Gulf, where the chief of Mohaysen tribe resided to the north of Khuzestan and from there through the Bakhtiyari land to Isfahan. After the opening of Suez Canal 1870 and the river Karun in 1880s British increased the commercial activities through the south-west to the centre of Persia.

The Persian Government granted a concession to the Bakhtiyari Khans. A British company holds the responsibility the construction and the repairs of the road for Bakhtiyari khans who managed the road guard for the security of passenger and goods and the collection of road tolls. On the eve of the 20th century, in 1899 the Bakhtiyari road was opened (68).

Very soon an oil concession was granted to a British subject in 1901. The oil was discovered by the British oil company in the winter quarters of the Bakhtiyari nomad tribe in 1908 and then the installation of a refinery was set up in Abadan island near Mohammareh in Khuzestan, where the chief of Mohaysen tribe, Sheikh Khaz'al, resided, This subject increased the importance of the south-west Persia in the British policy. The south-west area was the most extended and populated tribal area in Persia and many tribes, nomad, semi-nomad lived in highland and lowland. British Government developed rapidly her relations with the tribal chiefs in that area (69).

The A.P.O.C. through British consulates in the south concluded two Agreements with the Bakhtiyari Khans in 1905 and 1909. Then a Bakhtiyari Guard was appointed

by the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari to protect the oil fields, oil pipes and installation in Bakhtiyari land (70).

An Agreement also concluded with the chief of Mohaysen in 1909 without the knowledge of the Persian Government. Sheikh Khaz'al formed a Guard to protect the oil pipes and refinery in southern Khuzestan. In following years, especially after the Great War, the Oil Company, in searching of oil, expanded its activities in other tribal area in the south-west and concluded new agreements with the certain tribal chiefs (71).

Parallel to the British tribal policy in southern Persia, British reached to an agreement in 1907 with Russia on Persia to exclude the German activities and the other new comers in Persia. Very soon both powers implemented the gunboat diplomacy in Persia by stationing military detachments in this country. Russian detachments arrived in the so called Russian Zone and British detachments in so called British and neutral Zones. They expanded the size of their consulate guards and started to increase their interference in the Persian internal affairs.

British tribal policy and gunboat diplomacy weakened the position of Central Government and increased the rivalry and enmity between the local chieftains. On the eve of the First World War, Great Britain had close and stable relations with certain tribal chieftains in the south. The financial assistant of the A.P.O.C. and the British Government of India facilitated the establishment of British position in southern Persia, but British underestimated the anti-British atmosphere in Persia as well as among the tribal chieftains who lost their position (72).

1.7.1. Southern Tribal Chieftains and the War

During the War 1914-1918, the tribal chieftains in the south-west of Persia were divided between the two sides. Sheikh Khaz'al, the chief of Mohaysen tribe and the ruler of southern Khuzestan, the Ilkhani, Ilbegi and most of the Senior Khans of Bakhtiyari, the chief of Khamseh confederacy and some of the less important Khans of Qashqa'i as well as some lesser tribal chieftains supported and collaborated with the British forces in southern Persia. They were equipped with the British arms and financed by the British authorities (73). Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i,

most of Komareh, Lor and Dashtestan in Fars, Some of the Arab tribes of Khuzestan, certain younger Bakhtiyari Khans fought against British occupation of Persia (74).

After the war, in the years 1920-1921, when the British Government foresaw that the city of Tehran might be occupied by the Bolsheviks, they came into discussion with the southern great tribal chieftains to form a united front in the centre and southern Persia. The military power of tribes was still so strong that the British intended to mobilise them against the Soviet Republic of Gilan and the Russian Bolshevik (75).

1.7.2. British in Khuzestan during the War

Sheikh Khaz'al had co-operated loyally with the British Government and then the A.P.O.C. in 1897-1914, when the crisis and upheaval embraced throughout the country. He was strongly supported by the British Government and his tribesmen were well equipped with the British arms and ammunitions. Sheikh Khaz'al received five time assurance letters on the safety of his position and his future from the British Government in 1902, 1903, 1908, 1909 and 1910 (76). Sheikh Khaz'al expanded his power in southern and centre of Khuzestan. He had broken the power of various Arab tribes and many of their chieftains were either imprisoned or exiled. They lost power and prestige. He increased taxation and banished the tribal unrest's and the uprisings were suppressed (77).

With the outbreak of the War in 1914, despite the fact that the Persian Government declared neutrality, British Government persuaded Sheikh Khaz'al as a Persian subject to collaborate with the British forces in Persia and Mesopotamia and expanded the assurance letter to his heir (78). Khaz'al responded positively to the British demand. British Government prepared an expeditionary force in October 1914 and sent to the Persian Gulf. Some days after declaration of War by Ottomans, the British-Indian forces landed in Fao in Mesopotamia in 7 November 1914 and defeated the force of the Turks. Within a short time, however, British confronted with the uprising of Arab tribes in Khuzestan and the march of Ottoman troops into the province. Some of the Arab tribes, opponent to the Khaz'al rule joint the Jihad and revolted against him and the British.

They cut the oil pipes in several places and interrupted the current of oil in February 1915. Sheikh Khaz'al was unable either to suppress the rebel Arab tribes or to resist to the Turkish troops. He could not defend of southern Khuzestan and the British interests against the unified opponents and a regular army whereas he was equipped well. In the first half of the year 1915, British Government had to increase the number of British troops in Khuzestan to 22.000 men to maintain the Khaz'al's rule and safeguard the oil fields and oil installations. The Ottoman force and the opponent rebel Arab tribes in Khuzestan were defeated in May 1915. The Turkish force withdrew to Mesopotamia and the Arab tribes finally recognised the rule of Khaz'al some months later (79).

“The rebellion, however, was a serious blow to Khaz'al's prestige as well as the credibility of his rule: as his main attraction to the British was his ability to control the tribes and maintain public security. The rebellion had exposed the inner weakness of Khaz'al's rule and had siphoned more than 12.000 British troops from Mesopotamia. When the rebellion was finally crushed, the British could cope with next crisis. This uncertainty led to station a British garrison in the province” (80).

British troops stationed in Mohammareh, Ahvaz and Shush. They remained in Khuzestan until 1921, three years the war afterwards. With the occupation of Khuzestan by the British forces, Sheikh Khaz'al re-established his position in southern Khuzestan and British consulates in northern Khuzestan were involved in local affairs. Since 1915 a Vice-Consul was conferred on the Assistant Surgeon resided in Mohammareh and Vice-Consul in Ahvaz his main function related to the Bakhtiyari Khans.

Sheikh Khaz'al did his best to facilitate the situation for British in Khuzestan and Basreh Valayat in Mesopotamia where he had properties, gardens and influence. With his consent his palace in Basreh used by the British army as hospital, when the city was captured. In the years 1916-1920 the state of affairs in southern Khuzestan, from British point of view was satisfactory. The difficulties between Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans settled and a friendly relation maintained between the two sides. British trade was increased, the refinery at Abadan doubled in size and the output trebled.

The powerful pumping stations were erected at various points along the pipeline and were completed with comfortable quarters for the resident engineers and their staff. British founded a number of building and institutes in Ahvaz. The British authorities in London and Tehran as well as in the Persian Gulf appreciated Khaz'al for his efforts. He

was invested with the Grand Commander of the Indian Empire in 1917 (81). British were confident that in the turbulence years of Post-War, Sheikh Khaz'al would participate in any British supported alliance.

1.7.2.1. Administration of North Khuzestan

At the beginning of the Great War, the Bakhtiyari maintained Deputy of governors in Shushtar and Dezful, who were supported by a force of Bakhtiyari horsemen and for maintaining the order. The town people and peasants were depended to the good will of the Khans. With the arrival of British forces in 1916 the Bakhtiyari cavalries left the two towns. When the Mesopotamian expeditionary force landed at Basreh and British troops occupied Mohammareh and Ahvaz, the civil commissioner at Basreh deputed officially a political officer to Dezful in 1916 and afterward to Shushtar and a detachment of Indian cavalry located at Shush 32 km south of Dezful and between the two towns (82).

The two political officers in Shushtar and Dezful had also a small force in the town. British opened a Justice Department. The complaints should go first to the British Vice-Consulate, and then he would send the pleading for justice to the department of justice. In real terms the affairs of the province were run by the British trustees. They appointed the personalities who supported British policy or were the adherents to Khaz'al. Though, the Persian administration remained without change and a Governor-General was appointed by the Central Government, he had no real power in the northern Khuzestan (83).

British political officers in Shushtar and Dezful "became de facto Governors of the province" (84). Since April 1915 when Consul Trevor gave over Charge of the Mohammareh consulate, British officers in Khuzestan "supervised from Mesopotamia" and during the years 1917-1920 Wilson "while in Baghdad made a practice of dealing with all Khuzestan affairs as well as those of Bakhtiyari, through or in consultation with Captain Peel, British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz with results that have been most satisfactory" from British Political Resident point of view (85).

1.7.3. Bakhtiyaris and Khaz'al during the War

On the eve of the Great War it was almost two decades of Anglo-Bakhtiyari close relation. However, varieties of factors distinguished the Bakhtiyari relation with British from the Anglo-Khaz'al relation. After the conquest of Tehran in 1909 by the constitutionalists as well as Bakhtiyaris, the two Bakhtiyari ruling families participated and even chaired several Persian Cabinets. They were appointed as Governor-General in southern and central Persia. With such political and historical background as well as geographical position of Bakhtiyari in centre of Persia, the interests and the tendency of the majority of Bakhtiyari Khans were towards independence of Persia.

Even when the Bakhtiyari Khans concluded agreements with the British authorities to safeguard British interests, usually the senior Bakhtiyari Khans agreed conditionally. The second important difference was the internal structure of the ruling family. The power and financial privileges were divided between two great families of several senior khans and five or six multiplication times of younger Khans. The limitation of available posts and financial opportunities as well as the abuse of conditions caused dissatisfactions and quarrels among the Bakhtiyari Khans. Additionally, the third ruling family, who was excluded from the privileges, look forward to a new and just condition. For the reasons the Bakhtiyari Khans participated in various political and military activities in those years.

Khaz'al endeavoured since 1902 to reduce step by step his dependency to the Persian Government and stable his position by the British assurance letters. The rivalry inside the family was not very strong as to jeopardise his position. His territory was far from the capital, on the head of the Persian Gulf and the mouth of the river Karun. For the reasons Khaz'al wished to secure his future. British authorities in Persia wished to be sure that the Bakhtiyari Khans keep the safety of oil fields and pipelines and prevent of quarrel between the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al during the War. The majority of the senior Bakhtiyari Khans responded positively to the British authorities Persia, but a number younger Khans accompanied the National Committee and the Central Powers in Persia (86).

1.7.3.1. Anglo-Bakhtiyari relation d

1.7.3.2. uring the War

As the support of British Government established the position of Sheikh Khaz'al in the province against his opponents, British followed the same approach in Bakhtiyari by new form of the choice of Ilkhani since 1912. The Ilkhani had a free hand and a dictatorial power. This policy was not in accord with the tribal tradition and then caused the discontent of the Bakhtiyari Khans as it caused the revolt of Arab tribes in Khuzestan.

The proclamation of Jihad and the German's propaganda inflamed the national sensation in Persia in 1915. The neutrality of the majority of Bakhtiyari did not rub off the anxiety of British of possible attack of some of the Bakhtiyaris on the oil fields, Isfahan and Shushtar and their possible co-operation with Germans.

After the Mission of Wilhelm Wassmuth arrived in Shushtar north east of Khuzestan and near to the oil fields in February 1915 were surrounded and attacked by the British force. Wilhelm Wassmuth escaped, but British authorities became suspicious of the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari, Nassir Khan Sardar Jang. The residency of mission was belonged to the Bakhtiyari khans (87).

With the conclusion of the secret Anglo-Russian Agreement in March 1915, the Bakhtiyari land was in the so called British zone and British authorities were not sure on security of the oil fields due to unclear position of the Persian Government and the Bakhtiyari Khans towards the Entente Powers at this juncture. The British Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Sir Percy Cox, negotiated with the Ilkhani, Sardar Jang, and Ilbegi, Sardar Bahador, in 23 & 24 May 1915. They, both, gave him a written that they undertake to protect the employees and the property of the A.P.O.C. and to maintain order in the Bakhtiyari at least for 20 days should Persia join the Central Powers.

Cox was still anxious of the pro-German views of junior Khans and the possible effect of German agents on senior khans. After several months' correspondences among British departments in Bushehr, Tehran, Delhi and London, on 13 December 1915 a new agreement was signed by the Ilkhani and the Ilbegi with the consent of some junior khans. On 15 February 1916, this secret agreement was signed by the senior Khans living in Tehran and the British Minister, Sir Charles Marling.

This agreement signed by the majority of the influential Bakhtiyari. They accepted as usual the maintain security in the oil fields and Bakhtiyari, to maintain friendly relation with Sheikh Khaz'al, not to encroach on adjacent districts in the south. The other articles related the circumstances and long term British policy in Bakhtiyari: discourage agitation in Bakhtiyari, neither to take arms against Great Britain and Allies nor to furnish supplies or transport to those who might oppose Britain, if the hostilities were to spread in Persia, to prevent the Bakhtiyaries from taking part, protect the British lives and property and maintain order the Bakhtiyari road, if any khans failed in this "his share in the Oil Company will be forfeited to the British".

It was expected if Persia was to join the Entente Powers; the Bakhtiyaris place all of their forces at the disposal of the allies of Persia. In the article 8, British undertook to help the Bakhtiyari Khans in their difficulties, whether with the Persian Government or between themselves and the assistance in "consideration of Bakhtiyari candidates for the Governorships in provinces where British interest are paramount" (88). The conclusion of an Agreement with the Ilkhani on rewards for his service in 1916 made British authorities more confident on majority of Bakhtiyari's attitude.

1.7.3.2. Bakhtiyari Ilkhani in 1916-1917

Simultaneously, British authorities were in favour of Ilkhaniship of Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham. Apparently, the Ilkhani, Nassir Khan, (1912-1915) did not fulfil all their wishes. Though, in the agreement of 1912 the elected Ilkhani would remained in his post for five years, but with the request of the British, the Bakhtiyari Khans of the ruling families appointed the new Ilkhani who enjoyed the support of British. Sardar Mohtasham took the responsibility with new Ilbegi, Yusef Khan Amir Mojahed (89). In the weakness of the Persian Government, this Agreement was dependent the Bakhtiyari Khans to the British for their position and their income (90).

In fact, when in October-November 1915, German Minister in Tehran, Prince de Reuse, were negotiating on Perso-German co-operation and the Entente Powers were informed of the negotiation's contents, a part of increasing Russian force in Qazvin (120 km) moved towards the capital and reached in Karaj (40 km from Tehran) on 10

November 1915. The majority of the third parliament, Journalists and so on left Tehran for the city of Qom in 12 November. Four days later German and Ottoman Ministers arrived in Qom as well. Gendarmerie force, which supported the Migrants, defeated the Russian force in Hamadan in 20 November. The leaders of the Migrants formed the National Defence Committee. In addition to the force of Gendarmerie, number of volunteers from Isfahan and Bakhtiyari joined the National Committee (91).

In less than a month the Russian detachments captured the town Saveh near Qom. The force of National Committee could not resist to the trained and well-equipped Russian. The National Committee left the city for Kashan and then Isfahan in 17 December 1915. Subsequently the two mentioned cities were occupied by the Russians. In Isfahan the National Committee received well and placed by the certain personalities including certain Bakhtiyari Khans. A part of National Committee, volunteers, the force of Gendarmerie left Isfahan for Kermanshah front where the provisional Government, Ottoman forces and German officers and diplomats were in struggle and war with Russians. The other part of the National Committee went to summer quarters of Bakhtiyari to negotiate with the Morteza Qoli Khan the son of Ex-Prime Minister, Samsam al-Saltaneh (92).

He agreed to participate in the War inside the Central Powers, if they recognise the independence and integrity of Persia, provided him with necessary arms and financial requirement. Then, he and the Bakhtiyari cavalries would join them in Kermanshah front. The Migrants left Bakhtiyari land for Kermanshah and certain Bakhtiyaris joined them in the War against Russian. Meanwhile another group of volunteers of the province Isfahan arrived in the city in February 1916. In less than a month in the last day of winter 1916 the Russian force with the support and guidance of pro-British families, captured the city. The volunteer's force withdrew from Isfahan and then went to Sepid Dasht of Chahar Mahal. They were the guest of Abol al-Qassem Khan Bakhtiyari for almost two months. Then the refugees were the guest of his father, Zargham al-Saltaneh.

Some days later they were warmly received by the senior Khan Sardar Zafar despite the fact that he was under British pressure and obligation. The politician, intellectual and the other Persians refugees accepted and received again by Zargham al-Saltaneh. Meanwhile Zeiler the German Charge d'Affaires, some other Germans and his Persian secretary and 150 cavaliers arrived there. Sometime later, after the occupation

of Isfahan, Kardof the Vice-Consul in Isfahan joins the others. They were received warmly. Three weeks later, however, Zargham al-Saltaneh was informed by Morteza Qoli Khan that British agreed to Ilkhaniship of Sardar Mohtasham, among the other condition, was to arrest The Persian volunteers and the German Charge d'Affaires.

As news of the campaign of new Ilkhani reached there, they discussed and reached into conclusion not to concentrate in one place. The host came into contact with the heads of several villages in the area to receive a number of his respected guests as long as necessary. They took the responsibility accordingly. Almost the same time Russian started to punish those who rose against the Entente Powers and plundered the houses of the leading Bakhtiyaris such as Bibi (Lady) Maryam and the others in Isfahan (93).

After the Anglo-Russian Secret Agreement 1915, Isfahan added to the so-called Russian zone. British also opened a consulate in Dehkord centre of Chahar Mahal. On January 1916, Abol Qassem Khan and fifty of his cavaliers with two hundred and fifty Bakhtiyari volunteers and some junior khans left the Bakhtiyari Land for Kermanshah front. The city of Kermanshah captured by Russian in April 1916. The force of Ottomans and the Provisional Government had to withdraw to Mesopotamia. Abol Qassem Khan and his cavaliers returned through Lorestan. Several times, they confronted and fought in Lorestan and Khuzestan with the tribes who co-operated with the British in the war. They had to fight also with the British-Indian force in Khuzestan. Finally Abol Qassem Khan reached in Bakhtiyari with few accompanies. The victory of Ottomans in Kut al-Emareh in May 1916 caused that the Ottoman and Persian forces could return to Kermansh in August, he and fifty cavaliers join them accordingly without delay.

Captain Noel the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz and responsible for Bakhtiyari affairs sent British-Indian troops from Dehkord to summer quarters of Bakhtiyari. The Ilkhani (Sardar Mohtasham) and Ilbegi (Amir Mojahed) and some other Bakhtiyari Khans under British pressure intended to arrest Zargham al-Saltaneh the father of Abol Qassem Khan and bring to end the pro- Central Powers activities in Bakhtiyari. With regard to possible resistance by certain Khans, they agreed that he resided in a small village (94).

During the second phase of the war in Persia (almost 1916) the Russian and British dispatched more troops to Persia, British also prepared to organise the S.P.R.

and occupied almost the whole of the country. The exception was the western provinces in which fighting continued between the two sides. The personalities who were not in favour of occupation of Persia by the Anglo-Russian forces or co-operated with Central Powers representatives, then suffered from the British forces, South Persia Rifles and particularly the Russian brutalities.

The official reports and the memoirs indicate that both powers did not hesitate in some cases to use the harsh methods against non-committed persons to frighten the others. In Bakhtiyari, British intended to secure the current of oil, to cut the relation between the centre and the western part of the country through Bakhtiyari land and supervise the Governorship of Bakhtiyari. In September 1916, a force of Persian resistance movement with participation of a considerable number of Bakhtiyaris was defeated by a Russian force stationed near Isfahan. In that juncture, from British point of view, Bakhtiyari Khans and Bakhtiyari tribes people were oppose to the domination of Russian in the region. Captain Noel, the British Vice Consul in Ahvaz, a political officer of the Government of India, was of opinion that the reason of Bakhtiyari insurgent was the fear of appointment of Zel al-Soltan as Governor-General in Isfahan by the Russian.

With the instruction of British Minister in Tehran, Sir Charles Marling, Captain Noel, succeeded to mobilise a force of several hundred Bakhtiyaris with the help of Bakhtiyari Khans. The Bakhtiyari force dispersed the insurgents so that they could not gather any more (95). The station of South Persia Rifles detachments in Isfahan in 1916 was suggested by the Indian Government in order to prevent of predominance of Germans, Turks and could not hazard the security of oil fields. Finally on December 1916 Captain Noel suggested the formation a guerrilla force of Bakhtiyaris under British command. This plan was reaffirmed by the British authorities and approved by the British Government at the end of January 1917 but, it was laid aside in May 1917 (96).

1.7.3.3. New Bakhtiyari Ilkhani in 1917-1918

With the assistance of Soltan Mohammad Khan Sardar 'Ashja', Yusef Khan Amir Mojahed and Mohammad Reza Sardar Fateh, Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar hacked himself Ilkhani in 1917. From June 1917 until July 1919, Sardar Zafar was Ilkhani and

Sardar 'Ashja' Ilbegi. Despite the fact that the appointment of Sardar Zafar had approved by the British Minister (97) and he was strongly and consistently supported by the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, who was responsible for the Bakhtiyari affairs (98). His appointment, however, was never recognised by his brothers and cousins and a number of Khans.

Like his predecessors since 1912, Sardar Zafar was to be virtual dictator with a free hand on finance and revenue affairs of the Bakhtiyari land without sharing any surplus profits amongst the members of the two ruling families. The former Ilkhani remained in power less than eighteen months. The reasons for the appointment of new Ilkhani in Bakhtiyari are not clear. Apparently after the revolution in Russia, British Government preferred a strong Ilkhani in Bakhtiyari to prevent of any collisions. The former Ilkhani remained in power less than eighteen months.

The year of 1918, the time that the Persian nationalists challenged the power of British and fought against British military presence in Persia, it was not easy task to act in accord to the British policy. On his arrival in Ahvaz in winter 1918, Sardar Zafar asked British Consulate for rifles, ammunitions and a loan of 10.000 T. as well as more British support, if British authorities would desire him to remain Ilkhani. He asked the loan of two mountain guns when the expedition against the Kohgiluyeh tribes came in British plan. After a long discussion on expedition against Kohgiluyeh tribes, on the request of Colonel Arnold Wilson, in summer 1918 General Headquarters found themselves in a position to place a section of a mountain battery under the command of a British officer, at the disposal of Sardar Zafar and Sardar Ashja" (99).

British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, accompanied the force to Kohgiluyeh. It was aimed to punish the Tayyebi tribe, who plundered many caravans in Bakhtiyari road. Their strong holds were occupied, hostages were taken and arrears of revenue collected. From Wilson point of view the expedition was completely successful and no organised robberies by Kohgiluyeh tribes occurred between the autumn of 1918 and the autumn 1920 (100). Some years later, the British vice-consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, expressed a different view on this expedition from Wilson some years later. He wrote that the success of the expedition was only partially due to the efforts of the Ilkhani and Ilbegi.

Peel believed that they sat at Behbahan due to fearing failure and left the entire responsibility to four younger khans and to the British Vice-Consul. During the last

weeks of expedition, Amir Mojahed realised that the war in France was in favour of Allies, he wrote to Sardar Zafar, the Ilkhani that they should unite in rendering some signal service to the British (101). The arrival of this letter coincided with the news of British seize of Shiraz and Abadeh against the Qashqa'i's insurrection. Peel requested the help of Sardar Zafar to wire to Amir Mojahed to proceed at once to Abadeh with 500 cavalry and affection it relief and he did accordingly.

Meanwhile Sardar Zafar offered to place a force of 500 soars (cavalry) at the British disposal in early autumn 1918. A month later, British Government agreed to finance the force to be stationed in Chahar Mahal and to suppress the activities of the brigands at Isfahan districts and the unobedient elements in Bakhtiyari land and maintaining the authority of the Ilkhani and Ilbegi. The subsidy was continued until March 1919, although the brigands were destroyed finally in August 1919. British vice-consul in Ahvaz, Captain E. Peel, was of opinion that the Bakhtiyari cavalries proved very expensive to the British Government, but profitable to Sardar Zafar and Ashja. After the armistice signed in November 1918, he realised that Sardar Zafar was more expensive as Ilkhani „than British Government could afford (102).

As the subsidies were cut, British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz and Consul-General in Isfahan, Colonel Haig proceeded to Tehran to secure the Governorship of province Isfahan for him with Vothuq al-Dowleh. Sardar Jang, however, became the Governor-General of Isfahan and subsequently Sardar Zafar was given Yazd province while continuing to hold the Ilkhaniship of Bakhtiyari. British authorities asked Sardar Zafar to co-operate with Sardar Jang to suppress the Brigands and promised a high British order if he did so. Sardar Zafar, who received the Governorship of Yazd, sent his son as his deputy to Yazd. His son was accompanied by an assistant and the Bakhtiyari Cavalries. The two young men and the Bakhtiyari force caused a great discontent among the public as well as the land owners by imposing high taxes and took bribe (103).

1.7.4. Tribal Chieftains of Fars and the War

With the outbreak of the War in Europe in 1914, the public opinion in Persia was generally in favour of Central Power, The Persians were of opinion that the victory of the Entente Power, Russia and Britain would become even more aggressive in Persia

than before the War. With regard to the Anglo-Russian agreement 1907, the station of Russian and British detachments in Persia and their interference in the Persian affairs, they would jeopardise the independent of the country (104).

There was a prepared historical background for resistance movements in various parts of Persia especially where the Russian and British troops occupied. The German nationalist propaganda, promises and co-operation, the support of Jihad by the Shi'ah religious leaders of Persia caused seven years, 1915-1921, continuous resistance and confrontation in southern Fars, Gilan as well as the other parts of Persia until the last British detachments left the Persian soil in 1922.

In southern Fars in coastal areas close to the port of Bushehr, where the British Political Resident and British Navy were active, the reaction to the British policy was stronger; they had the direct experience of the British presence similar to the experience of the People of Azarbaijan, Gilan and Qazvin of Russians. The people's insurrection in the south against British began in March 1915 when the British force occupied the German Consulate in Bushehr and arrested the members of Consulate.

The native of Bushehr hinterland protested to the British action, which he ignored the neutrality of Persia in the war; they made Bushehr insecure for the British. The occupation of Bushehr port by the British naval force and the arrival of the former German consul Wilhelm Wassmuth in the south escalated the resistance movement throughout the province of Fars (105). Most of the southern tribes, Landowners, Farmers, Merchants, U'lama' and the other city dwellers participated actively in the battles. The tribal chieftains, who were traditionally friendly with the British, remained in Allied camp and the others in the resistance movement.

Due to the pressure of British Legation in Tehran, the Governor-General of Fars, Ali Qoli Khan Mokhber al-Saltaneh, who was educated in Germany, was recalled to Tehran in the middle of September 1915. With his return the situation in Shiraz went from bad to worse. Most of the British political and commercial institutes in Fars were occupied in November 1915 and made the position for British in Shiraz and Fars insecure (106). The British consul in Shiraz, Sir Frederick O'Connor, and his daughter, Margaret Ferguson mention in their memoirs of those days and afterwards.

The deputy of governor-general of Fars and the chief of Khamseh Confederacy, Habib-allah Khan Qavam al-Molk, who was in close and friendly relation with the British authorities, fled from Shiraz to the southern coast, where he then met Sir Percy

Cox and the other British authorities in 24 February 1916 and received the financial and military support (107). The Ilkhani of Qashqa'i tribe, Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh, however, remained neutral in the first stage of people's rising in Bushehr, Kazerun and Shiraz. He supported the leaders of the movement mainly orally and morally. Though, Sowlat al-Dowleh as the most powerful chieftains in Fars did not fulfil the wishes of rebels, as they expected, but even his moral support was very useful to them.

Habib-Allah Khan Qavam al-Molk, the chief of the Khamseh tribes with his force left the south for Shiraz. He, however, died in an incident, before arriving in Shiraz. His son and successor, Ibrahim Khan, who received the same title from the Central Government, recaptured the city of Shiraz in 24 April 1916. At the same time, Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, also occupied the west part of Shiraz.

1.7.4.1. Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and the South Persia Rifles

In the second stage of war, after several months of delay, finally, the pro-British Governor General, Prince H.A. Farmanfarma, accompanied by the S.P.R. arrived in Shiraz in 15 October 1916. Sowlat al-Dowleh again respected the neutrality of Persia in the war and agreed to restrain the Qashqa'i tribesmen from robbery. Some years later Sykes wrote: Sowlat al-Dowleh carried out his agreement with British and Farmanfarma. He did not open hostility to the British force in 1917, when British were weak and were busy organising the S.P.R. lines of communication building posts and opening up routes for wheeled traffic (108).

Though, the Qavamis were appointed as the deputy Governor-General of Fars, the mayor of Shiraz, the Governor of eastern districts of Fars and the Chief of Khamseh Confederation, but they were still in weaker position as the heads of Qashqa'i. Qavamis were outsider to the chiefs and tribesmen of Khamseh confederation. The ruling families of Qashqa'i identified themselves with the tribe for centuries. The lesser Turkish, Lor and the other tribes in Fars had more sympathy to Shahilu leadership than to Qavamis. There were, however, insurgent chiefs in the tribe, who looked forward to receive the support of Qavamis. The facts indicate that the Qavamis were able to challenge the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i, only with the British support. The Qavamis and British had opened a friendly relation.

From the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i point of view, the presence of British force in the province and their interference in the internal and tribal affairs of Fars were as troublesome. General Sir Percy Sykes reached into conclusion that with the present of Sowlat al-Dowleh the situation in Fars was shaky. He wrote: we (British) realised that the agreement was not a final settlement with Sowlat al-Dowleh and he was thoroughly untrustworthy. In reality, Sowlat al-Dowleh was the chief of the strongest tribes in Fars. Due to the lengthy annual migration and passing through hundreds of villages, „several of districts in Fars were entirely in the hand of Qashqa'i who thereby controlled a population of 100.000 villagers. Additionally, the minor non-Qashqa'i tribes of Fars even some of the tribes of Khamseh confederation looked to the Qashqa'i Ilkhani.

In Sykes' opinion, Sowlat al-Dowleh would oppose to our (British) presence in Fars; for Sowlat knew that his position as „uncrowned king would be destroyed if we succeeded in restoring the authority of the Persian [British] Government (109). Sykes got in touch with the brothers and the rivals of Sowlat al-Dowleh as well as the heads of Kashkuli tribe, a branch of Qashqa'i who had a tense relation with the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i.

Gradually the S.P.R. established in Fars and the number of personnel was increased in 1916-1917. British position was stronger than at any previous time and the British Intelligence department was well organised. In addition to the S.P.R. and the British-Indian forces, British authorities were enable to purchase the support of certain Persian officials such as the Governor-General of Fars, Farmanfarma, and some of the chiefs of the tribes, Ibrahim Qavam al-Molk like his father, two brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh, some of the Kashkulis and Hayat Dawudis who were armed with British arsenal and ammunitions (110).

1.7.4.2. Non-Recognition of the S. P. R.

Russian and British imposed the pro-Allied politician as the chief of Cabinets, a task in which they carried out during the years 1916-1917 until the resignation of Vothuq al-Dowleh the pro-Allied Prime Minister in 27 May 1917. Russian Revolutions under Krensky and then Lenin weakened the position of British in Persia as well. The successors of Vothuq al-Dowleh formed moderate cabinets who intended to keep the neutrality of Persia. For almost a year, June 1917-June 1918, the efforts of the British

representatives in Tehran were unsuccessful to remove the neutral Prime Ministers and bring a pro-British cabinet in power.

With the Bolshevik revolution in November 1917, Russian forces received order to return from Persia. The Bolshevik Government annulled the Tsarist concessions at the beginning 1918. The Persians expected that the British would follow the same policy and British forces would evacuate shortly the neutral Persia. In continuation of this policy, the Cabinet of Ala al-Saltaneh refused the formal recognition of South Persia Rifles in October 1917. He asked the British authorities to pass over the S.P.R. to the Persian Government. This cabinet prepared to invite officers for the force from the neutral European countries (111).

On February 1918 the Cabinet of Mostowfi al-Mamalek repeated the above mentioned demand to the British Legation. The denouncement of South Persia Rifles officially and publicly as a foreign force in March 1918, had far reaching effects on the situation of Fars which was already acute and potentially explosive. British not only did not fulfil the Persian's wishes, but also sent more troops into Persia and formed new mercenary forces under British command at the beginning of 1918 (112).

The British Government intended to consolidate her position in Persia. The commander of the S.P.R., General Sir Percy Sykes, who left Persia for a journey to India, brought more troops and military equipment to Fars from India to recruit the British forces in southern Persia. He expanded again the size of the S.P.R. without the knowledge of Governor-General of Fars. The S.P.R. began a harsher behaviour towards the public and the commander of the force was rough and less inflexible. The people of Fars were furious of South Persia Rifles. Even the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Charles Marling, criticised the harsh policy of the Sykes.

The German victory in the French fronts in spring 1918, affected on the political development in Persia. The Persian Governments did not agree with British policy in Persia, but they had no force to execute their decisions. The chief of the cabinets' one after another hinted that the Ilkhani of the tribe that he should rise against the occupation and increasingly interference of British in the Persian affairs. The relation between the S.P.R. and the people of Fars gradually deteriorated. Some of the Persian officers and non-commissioners of the S.P.R. resigned and left the force. Farmanfarma, the governor-general of Fars, who was in a good term and co-operative with the British,

endeavoured to dissuade the British commanders of the harsh treatments, but his efforts did not produce any results.

Two years of presence and interference in local affairs of the S.P.R. caused the discontent of various social groups and even from the beginning the religious class, the democrats and a large percentage of the town people were hostile as also most of the nomads (113). The denunciation of the S.P.R. as a foreign force by the Persian Government mobilised the people of Fars as a whole against the British occupation and the presence of the S.P.R. in Fars. In fact, the renunciation of Central Government was the Persian response to the new British strategy on arrival of the new British forces and occupation of Persia as a whole.

The commanders of the S.P.R. and the British consul in Shiraz who could not pretend that the force is Persian and justify its presence did take a tough measure against the people who gathered around Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Persian ranks who did not want to fight with their compatriots, deserted the S.P.R. General Sykes ordered the execution of some of the deserted Persian ranks even without trial and requested new forces from Indian Government.

1.7.4.3. The Anglo-Qashqa'i War in 1918

On May 1918, in a small local incident near Shiraz (Khan-e-Zenyan), the South Persia Rifles force instead of finding a solution through the headman of Dare-Shuri (a tribe of Qashqa'i) in the region, they killed, wounded and jailed a number of Dare-Shuri of Qashqa'i. Most of the Fars province had turned hostile as a result of anti-British propaganda. Even Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk did not communicate for the time being with the British by attitude of some Khamseh tribes and by religious and other influential personalities.

Farmanfarma, however, succeeded to win his support, Colonel Gough was subsidising Sardar Ehtesham, the brother of Sowlat al-Dowleh and a candidate for Sowlat al-Dowleh position, as the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. He was negotiating with Mohammad Ali Khan, the chief of Kashkuli, a tribe of Qashqa'i for his support. The chief of General Staff in India sent at once more troops to Bandar Abbas and it was started preparations for an advance on the town Kazerun from the port Bushehr in the early autumn 1918.

Sowlat al-Dowleh on his letters and telegrams to Farmanfarma, Qavam al-Molk and the Central Government, promised that he would keep his tribes in order and would safeguard the road in his territory, provided he received an assurance that neither British troops nor the S. P. R. would in future interfere with his tribes, whose robberies he contended, did not concern the British (114). From the view point of the British Consul in Shiraz, Captain Gough, it was, however, a favourable moment for putting a check on the ambitions of Sowlat, and that the punishment of the tribe would prove an easy affair (115).

In addition to Qashqa'is, the contingents of Non-qashqa'i tribes of Fars as well as the groups of volunteers of the town and rural areas, (among them the prominent figure Nasser al-Divan Kazeruni and his followers) joined the movement. The force of resistance movement had the moral support of Democrats, some of the U'lama and the public, who demonstrated actively their hostility towards the presence of British force and the S.P.R.

The S.P.R. received the support of British-Indian force as well as Qavam al-Molk, Sardar Ehtesham, Ali Khan, Mohammad Khan Kashkuli and their forces. In Tehran, the British Legation did its best to persuade Ahmad Shah to appoint a pro-British Prime Minister. It happened only in the middle of summer 1918.

British authorities in Fars through the Governor-General of Fars imposed Sardar Ehtesham as the new Ilkhani of Qashqa'i at this juncture due to the cut of communication. The Persian Government had no knowledge about the change of Ilkhani. The fighting continued in full scale during the summer and autumn 1918 around Shiraz, Abadeh and Firuzabad. The belligerents of the Great War announced cease fire, but the fighting did not come to standstill in the province of Fars in neutral Persia (116).

1.8. Summary

- (1) The physical geography and the geographical position of Persia affected directly on the existence and continuation of pastoral nomadism in Persia.
- (2) The scarcity of water, scarcity of fertile land, or both, difficulties of irrigation and limitation of cultivation, on the one hand, variation of climate and existence of vast seasonal grasslands on the other hand caused to develop the stock breeding and pastoralism.
- (3) The successive immigration and invasion of Iranian tribes, then Arab and finally Turk-Mongols via Central Asia, Caucasus and Arabia increased and expanded the nomadic way of life in the Iranian Plateau.
- (4) The Pastoral nomad tribes lived in tribal form, migrated annually for summer and winter quarters in search of water and seasonal pastures. They resided mainly in the mountains and foothills near the pastures.
- (5) A tribe consists of several sub-tribes with a government system. Those features distinguished them from nomads in dessert and steppes.
- (6) There were many great tribes in the Persian history. The great tribe consists of several lesser tribes and often ethnically different. The authority in the great tribe was concentrated in the hand of an Ilkhani and an Ilbegi, his assistant. The Ilkhani had influence in all sub-tribes. The Ilkhani of the great tribe was subject to the approval of the Shah.
- (7) It has been estimated that after the First World War the population of Persia was over 10 million. A quarter of population was nomads and semi-nomads, who dispersed throughout the country.
- (8) The unique physical features and climate of southern Zagros and one of the most populated nomad tribes area in Persia and the world, which distinguish it from central part of Persia and it's political-cultural interrelations in modern history, which distinguished it from northern Zagros provinces, are the bases for concentration of study upon south west of Persia.
- (9) In the second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the south-west Persia had about one-fourth of the country's population. Five great tribes with considerable population resided there and their chiefs had immense

political and military power. Beside that there were many small and lesser tribes, who had close relations with the chiefs of great tribes.

- (10) The political power of Bakhtiyari great tribe increased in the second half of the 19th century.
- (11) As a result of Agreements between British Oil Company and Senior Bakhtiyari Khans and discovery of oil in Bakhtiyari pasture lands in the first decade of 20th century, the Bakhtiyari Khans became wealthier.
- (12) Since the conquest of Tehran by the constitutionalists in 1909, the Bakhtiyari Khans participated in the Cabinets and national politics and consolidated their political position. They were appointed as Prime Minister, Minister of War the Cabinets, Governor-General in several provinces.
- (13) The commercial activities in the Persian Gulf increased the importance of Mohammareh in the second half of the 19th century.
- (14) Sheikh Khaz'al, the chief of Mohaysen tribe and the ruler of Mohammareh succeeded to bring the other Arab tribes in Khuzestan under his rule. At the same time, he developed his relation with the British authorities in southern Persia and the Persian Gulf. The Oil Company also concluded an agreement with Sheikh Khaz'al for protection of the oil installations and staffs.
- (15) As a result of his co-operation, Sheikh Khaz'al receive assurance letters from British Government. Khaz'al consolidated his position in southern of Khuzestan.
- (16) The power of great tribe of Qashqa'i expanded in Fars throughout the 19th century. For the reason, with the approval of the Shah, the Governor-General of Fars organised a new tribal confederation consisted of five tribes in 1870s.
- (17) He appointed the head of Qavami's family, an aristocrat - merchant and hereditary acting governor and mayor of Shiraz as the chief of Khamseh confederation.
- (18) Before the Great War, the chief of Khamseh tribe had a friendly relation with British Consulate and he was supported.
- (19) During the Great War, the tribes in the south-west Zagros similar to other parts of Persia supported the belligerents and participated in the War.
- (20) The chief of Mohaysen, The senior Bakhtiyari Khans and the chief of Khamseh confederation supported British in the war and received financial subsidy and military equipment.

(21) The chief of Qashqa'i remained neutral in the war, but he resisted to the British presence in 1918 when he received a gesture from the Central Government in 1918. This caused the Anglo-Qashqa'i War.

II. Qajar Persia in Modern History

2.1. Persia and Great Powers in 1796-1914

Since the beginning of the 19th century, the relations with Modern Europe and the European Powers affected on the political and the social affairs of Persia. In the twentieth century, with regard to the geographical location of Persia, the question of Persian oil, the new Post-War (1919_1925) international condition and confrontation between Great Britain and Soviet Russia in which had a strong affection on the future of Persia and Persian society (1). An overview on the Persian history in modern times gives a clearer picture of internal and international relations of Persia at this juncture and makes more precisely the questionings on the situation of nomad tribe communities in the Post-War Persia.

Since the ancient days of Greeks and Romans to the present times, Persia has had, always but with fluctuation, the political, military, commercial and cultural relations with European powers. In new age, since the 15th century and during the Safavid Empire (1501-1722) these relations in various aspects developed steadily. How do we distinguish the relation of Persia with Europe since 19th century from previous times is the strong effect of Europe on political, military as well as social and economic structure of Persia.

Following the expansion policy of new European powers in Asia, British colonised some part of India in the second half of the 18th century. They had previously defeated and sent out the French from India. British prepared to expand their territory in India and neighbour lands. They did not desire to be the witness of the arrival of Russia or any other colonial powers in the Persian Gulf and near the border of India. Russians also intended to reach to the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean in the 18th century (2).

On the eve of the 19th century, suddenly Persia confronted with two new powerful colonial power neighbours, first Russia in the north and then Great Britain in the south. The annexation of Georgia by Russian in the last decade of the 18th century broke out the hostility between Persia and Russia. In continuation two series of fighting occurred in the first half of the 19th century. Persian army was defeated and had to sign the treaties of Golestan in 1813 and Torkmanchai in 1828. Persia suffered severe territorial

losses in Caucasus to Russia and had to grant also certain commercial privileges and judicial rights to Russia.

The attempts of Persia to regain Herat in the years 1838 and 1856, confronted with the British protest and occupation of the southern Persian ports and islands in the Persian Gulf. From British viewpoint Persian Royal court was under Russian influence and the presence of Persia in Herat would jeopardise British interests in India. Persia had to withdraw his force from Herat and had to grant the same commercial privileges and judicial rights to the British (3).

Meanwhile Russia expanded his territory on the east coast of Caspian Sea and occupied all the territory there which had been periodically under Persian rule. British expanded the Indian colony toward the west as well. She reached to the eastern border of Persia by occupying most part of Baluchestan (4).

In the second half of the 19th century, the military rivalry between Russian and British in Persia took the form of economic penetration and political influence. Since the growing industrialisation of the west demanded both accesses to raw materials and new markets for manufactured products, certain distant countries were marked for economic penetration, necessitating some degree of political intervention. Within Persia this policy found one application in struggle for concession (5). The two Great Powers gained various economic concessions.

With the appearance of a new industrial power, Germany, at the international scene, on the eve of the 20th century, the old colonial powers, Russia, Great Britain and France, came into understanding to settle their differences in Asia and Africa. First French and British concluded the Entente Cordiale in 1904. Then as a result of negotiations between Russia and Britain on Asian countries, they reached finally, to the Anglo-Russian Convention 1907. In this Agreement they divided Persia into so-called British, Russian and neutral Zone, where both could apply for the concession from Persian Government.

This Agreement was rejected by the Constitutional Government of Persia. The two colonial powers, however, endeavoured in various forms and means to make their position solid. From 1909, Russian and British Governments, both, sent military detachments and Consulate Guards to the Persian soil (6).

The British enterprises, especially in oil industry, were active in so-called neutral zone. British Government, therefore, started to negotiate with Russia on the future of

neutral zone. With the outbreak of the Great War, the negotiations started again and finally they concluded the secret treaty of 1915. British prepared to agree to the occupation of the strait of Dardanelles in Turkey, a geo-strategically and political concession to Russia, in return to annex the almost neutral zone in Persia to so-called British zone (7).

2. 2. Persians and the Modern Europe

In the relation between Persia and Europe developed rapidly. The cultural and commercial relations were as important as the political and military. The number of visitors from the two sides increased. A large number of Europeans with different social backgrounds and aims visited Persia. Some of them wrote memories and travel accounts of their contact with the Persians. These writings are now one of the main sources of Persian studies in the 19th century (8).

The Persians from aristocrat, merchant and middle class families who visited European capitals or resided as diplomat as well as those who studied in European educational institutes and universities, became familiar with the modern Europe. Persian intellectuals realised the importance of modern political thoughts and the modern political systems in development of society. There are several travel accounts of the Persians in Europe from those days (9). Some of them watched carefully the European political systems and social relations. The political thinkers of Persia in the 19th century are chiefly reformers but some of them were inspired by the French revolution 1789. They wrote several reform treatises for Persia (10).

The Persian statesmen endeavoured to implement the political, military and educational reforms and set up new factories. Though, certain modern institutions were founded, but most of the reforms unfinished or remained in abeyance or reached to no final satisfactory results due to internal obstacles and Anglo-Russian interference (11). When the reforms did not reach into definite visible changes, the social process shaped differently at the end of the 19th century. The tobacco movement in 1891, an alliance between the merchants and U'lama, compelled the Nasser al-Din Shah (1848-1896) to annul the concession in which he had granted to a British subject. Few years later, he was assassinated in 1896 by a political and judicial discontent who suffered from Royal House.

Finally the constitutional revolution began in 1905-1909 when the Russians were defeated by Japan in 1904 and the revolution broke out in Russia in 1905. After one year struggle, for the first time in the history of Persia in 1906 a Constitutional Monarchy and a Parliamentary system were founded. Political parties and free press came to appearance (12).

British Government supported the Persian revolution in the first phase, but in continuation of Entente Cordiale with France in 1904, negotiated and then concluded an agreement with the weak Russia on Asian countries including Persia in 1907. The two colonial powers changed their rivalry into co-operation in Persia. They could not break the new political system in Persia, but they succeeded to limit the democratic activities. Russian troops who stationed in Persia supported the despotic forces. The Russians executed the Constitutionals in Tabriz in January 1912 and bombarded the holy city of Mashad in March 1912 (13).

2.3. Persia and the Great War

On 2 August 1914, the Great War broke out in Europe between the Entente, Russia, Great Britain and France, and the Central Powers (Germany and Austria). Almost three months later, on 29 October 1914, Turkey entered the War in side with the Central Powers. With regard to the political and geographical position of Persia among the belligerents, and certain negotiations and border incidents in the western areas of Persia in previous months, on November the first, 1914, the Persian Government declared it's neutrality in the War For the following reasons, however, this policy did not function.

On the one hand the presence of Russian and British detachments in Persia and the Persian Gulf and the permanent efforts of British to penetrate into Mesopotamia against the Ottomans as well as the strategically location of Persia and the importance of oil current of Persia to Great Britain. On the other hand, the intention of Central Powers to destabilise the situation for the Entente powers at this juncture. These factors caused that the four belligerent powers used Persia as a battlefield (14).

2.3.1. Persia and the Belligerents in 1914-1917

Russia and Great Britain were neighbours of Persia and had varieties of important and even vital interests in this country. They intended to protect their interests and even extend their political, military and economic position in Persia. The Russian and British detachments had already stationed in Persia since 1909 (15) to implement the content of the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907. Before the War, British and Russian negotiated for a new partition of Persia, with the desire of British to control the neutral zone where the oil fields situated (16).

In addition to the defence of India, political and commercial interests in the Persian Gulf, the protection of the oil fields, oil installations and refinery in Khuzestan were of vital important for the British Navy and this subject found a priority in British policy. The oil supplies by the A.P.O.C. about 270.000 tons in 1914, reached to nearly 900.000 tons a year by the end of the War (17). Since 1909, the Royal Navy began to change the fuel from coal to oil. In 1914, before the outbreak of the War, the British Government (British Navy) became the greater share holder in the A.P.O.C. This “had become a most valuable factor in the prosecution of the War” and at the same time British intended to penetrate into the Turkish territory, in Mesopotamia (18).

For the reasons the Government of India had previous months to the War stationed an expeditionary force in Bahrain in the late summer 1914, British Government concluded a secret agreement with Sheikh Khaz'al, a Persian subject and the chief of the Mohaysen tribe and the ruler of southern Khuzestan. He owned various properties in southern Mesopotamia as well (19). The Anglo-Russian policy in the region and Persia gave an opportunity to Germans and Turks to implement their War projects. The mentioned factors caused that the belligerent powers used Persia as a battlefield (20).

The Ottomans, who had suffered for many decades from British and Russian encroachment and intervention, now intended to defend the integrity of Ottomans territory and at the same time Turkey had irredentism motive in the region by proclamation of Pan Islamism and Pan-Turanism (21). More than ten thousands Russian soldiers as well as a large number Russian Consulate Guards resided in Persia. Ottomans had also more than thousand km common border with Persia in the east. The Ottoman Government was anxious of the station of such large Russian forces in north

Persia especially in Azarbaijan close to the border of Ottoman Empire. It was likely a Turkish invasion.

At the beginning of October 1914, six thousand Turkish soldiers occupied the Persian border area, west side of the Urmieh lake to close the strategically routes against the possible Russian invasion (22). At the begin of November 1914, after the entering of Turkey into the War, the Persian Government received a note from the Ottoman Government who requested the evacuation of Russian force from the Persian soil. Otherwise the Turkish army would occupy the province of Azarbaijan to prevent of possible attack of Russians. The Persian Government asked Russian and British to respect the neutrality of Persia and withdraw their troops from the Persian soil. The both Great Powers ignored the Persian Government's demand. They send even more troops in this country and increased the number of their stations.

On 3 of December 1914, two Divisions of Russian army passed over the river of Aras and occupied the border area in the north-west of Persia and then entered and moved forward into the Ottoman soil. The Turkish troops in a large number raided first into Caucasus in December 1914 and then into Azarbaijan. Then, in the absent of Russians in Tabriz, the Turkish troops occupied the city in January 1915, but at the end of the same month they were defeated by the Russian forces and the Turks had to evacuate the capital of Azarbaijan. The battle in Urmiyeh city in west Ajarbaijan was stiffer between the two sides. Finally the Turkish troops were retreated from Persia by the Russian forces. New Russian detachments landed also in the port of Anzali at the Caspian Sea (23).

A British-Indian force sailed from India, One day after British declaration of War on Ottomans. A week after the Turkish attack on the Russian ports, on 6 November 1914, British troops landed a party in Persian island Abadan to protect the refinery, then captured Fao in Mesopotamia. A British-Indian force had also sailed from India and by 23 November British took the port of Basreh (24). Meanwhile at the beginning of the War, the Sheikh al-Islam of Ottoman proclaimed Jihad against British, French and Russians. Some of Shi'ah U'lama in Najaf and Kerbela sanctioned the Jihad and asked the Persian Government to participate in the War in side with Ottomans (25), but the Persian Government preferred to remain neutral in the circumstances.

The Turks, who realised the value of the Persian oil supplies to the British, began to instigate the local Arab tribes in Khuzestan to cut the pipelines. In late January 1915,

the Turkish troops and Arab tribes of Mesopotamia invaded Khuzestan. Then, a British-Indian Battalion proceeded to the city of Ahvaz in Khuzestan and established a protective ring around the Abadan refinery and adjoining oil installation. The Arab tribes of Khuzestan, however, cut the oil pipe in a number of places and putting it out of action for more than three months. Sheikh Khaz'al was unable to prevent the Arab tribes' action. British Government sent a Division there and the number of the British-Indian troops in Khuzestan reached over 12.000 men and "the threat to the oil finally faded away as the Turks were driven back in Mesopotamia in May 1915. British troops remained almost six years in Khuzestan (26).

It appears that the War in Persia accelerated the Anglo-Russian negotiation on partition of Persia and the region. The two Great Powers started again to negotiate on expansion the agreement of 1907 and they concluded the secret Constantinople Agreement in March 1915. Russian agreed most part of the so-called Neutral Zone, in the agreement of 1907, to pass to the British Zone. In return British agreed the districts adjoining Isfahan and Yazd as well as easternmost of neutral zone pass into Russian zone. British also promised a geo-strategically and political concession to Russia, the Post-War control of Constantinople and straits. There was no reference to the independence of Persia. Russian gained practically full freedom of action in her own zone and so did British, a virtual partition of Persia (27).

2.3. 2. The German Missions in Persia

In less than two weeks after the begin of War in an inter-agency conference in der Auswärtiges Amt in Berlin, it was decided to send a especial mission to Afghanistan via Persia in the hope of inducing Amir to take sides with the Central Power against British in India. Then, this plan was received the sanction and the support of the Turkish Government when entered the War (28). The aim of Germany was to divert the pressure of British and Russian from the European fronts by intensifying anti-Entente activities in Persia, Afghanistan and India and to persuade Persia, as the second independence Muslim country, to follow the lead of Berlin (29).

The Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 was contrary to the integrity and independence of Persia. Russian and British military activities violated the neutrality of Persia. At the same time British authorities were aware of Persian's opposition to the Anglo-Russian policy in Persia. The Persians showed more sympathy to Central Powers

and some of them even participated in the war against the Allied forces. Many influential Persians especially Democrats distrusted Russia and Britain because of the agreement 1907 and feared if the Entente won the War, Persian independence would be lost and its territory be divided between Russia and Great Britain (30).

A Berlin Committee was formed by the Persian politicians and intellectuals with the financial support of the *auswärtiges Amt*. The aim was to mobilise and organise the anti-Russian and anti-British resistance movement in co-operation with Germans and Ottomans by sending several members to Persia. They came in touch with the influential personalities and the chieftains of the tribes. The Persian Committee published several books and a famous political periodical "Kaveh" in Berlin. After the War, Kaveh reshaped as a periodical on literature and social Sciences mainly on Persian affairs for some years.

The Persians, however, had no confidence in the Ottomans either due to their territorial ambitions. A large number of the Persian politicians especially in Parliament (Majles) as well as the public regarded Germany as a friendly Great Power, who assisted the Persians in their struggle against the Anglo-Russian intention (31).

Many tribal chieftains in the south-west of Persia sided with the belligerents. Some of them supported British policy or joint forces and the others were in touch and co-operation with the Germans and Ottomans (32). The German missions were received warmly by the Persians. The question of military missions in Persia found more important weight in German policy. As the mission of Oskar Niedermeyer reached Tehran, it was known that the German Missions also would be sent throughout the country. Some two hundred German agents, provided with funds, wireless sets, and hostile tracts, arrived in Persia in early 1915 and found fertile ground to instigate anti-British feeling (33). German emissaries were sent to the west, south and centre of Persia and to Afghanistan and India via Persia in 1915.

The British Government of India formed a line of military posts by stationing a Division in east Persia to prevent them from penetration into India and Afghanistan. A part of German emissaries was arrested by the British or through certain tribal chieftains who enjoyed of British financial and military support. Only a small party of German Mission reached Kabul, but they were unable to persuade the Amir of Afghanistan and returned to Persia (34).

As a result of Anglo-Russian preparation, in the first stage of the War in 1915, the Russian force in Azarbaijan and the British force in Khuzestan succeeded to retreat the Turkish troops from Persia. The British force in Mesopotamia reached even in Ctesphon near Baghdad. The possible move of Turkish force towards Afghanistan via Persia was neutralised. British were informed that the German Missions and Consulates intend to equip the tribes and instigate the local religious leaders and influential personalities for a Jihad against British (35).

On 9 March 1915, the German Consulate in the port of Bushehr in southern Persia was occupied by the British troops and the German Consul and a staff were arrested and deported to India. British authorities ignored the protest of the Persia and the Persians. British arrested also the mission of Wilhelm Wassmuss, the former German Consul in Bushehr, who came from Baghdad and arrived in Persia in January 1915, but he managed to escape. British officials in Bushehr had no hesitation to suppress the suspected opponents directly by sending British military column or with the assistance the friendly tribal Chieftains or Governors (36).

Despite the fact that British consolidating their position in Bushehr by successive landing new British detachments, Wassmuss succeeded to persuade the Tangestanis of Bushehr hinterland to attack the British political Residency in Bushehr, “the symbol of British power in the Persian Gulf” on 12 and 13 July 1915. They were driven off, but the “British prestige suffered a hard knock”. Three weeks later, at the beginning of August 1915, The British troops landed and occupied the city of Bushehr. Bushehr was returned to Persian control on 18 October 1915(37).

For the reasons the German agents in the south, west and centre of Persia were able to inciting the anti-British sentiments. In the course of 1915 the German Consulates increased their activities and the German military missions arrived in Persia. In addition to Wassmuss mission, then the German Minister returned to his post in March. “German diplomats and agents in Persia discovered enticing potentialities for swinging Persia from neutrality towards an anti-Entente stands.

In fact, the networks of German emissaries in southern Persia found the ground very receptive to their propaganda. Such agents as consul Wüstrow in Shiraz, Klein in Kirmanshah, Dr Biach in Yazd and Baluchistan, Zugmayer and Friesinger in Kirman, and Seiler in Isfahan, in addition to Wassmuss in southern area of Fars, were in a

position to enlist the support of various local nationalists and to assume control of the cities and districts in which they operated”(38).

Many Consular Officials and bank managers in the south and centre of Persia in 1915 were seized, wounded or murdered and in some cases the entire British colonies were captured or had to be evacuated, to the Persian Gulf coast, where the Anglo-Indian troops offered better security. In response, British Government sent more troops and military equipment to Persia. Some of the traditional friendly local powers and tribal chieftains, such as Qavam al-Molk the chief of Khamseh confederation and the deputy of the Governor-General of Fars, were financed and equipped with arms and ammunition the British. New agreements were also concluded with the senior Bakhtiyari Khans.

British secured not only the oil fields, oil pipes and other installation during the War, they also participated in several campaigns in accordance with British policy. Fighting extended in the Persia and Mesopotamia during the year 1915. The Persian Government agreed to appoint certain Governors in the south who had more sympathy for Entente Powers (39). In Tehran, the political confrontation happened several months later. It appears that the presence of experienced Persian statesmen, the presence of the diplomatic representatives of the four powers and the distance of the capital from the forces of belligerents were the effective factors in that situation.

On the eve of the War, the coronation of the young Ahmad Shah was taken place and the Regency and its political consequences came to an end. After some years, the Anglo-Russian opposition, finally the third Majles was opened at the beginning of January 1915. The cabinet of Mostowfi decided to implement neutrality in the Persian policy. The German Legation in Tehran followed an active policy in opening contact with the influential personalities and the deputies of Majles. The aim was to persuade the Persian Government to take side with the Central Powers and participate in the War.

At this juncture, there were two approaches towards the belligerents in Persia. The conservative personalities and the deputies were of opinion that the Russian Government policy in Persia was always anti-Constitutional since 1906 and the Russian actions caused the dissolve of the first and the second Persian Parliament. British as the Russian ally did not disapprove. For continuation of the Constitutional Monarchy and Parliamentary System in Persia we should not provoke the Russian Government due to military weakness of Persia. The Majority and Democrats in Parliament were of opinion

that it is an opportunity “to hit back at the authors of the 1907 convention” by an alliance with Germany and participation in the War. Finally, the Government of Mostowfi and the German Minister in Tehran, Von Reuss, began secretly to negotiate on the conditions of an alliance (40).

Somehow the British and Russian were informed of the secret negotiation. Additionally, the anti-Russian and anti-British were intensified by the German-Democrats activities in Tehran and the other cities. The two Entente Powers warned the Persian Government of any hostile action and went on to change the condition by force. Russian began to station a large number of troops in Qazvin city. A substantial Russian force under the command of General Baratof landed in the port of Anzali in 28 October 1915. The total number of the effective force of General Baratof in Qazvin would reach to 10.000 men. The half of the forces were stationed or moved towards the city. The other Russian troops would join the force in Qazvin. On 7 November 1915, Baratof dispatched the Russian detachments towards Karaj near Tehran (41).

The Russian action provoked a panic and strong sentiment especially in parliament against Russian who had violated the neutrality and independence of Persia. The Persian Parliament suggested that the Shah and the Government should leave Tehran and go to Isfahan. The Shah was about to start his journey, but the Anglo-Russian Ministers in Persia persuaded him to stay in Tehran.

Among the Mohajerin who left the capital for the city of Qom were many deputies mainly Democrats, the representatives of the Central Powers, Gendarmes, and numbers of the influential personalities as well as public. The Mohajerin rejected the request of the Persian Government to return to Tehran in 25 November 1915 and the same day formed the Committee of National Defence in Qom. They could not, however, resist to the Russian force and the Committee of National Defence had to withdraw to the city of Kashan and then to Isfahan in 23 December 1915.

Two weeks later Mohajerin left the city of Isfahan for Kermanshah. The chiefs of certain Lor and Kurdish tribes supported the movement. They formed the National Government in Kermanshah and then concluded an alliance treaty with the German Minister. The National Government could form only a small strong force, but not so strong as expected. In Tehran, the Cabinet of Mostowfi resigned in 23 November 1915 and a pro-Entente Cabinet of Farmanfarma was formed (42).

On December 1915 in a statement the Persian Government mentioned of his decision to increase the number of Persian Cossack force. The British Minister in Tehran, Charles Marling, recommended the British Government the formation a similar force under British officers in the south. The Foreign Office and the India Office agreed unanimously.

Since 1905 even before, the different British departments raised the idea of formation a local force under British officer to protect increasingly British interests in Persia, but for various reasons this question remained in abeyance. It was a reaction and counter balance to Russian influence as well. The Germans succeeded to interrupt British activities in the south and diminish British prestige and influence during the year 1915, but at this juncture the German menace did not “constitute any real threat to Britain’ s position in Persia.” The Russians had already approved the British proposals (43).

General Sir Percy Sykes was selected as the head of the mission. Chamberlain was aware that the Persian Government would object to the formation a force under British, since “this would involve recognition of sphere laid down in the Anglo-Russian convention” but he wrote: “the proposal should be pressed upon them.”

On 16 March 1916, a military mission under the command of General Sykes arrived in the coastal city of Bandar Abbas where they started to organise a force named south Persia Rifles by recruiting from the local men. Then, they moved to the cities Kerman and Shiraz and recruited additional men. The S.P.R. force composed of two brigades and battalion and the size of the force reached to eight thousand men (44).

With the presence of a large number of the British-Indian forces in Khuzestan, eastern Persia and the southern ports as well as the S.P.R., the military position of British improved gradually in 1916 in the south and centre of Persia. However, there was a strong feeling against the presence of British troops especially the S.P.R. in southern Persia and the fighting still continued in certain areas against British.

The situation was, however, disappointing for the British army in Mesopotamia. The last days of November 1915, the British army were defeated in Ctesphon. They retreated to Kut al-Amarah in December where they were surrounded by the Turkish forces for about five months. British Government had requested Russians to send a strong force through Persia to attack Baghdad and co-operates with the British Army in Mesopotamia. The Russian army could not reach to the Mesopotamia and the British

Government could not help the British army either. On 29 April 1916, the British forces were badly defeated in Kut al-Amara in southern Mesopotamia and 13,000 men of British force were surrendered to the Turkish army (45).

Russian forces, however, opened an offensive against the force of National Government in Kermanshah. They had to withdraw to the Ottomans territory. Throughout the year 1916, there were attack and counter-attack by the Turkish and Russian forces in the western Persia. The provinces and the cities were often under occupation one of the two forces. The National Government returned to Kermanshah when the Turks advanced towards the central provinces. In the year 1916, the military and financial situation of the Persian Government deteriorated.

The representatives of Russia and Great Britain in Tehran took the opportunity to implement the content of the secret agreement 1915. They offered financial assistance to Persian Government, but imposed the control of the expenditure through a Mix Commission in 2 May 1916. With Moratorium in 1916, the Russian and British did take another step to bring the Persian military, finance and administration under their supervision. This action could practically lead towards the partition of Persia (46).

In this relation, in 2 August 1916, the two Entente Powers put Persian Government under pressure to recognise the S.P.R. as a Persian force under British command similar to the Persian Cossack force under Russian Command and simultaneously asked the increase of the two forces to eleven thousand each (47). The Persian Prime Minister agreed only under force Major. At the beginning of 1917, the Russian in Persia and the British in Mesopotamia reached to a relative stable success. British army rehabilitated in Mesopotamia after several months, when the British army in February 1917 succeeded to defeat the Turkish forces in Kut al-Amara in February 1917 and captured the city of Baghdad.

At the beginning of 1917 the Russian force under General Baratof rushed towards Hamadan and Kermanshah. The Turks could not resist against the Russian force and evacuated the city of Kermanshah exactly the same day that the British force arrived in Baghdad. With the Turkish force, the National Government went to Mesopotamia, where the Ottomans disarmed and confiscated the arms, ammunitions and caches of Persians who received from the German Government. The Persians regarded the rough behaviour of the Turks as an unfriendly action. They left for Germany or returned to Persia (48).

On 2 April 1917, the British and Russian forces joint together in Kermanshah, when the voice of Russian revolution was heard. During the years 1914-1917 with the occupation of the country, the democratic activities decreased. The Persian Parliament was closed and the press limited. The resistance movements were shaped by the people in different parts of Persia (49).

2.4. From Russian Revolutions to Armistice

The defeat of Tsarist Russia by Imperial Germany made possible the Russian Revolution. On 15 March 1917, in the wake of military disaster, Nicholas II was forced to abdicate in favour of a provisional Government (50).

2.4.1. Persia in the Years 1917-1918

The fall of Romanov dynasty was received by the public in Persia as well as journalists, intellectuals and politicians with great enthusiasm. They saw an end to more than a century of Russian aggression. The Russian soldiers in Persia celebrated this event in Russia and formed the revolutionaries committee. A large number of Russian soldiers in Persia called the Persians to brotherhood. The former Persian deputies congratulated the Duma, but the Provisional Government informed the Persian Government that the Russia will continue the war and alliance with British and the Russian policy in Persia has not changed. The second Provisional Government was formed under Alexandre Kernesky. He was not successful and replaced by a new revolution (51).

With the revolution in 7 November 1917, the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia. Very soon, at the beginning of December 1917, Lenin, the head of the Bolshevik Government addressed a very sympathetic and hopeful message to the Muslim in Russia and the east, including Persia. The Bolshevik Government also came into negotiation with the Central Powers (Germany) for a peace treaty.

After the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917, the Russian Government under the leadership of Lenin conveyed a new foreign policy in which it affected on the

political situation in Persia and the other Asian countries. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Persia and conclusion a friendship treaty changed fundamentally the political situation in Persia. Since the beginning of the 20th century, Vladimir Lenin as one of the leaders of opposition of Tsarist Regime criticised the Anglo-Russian colonial policy in Asia especially in the southern neighbour countries of Russia: Persia, Turkey and China (52).

When he came to power immediately opened a friendly relation with the southern neighbour countries. This decision was taken for two reasons: firstly ideological and secondly the Russian political interests. With the political gesture on equality of all nations and then the conclusion of friendship treaties the Soviet Russia secured the southern borders of Russia and stimulated the Asian countries against the British colonial policy.

After the Revolution in autumn 1917, immediately the Bolshevik Government came into negotiation with the Central Powers on an Armistice and peace treaty. The Persian Committee in Berlin, a committee of the Persian politicians and intellectuals, who had a very close and co-operative relation with the Deutsch Auswärtiges Amt during the War, requested the German Government to support the Persian independence in negotiation with Russia and the evacuation of Russian troops from Persia. The German Government responded positively to the Persian demand.

As a result, when the Bolshevik Government and the Central Powers signed the Brest-Litovsk Armistice in 15 December 1917, the Russian and Turkish Governments recognised the independence of Persia and agreed to evacuate their troops from the Persian soil. The Persian Charge d’Affaires in Berlin informed the Persian Foreign Ministry accordingly (53). On 16 December 1917, Vladimir Lenin issued an appeal to the Muslims of Russia and the east.

“ Muslims of the east, Persians, Turks, Arabs and Hindus! All you in whose lives and property, in whose freedom and native landhave for centuries traded! All you whose countries the robbers who began the war now desire to partition! We declare..... that the treaty for partition of Persia null and void. As soon as military operations cease, the arm forces will be withdrawn from Persia and the Persian will be guaranteed the right of free determination of their own destiny”(54).

On 19 December 1917, Leon Trotski, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, despatched a letter to the Persian Charge d’Affaires, Ass’ad Bahador, and invited him to

a negotiation about the evacuation of Russian forces from Persia. Ass'ad Bahador, who was authorised by the Persian Government to negotiate on evacuation of Russian troops, succeeded to persuade the Russian Government to declare officially the repudiation of the agreement 1907 (55).

On 12 January 1918, the representative of the Bolshevik Government, Karl Bravin, arrived in Tehran with a message from Lenin for the Persian Government. This message was printed also in a Persian newspaper. Lenin stated that the comrade Bravin was instructed to negotiate with the Persian Government in view to conclude a trade and other friendly agreements. The purpose is the good neighbourly relations and the joint fight againstBritish. He added: "The Workers and Peasants Government is prepared to repair the injustice done by the former Government of the Russian Tsar by repudiating all Tsarist privileges and agreements that are contrary to the sovereignty of Persia. The future relations between Russia and Persia will be based upon a free agreement and mutual respect among, nations." he Persian policy of the Soviet Government was based on political interests and ideological understanding. In addition to ideological believe, from the Russian Bolsheviks point of view Persia was very important for a revolution in Asia. Secondly, the friendly Asian neighbouring countries secured the southern of the Soviet Russia. Thirdly, it was more effective the anti-British propaganda campaign. Two days later, on 14 January 1918, Trotsky sent an official letter to the Persian Legation in Saint Petersburg. He stated:

"The Council of the People's Commissars declares that the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, which was directed against the freedom and independence of the Persian People, is annulled once and for all. Simultaneously the Council of the People's Commissars declares as null as void all earlier and later agreements which in any way limit or interferes with the right of the Persian people to a free and independent existence"(56).

Though, Bravin was received warmly in private by the high ranking politicians and the Persian Government arranged the facilities and accommodation for him, but the Persian Government was not in a position to recognise the new regime in Russia. The Bolshevik Government was not in a stable position. The representatives of the old regime were still very active in the Russian Legation in Tehran and the Russian Officers in the Persian Cossack Division as well as British pressure.

On 3 March 1918 a peace treaty concluded between the Bolshevik Russia and the Central Powers. The Russian and Turkish Governments were obliged to evacuate the Persian soil and respect the integrity of Persia. On 27 March 1918, the German Emperor informed telegraphic the Shah of Persia of the Brest-Litovsk Agreement. This news caused a great pleasure among the Persians throughout the country. The February revolution in Russia caused chaos among the Russian forces in Persia for several months and the Russian troops did not receive their salary (57).

With the news of Bolshevik revolution the situation of Russian army in Persia went from bad to worse. The Russian army lost its organisation and the distribution of British financial assistance could not prevent of disintegration of the Russian troops in Persia. By the order of the Bolshevik Government the majority of the soldiers returned to Russia. The evacuation happened, however, disorganise and not always without damaging the private properties (58).

Meanwhile in April 1918, Karl Bravin went to Afghanistan, but he was killed in Ghaznin before reaching Kabul. Bravin succeeded to change the public opinion in favour of Russian and he left the draft of a friendship treaty in the Persian Ministry for foreign affairs (59). The second Bolshevik diplomatic mission was under Ivan Kolomitsev, who arrived in Tehran in 3 July 1918.

He was not received by the Foreign Ministry similar to his predecessor. The Persian Cabinet argued that his credential has no validity. Kolomitsev followed the same policy as Bravin: the official recognition of Soviet Russia, the abrogation of the Old Russian treaties and the conclusion of a friendship treaty. When the British favourite personality, Hassan Vothuq al-Dowleh formed the cabinet in 29 August 1918, the presence of Russian Bolshevik was not tolerated in Tehran. On 2 November 1918, the last days of the war, the residential building of the mission was attacked by the order of Russian officers of Cossack Division and the support of old Russian Legation. It appears that the action was not without the consent of Vothuq al-Dowleh and British authorities in Tehran.

Kolomitsev succeeded to escape, but the others were arrested and jailed by the British Command. The Bolshevik policy in Persia and the evacuation of Russian forces from Persia encouraged the moderate Persian Cabinets in 1918. They reached into conclusion that the Persian Government should seize the opportunity in the absence of Russian to strengthening the position of Persian Government by necessary reforms and

organising a Persian military force. Persia had suffered during the war from the presence and confrontation of belligerent's troops in the absence a strong Persian uniform army.

The Persian Cabinets had endeavoured to expand the size of Persian forces, for the reasons without success. Now, in the first step, the moderate Persian Cabinets did not recognise the S.P.R. as a Persian force and also asked the British Government to order the evacuation of British forces from Persia. British Government did not agree to withdraw the British-Indian troops from Persia during the war. Though, the moderate Cabinets did not remain in power for a long time, but the ideas continued to exist (60).

In this juncture, the British Government also reached to conclusion to strengthening their position in Persia. First of all, British Government undertook to pay the monthly subsidy to the Persian Cossack Division instead the Russian Government. British began to pay the salary of the remnant part of the Russian forces who agreed to stay in Persia. They were under the Command of General Baratof in Hamadan. During the year 1918, British Government dispatched more troops to Persia and British military missions began to form new mercenary forces in the west and the east of Persia. British forces occupied the western and the northern Persia and transferred their headquarters from Hamadan to the city of Qazvin, north-west of Tehran, where they could watch the roads to Tabriz Baghdad and Rasht and on time could operate against the Turkish force or Bolshevik Government.

British also organised a Navy Force from the Russian Navy in the Caspian Sea and two military forces sent to Central Asia and Caucasus (61). The British Legation in Tehran endeavoured to bring a pro-British cabinet to power by causing the fall of one after the other of the moderate Persian Cabinets who rejected the S.P.R. as a Persian force and even went on to annul the Capitulation or the judicial right to the British and the others. Finally, British Minister in Tehran, Sir Charles Marling succeeded to persuade the young Shah to appoint again the former pro-British prime Minister, Hassan Vothuq al-Dowleh, as the head of the new cabinet in 18 July 1918 (62).

2. 5. Persia After the War

After the Armistice on 11 November 1918, British Government not only did not withdraw her troops from neutral Persia, she also brought more troops into Persia and also organised new local force under British command. The aims of British in Persia were (a) to bring Persia under British supervision through an advisory system similar to a private mandate (b) to be assured that no threat would jeopardise the security of India or the British position in the Persian Gulf and the British position in the Persian Gulf and the British interests in Persia included the current of oil and the installations of the A.P.O.C. “whose crucial importance to the British naval had been demonstrated during the War” (c) to break the Bolshevik Government, by supporting the white Russians and the new republics in Central Asia and Caucasus. For the reason British troops were stationed almost throughout the neutral Persia. British Government used the soil of Persia also as a base to send the British military troops and missions to Caucasus and Central Asia and supervising the oil fields of Baku (63).

On contrary to his predecessors, the Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh (1918-1920), not only did not protest to the presence of British troops and British military operation from Persia against Russia, but also collaborated with the British in anti-Bolshevik policy, namely the cabinet cut the diplomatic relation with Bolshevik Government. In return the British political and military authorities in Persia supported the cabinet against his opponents.

2. 5.1. Persia and Paris Peace Conference

At the beginning of 1919 the Persian Government sent a delegation headed by the Persian Foreign Minister, A.Q. Moshaver al-Mamalek, to the Paris Peace Conference to secure the independence and integrity of Persia. During the war Persia suffered from the confrontation of belligerents on the Persian soil. Persia had certain political and economic claims. Despite the fact that Persia suffered during the war, but British delegation did their best to exclude Persian delegation to be heard at the Peace Conference on the ground that Persia “had not been a belligerent power in the European War” (64).

British Legation in Tehran had previously promised to support the admission of the Persian delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. Additionally certain neutral countries and even non-governmental delegations were received the permission. With regard to the President Wilson declaration in 1917, the Persian Legation in Washington paid the attention of the State Department and the President of the United State to the Persian question and requested the support of the United State of the Persian delegation in the Peace Conference. The Persian delegation under Minister for Foreign affairs discussed in Paris the Persian demands with the American Delegation, the influential adviser of President and the secretary of state.

The American authorities in many occasions and to certain extend the heads of Italian and French delegations supported the case of Persia, but it was postponed and then rejected by the British delegation. British reaction in the Paris Peace Conference caused the suspicious of the Persians (65).

Some months later when in Tehran and London the text of the Anglo-Persian Agreement in 9 August 1919 was announced, it was rejected by the Persians as well American, French and the Soviet Russia. The content of the agreement, the British policy in Persia at least for the last two decades and the psychological reaction to the British action in Paris Peace Conference and the secrecy of the negotiation and then the news of bribery was among the reasons on opposition to the agreement.

2. 5.2. The Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919

With the collapse of Russia and the Central Powers Empires, in the absence of Russian and the presence of British forces in Persia, the British Government reached to conclusion, that it is the time to consolidate the British position in Persia. An agreement with Persia would bring to an end the more than a century of rivalry with Russian in this country.

2.5.2.1. The Aim and Method

Lord George Curzon, the acting Foreign Secretary, was the main architecture of the agreement. He was familiar with the affairs of Persia for more than three decades. Curzon was the author of several articles and the famous work "Persia and the Persian Question". Always he had dreamt, wrote Harold Nicolson, of creating a chain of Wassaal states stretching from Mediterranean to the Pamirs and, protecting, not the Indian frontiers merely, but our communications with our further Empire. "In this chain of buffer states stretching between India and all European interference, Persia was to him at once the weakest and most vital link"(66).

The dreamed occasion arrived. In summer 1918, he gave financial and political support to the return of former Prime Minister, Vothuq al-Dowleh, to power. Then he appointed Sir Percy Cox, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, as the British Minister in Tehran to negotiate on an Anglo-Persian Agreement. After the War, the British policy in Persia continued, but at the same time expanded. During the years 1907-1917 the two colonial powers intended to divide the country into British and Russian zones, with two forces under Russian and British command and supervise the financial department by a joint committee.

The Central Government should be weaken and the tribal chieftains should be equip and strengthen against the Central Government. Now British intended to unify the country into British Zone, and organise a uniform force under British command and supervise the financial and the other departments of Persian Government. The Central Government should be strengthened and the tribal chieftain especially the unfriendly chieftains to the British should be weakened.

After several months of secret negotiations between the British Minister in Tehran and three Persian Ministers, the Prime, Justice and Finance Ministers, the Anglo-Persian Agreement with additional letters was concluded. On 9 August 1919, the text of the agreement was published in Tehran and London. In this agreement the British Government was the sole power who supervised the Persian military and financial affairs. The agreement safeguarded the British geo-strategically interests in Persia and the region as a whole (67). On 9 August 1919, a memorandum was circulated to the British Cabinet. Lord Curzon explained to his colleagues the reasons and the importance of the Anglo-Persian Agreement at this juncture. :

“Her geographical position, the magnitude of our interests in the country, and the future safety of our eastern Empire render it impossible for us now....to disinterest ourselves from what happened in Persia“ Moreover, now that we are about to assume the mandate for Mesopotamia, which will make us conterminous with the western frontiers of Persia, we cannot permit the existence, between the frontiers of our Indian Empire in Baluchistan and those of our new Protectorate, of a hotbed of misrule, enemy intrigue, financial chaos, and political disorder. Further if Persia were to be left alone, there is every reason to fear that she would be overrun by Bolshevik influences from the north. Lastly, we possess in the south-western corner of Persia great assets in the shape of oil fields, which are worked for British Navy and which give us a commanding interest in that part of the world”

In these circumstances,.....to make an arrangement by which, without assuming a direct control over Persian administration or involving ourselves in continued financial responsibilities on a large scale, we should yet be able to provide Persia with the expert assistance and advice which will enable the State to be rebuilt...., we undertake to supply, at the cost of the Persian Government, such expert advisers as many may be considered necessary for various branches of the Persian Administration. Among other things, the Persian Government desire to establish a uniform force,...., which have hitherto existed in various parts of the country. We propose to lend such officers as may be required to organise this force. Further, the Treasury has agreed to make an advance to the Persian Government of L 2.000.000, and to be secured upon the Persian customs revenues in order to allow the Persian Government to initiate the reforms which are in contemplation (68).

The British Government intended to bring the whole of Persian forces, financial and the other departments under British supervision. The Central Government should be now strengthened to be able to suppress the Bolsheviks and the other anti-British movements as well as the uprising of nomad tribes and the other centrifugal forces. To secure the Persian borders against revolutionary groups. The treaty of 1919, “in effect turned Persia into a private mandate of Great Britain” (69).

British advisers were supplied to the various Departments of the Persian Government and given adequate powers. At the begin of the year 1920, British advisers arrived in Tehran and began to set up the Joint Customs and Military Commissions to

study on administration reforms and organisation the uniform Army, without waiting the ratification of the agreement by the Persian parliament.

2.5.2.2. The Opponents of the Agreement

The agreement was rejected inside the country. The Persian politicians and intellectuals protested strongly against the agreement in the country and abroad. It was also rejected by the Governments of France, United States and Bolshevik Russia. The Persian, European and American press criticised sharply the agreement. British Government endeavoured to persuade the United States and France to support the agreement and the British policy in Persia. British Foreign Office reached to no success.

French Government pretended that they have no objection to the agreement and opposition of the French Minister in Tehran to the agreement was without instruction. The United States authorities told British that the agreement gives a monopoly position to Great Britain. They are against it for the reason that the American enterprises and American citizens would be undermined (70).

On 26 July 1919, two weeks before the publication of the Anglo-Persian Agreement in 9, August 1919, the Russian Foreign Ministry sent a note to the Persian Legation. The Bolshevik Government annulled the Persian debts, all privileges and concessions of Tsari Russia. The Russian Bank, railways and port installations turned transferred to Persian Government. The Soviet Government renounced the concession on customs and post tariffs as well as judicial rights. Finally the Soviet Foreign Ministry stated that they hope the action of the Soviet Government opens a new chapter in the history of Soviet-Persia Government (71).

The same month, Kolomitsev was sent to Persia and this time with a credential from Lenin. The missions were arrested by the Russian Cossack Officers in the south east of Caspian sea near the port of Gaz and then executed in August 1919 after receiving the order of the Russian Commander of Cossack Division in Tehran. Kolomitsev had brought a draft of a friendship treaty (72). On 28 August 1919, almost three weeks after the publication of the Anglo-Persian Agreement, the Foreign Ministry declared in a statement the view of Bolshevik Government on this subject. For the first time since the revolution, in an official declaration the Soviet Government attacked

strongly the Persian Government and regarded the Anglo-Persian agreement as a document of no validity. The Bolshevik Government realised that their efforts in Persia brought no result.

It appears that the Bolshevik Government was anxious that the British army would jeopardise Caucasus and southern Russia (73). In practice, however, the Bolshevik Government did nothing against Persia for nine months. British Government ignored the Russian Bolshevik critique and continued the anti-Bolshevik campaign from the Persian soil. Vothuq al-Dowleh supported British policy in Caucasus and began to open the political relation with the three republics in Caucasus.

2.5.2.3. Soviet Government and the Agreement

The Bolshevik Government succeeded gradually to defeat the white Russians and the other forces inside the Russia during the year 1919-1920. The forces of Entente as well as British evacuated the Russian territory and British forces returned to Persia. The Bolshevik forces reached the borders of Russian Empire in Caucasus and Central Asia in 1920. Denikine and a part of his white Russian force landed in the Persian Port of Anzali in the Caspian Sea where the British Navy and British force had stationed.

The Bolshevik Government regarded the presence of British forces in Persia and the British Navy in the Caspian see as a threat to the future of Bolshevik Russia. Almost nine months after the conclusion of the Anglo-Persian agreement 1919, in 18 May 1920 several ship of Russian Bolshevik suddenly appeared near the coast of Persia and occupied the port of Anzali in the province of Gilan and captured the Navy of White Russian.

British Navy and force surrounded to the Russian Bolshevik without fighting. With the consent of Bolshevik commander, British forces left Gilan for Qazvin (74). A coalition government of the Persian nationalists, social-democrats and Bolsheviks was formed immediately in Rasht, the capital of Gilan. Then, they expanded their territory to the neighbouring province of Mazandaran and threatened to capture Tehran (75).

The Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh protested to the occupation of Gilan by the Russian Bolshevik and at the same time began to negotiate with the Bolshevik Government in Moscow. The Russian Government, however, did not trust Vothuq al-

Dowleh due to his pro-British policy. Meanwhile, after some years of military confrontation, the British and the Bolshevik Governments began to negotiate on political and commercial relations between the two countries in London in May 1920. They discussed also the Asian Affairs and finally reached to certain agreement (76). The British Cabinet, for political and financial reasons, approved the evacuation of British forces from northern Persia in spring 1921.

2.5. 3. The Moderate Cabinet

Ahmad Shah, who had left Tehran for Europe since August 1919, returned there in 3 June 1920, two weeks after the Russian Bolshevik occupied the province of Gilan. As the Shah was in Europe, he became aware of United States, France and some other countries' opposition to the agreement and the Persian independence. He received several prominent Persian politicians, intellectuals and the religious leaders, who advised him to reject the agreement and to appoint a new Prime Minister.

The occupation of Gilan was an indication of the defeat of Vothuq al-Dowleh in foreign policy. The increasingly opposition of the Persians inside the country, the insurrection of Democrat in Azarbaijan and Jangalis in Gilan as well as the Great Powers opposition to the agreement, the occupation of Anzali by the Russian, caused that finally the young and undecided Shah, despite the desire of Curzon, did not support the Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh and he compelled to resign in 28 June 1920.

The British Minister, the negotiator of the agreement in Tehran and staunch supporter of Hassan Vothuq al-Dowleh, Sir Percy Cox, were informed that he was appointed as the British High Commissioner in Baghdad in 3 June 1920 and he left Tehran for London a week later (77). Curzon and Cox underestimated nationalism in Persia. In addition to historical and traditional national proud, the German policy during the War and then the policy of Russian Bolshevik in Persia intensified the nationalism among the Persians.

The method of negotiation and the content of the agreement are among the factors of opposition to the agreement. The failure of Vothuq al-Dowleh's Cabinet (July 1918-June 1920) in foreign policy caused that he had to resign. Although British troops stationed throughout the country, Ahmad Shah invited Hassan Khan Moshir al-Dowleh,

a moderate Democrat statesman, was invited to form a new Cabinet in June 1920. He had a different vision and approach in foreign policies (78). The neutrality in foreign policy reappeared and the relation with Russia was reopened.

Bolshevik Government informed Persia that they would leave the Persian soil, provided that British troops withdraw from the Persian territory. British Government was under Bolshevik pressure as well as British tax payer. Moshir al-Dowleh was aware that the Bolshevik Government endeavoured to open a friendly relation with Persia and the southern Asian neighbour countries and they annulled officially the concessions of Tsar Regime in Persia. He knew also that Russians realise that due to the British pressure, the moderate Persian Cabinets did not recognise the Bolshevik regime in Russia, but the Bolshevik Government rejected the agreement of Vothuq al-Dowleh with the British in 1919.

Despite the fact that the Bolshevik Government occupied the Gilan province, it appeared that they were ready to negotiate on the relations of the two countries in future. The Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh approved:

- a) To postponed the implement of the Anglo-Persian agreement 1919 until the ratification by the Persian Parliament.
- b) To send a mission to Moscow to negotiate and conclude a friendly agreement with the Soviet Russia.
- c) To send the Persian Cossack force to the Persian provinces of the Caspian Sea against the force of Gilan Republic.
- d) To send an emissary to Gilan to pacify the nationalists.
- e) To send a new governor-general to Tabriz and pacify the Democrat insurrection.

The decision of the Persian Government to postpone the agreement was announced officially through the Persian newspapers and the members of joint commissions remained unemployed. Armitage smith, the head of the financial advisers was sent to Great Britain to negotiate with the A.P.O.C. on Persian behalf.

The radical Bolsheviks in International Congress 1920 and Baku Congress 1920 spoke of revolution in Asia especially after the occupation of Gilan, but the Bolshevik Government under Lenin prepared to negotiate with Persia. The Bolshevik Government received the Persian mission warmly and Lenin received personally the head of the mission, the former Foreign Minister, A. A . Ansari.

With some delay, the negotiation started. There were progress and mutual understanding in many articles. The Persian delegation had to consult the Central Government in certain subject and the approval of the agreement as a whole. The Soviet Government assured the Persian delegation that the Russian Bolshevik would evacuate the port of Anzali when the British forces evacuate the Persian territory as well (79).

At the beginning of 1921, the Persian delegation and the Soviet Russia reached to an agreement. With some corrections, the Persian Government ratified the final draft of the Perso-Soviet treaty of friendship in 6 February 1921. The Soviet Russia annulled all treaties between Tsarist Russia and Persia and between Russia and a third power against the interests of Persia. The Soviet Russia voided the debts of Persia, the judiciary rights (Capitulation) and the Russian concessions and turned over the railway from Tabriz to Julfa, roads and telegraph lines, the Discount Bank of Persia, the installation of the port of Anzali. Soviet Russia recognised and gave Persia equal navigation rights on the Caspian Sea (80).

A Persian Cossack Brigade under the Command of Colonel Starroselski began to fight with the force of the Gilan republic. In autumn 1920, the Cossack forces in Mazandaran had several victories and the Commander of the Cossack was decorated by the Shah with a begrimmed sword. Suddenly the Cossack was defeated near Rasht and compelled to retreat from Gilan. The Cossack force retreated from Gilan and stationed near Qazvin not far from the British Norperforce. The reasons were mentioned for the defeat is not satisfactory and there exists dark points in this event.

It is certain that the British authorities were anxious of presence the Russian Officers in the Persian Cossack force when the British would evacuate the Persian soil. The future of Russian Cossack Officers was the subject of many discussions among the British authorities (81).

2.6. The Persian Cossack Coup

The British authorities in London, Delhi and Persia realised that the Anglo-Persian Agreement had no future in Persia and the British forces were preparing to leave Persia. Among the available Persian forces in Persia the Persian Cossack Division was

the strongest and the force was under the command of Russian Officers. The Officers of Gendarmerie had a close relation with the national leaders and partly fought against British during the war.

British provided several plans to safeguard the British interests in the absence of British troops. Some months before leaving Persia, The new Commander of British Norperforce, General Edmond Ironside, took advantage of the Cossack defeat. He and the British Minister in Tehran, Herman Norman, asked the Persian Government to expel the Russian Officers from Persia, otherwise they would cease to pay the monthly loan (82).

The Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh did not consent the British suggestion and resigned in 25 September 1920. The day after Ahmad Shah appointed Sepahdar as new Prime Minister and finally agreed to expel the Russian Officers, but he appointed a Persian officer and not British as the commander of the Persian Cossack Division. British Norperforce arrested the Russian Officers and expelled them from Persia (83).

With the order of General Ironside, certain British officers assisted the Persian Officers of the Cossack force to reorganise the defeated military Brigade near Qazvin. Some months later the Cossacks were rehabilitated. On February 17, 1921, two thousand Cossacks and hundred Gendarmes under the Command of a high rank Officer Mir Panj, Brigadier, Reza Khan one of the Commanders of Persian Cossack force near the city of Qazvin marched towards Tehran. The Cossack force captured the capital almost without bloodshed in 21 February 1921 (84).

The force of Gendarmerie, Police and Central Brigade as well as the Cossacks in Tehran did not oppose to the occupation of the city. Certain civil and Gendarmerie Officers, encouraged and joint the Persian Cossack Officers in military coup in Tehran. The Commander of Norperforce and his officers in Qazvin and the British Legation in Tehran encouraged the Cossack officers in Qazvin and facilitated the situation for them in Qazvin and Tehran (85). The reason for this co-operation was formulated by Reza Khan, the Commander of the coup d'état, who stated: it was determined to establish a strong government that would be ready to oppose the Bolshevik advance after British withdrawal (86).

The Commanders of the Persian Cossack suggested to Ahmad Shah the premiership of a journalist, Seyyed Zia al-Din Tabatabai. He reluctantly agreed. Seyyed Zia al-Din Tabatabai, as new Prime Minister stated in his declaration that security of the

country and formation a modern army had the first priority and then modernisation of the country by administration, financial, judiciary and education reforms and the improvement of peasants and worker's standard of living (87). The majority of constitutional politicians were arrested. The newspapers were closed and some of the journalists were exiled.

2.6.1. Towards an Administration Reform

Since the Constitutional Revolution modernisation of the country was a part of each cabinet's projects. Due to internal struggles, the Anglo-Russian interference's and the War 1914-1918, most of reforms remained unfinished or in abeyance. After the War, certain steps were taken by the Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh in administration and judiciary reforms such as foundation the registration office and the faculty of law. Then, he concluded the agreement of 1919. The Joint Commissions were set up to arrange certain financial, administration and military reforms, but under British advisers. The aim of Joint Military Commission in 1920 was to organise a uniform army. The report of the Military Commission indicates that the nomad tribes were regarded as the most dangerous force to the internal security (88). However, As long as Vothuq al-Dowleh was in power (19 July 1918-25 June 1920) no step was taken against tribes. The question of tribal taxation has mainly fallen into abeyance. At the same time some of the friendly chieftains in the south allied with the cabinet against the rebel bandits (89).

Seyyed Zia al-Din improved some aspect of the Tehran municipality. The invitation of foreign advisers from European countries and the United States of America was ratified by the Cabinet. The Minister of War in the coup regime, Major Mass'ud Khan, announced the reorganisation of the Ministry of War in 6 March 1921, but he was only two months in office. The political wing of the coup was about hundred days in power until 25 June 1921. Ahmad Shah was discontent with the policy and the behaviour of Prime Minister of the coup regime. He was also under pressure from the families of the political prisoners. The Military Commander of the coup, however, remained in power as the Minister of War in the following Persian Cabinets.

Some of prisoners were members of the Royal family and the close relatives of the Shah himself. Reza Khan assured the Shah of his loyal and made Seyyed Zia al-Din responsible for the imprisonment of politicians. Ahmad Shah dismissed Seyyed Zia al-

Din from premiership in 25 May 1921 and he left the country immediately. A prisoner of the Coup, the former Governor-General of Khorassan, Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh, was appointed as the new Prime Minister in 30 May 1921 (90).

2. 6. 2. The Successive Persian Cabinets

The Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh and Reza Khan the Minister of War began to ratify the bills on reform projects and administration reforms in national level and the following cabinets continued the process. The non-written constant Minister of War, Reza Khan, began the reform and organisation Persian forces and uniform military. An American financial Mission under Dr. Arthur Millspaugh was invited by the Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh to reshape the financial department.

They arrived in Persia in autumn 1922 (91). Millspaugh realised that there are several experts from European countries, Belgian, France, Swede, Germany and Netherlands as advisers to the various Persian departments (92). Reza Khan, the Minister of War, was an ambitious and persistence man. Before the Coup of February 1921, he had no high level governmental experience. The expulsion of Russian officers and the condition of the country gave him an opportunity to rise to the first stage.

He considered that he can stable his position by gradual expansion of his military forces. He indicated that he was able to deal with his rivals and opponents who underestimated his political ability and his ambitious at the beginning. Reza Khan was the commander of Cossack Regiment in Hammadan in 1920 and after the expelling the Russian officers, he was one of the high rank officer in Cossack Camp in Qazvin, but not the highest one. Additionally, there were several Persian Generals of Cossack Division in Tehran.)

After the capture of the capital, Reza Khan the Military Commander of the Coup d'état in February 1921 was officially appointed as the Commander in Chief of the Cossack Division. Two months later, he causes the resignation of the Minister of War, Major Massud Khan, in 26 April 1921. The same day, Reza Khan became the Minister of War as well. Very soon, he collaborated with the Shah against the Prime Minister. Seyyed Zia al-Din was dismissed by the Shah in 25 May 1920. Seyyed Zia al-Din was

in power only three months, but Reza Khan retained his office as the Minister of War in all cabinets for almost two and half years (93).

The aim of Reza Khan, like the Military Commission, was to organise a uniform army. It was foreseen to suppress and disarm the tribes and minimise the political power of the tribal chieftains when the army would organise (94).

Reza Khan explains his view clearly in his travel account of Khuzestan (95). Reza Khan, the Minister of War, expanded the size of Cossack Division from eight thousand to seventeen thousand in 1921 to strengthen his position against the other forces. He also brought the other available modern Persian military forces under the Ministry of War. Then he organised a uniform modern army based the Cossack force as the nucleus of the new army and the other available modern Persian forces, Gendarmerie with 8.000 men, Central Guard and the Provincial Guards (96).

Some of the Persian personals of the disbanded South Persia Rifles and the other local forces under British Commands in Hamadan and Sistan-Birjand whom were formed during the Great War, also joined the new army. Reza Khan relied more on the Cossack Commanders who received usually better position in the new army. At the same time there were no more independent forces in the country.

“The army to be composed of five divisions: (1) Tehran, (2) Tabriz, (3) Hamadan, (4) Isfahan and (5) Mashad and the northern Independent Brigade in Rasht. In addition a special Gendarmerie force was organised under the name of Amnieh for the security of the roads” (97) .

Reza Khan related the improvement of country’s security and the strengthening of the Persian Government to his personal ambitious and concentrated the Military power in his hand. Various movements were suppressed one after the other. The authority of Central Government was re-established even in remote areas. The army detachments were stationed throughout the country and the superiority position of the military commanders in the provinces strengthened the position of the Minister of War in Tehran (98).

The cabinets had to allocate and pay the lion share of the budget to the army. He received the support of conservative as well as democrats in parliament. British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine, appreciated the efforts of the Persian Army and his Commander in the north and the west part of the country.

2.6.3. Reza Khan and Sir Percy Loraine

As a result of occupation of the Persian territory during the war and afterwards and British interference in the Persian Affairs, there were “for a good many years a certain hostility to Great Britain”. With the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din the hostility reached to its maximum point for almost two and half years, wrote Havard, British Oriental Secretary. He added: “Government after Government made no attempt to stem that hostility” and “some of them even covertly abetted” Addition to the public, the Persian press and the Parliament had a critical view on British policy in Persia.

During those years, Reza Khan indicated to the British authorities in the Legation in Tehran that he is the only person who is able to bring the security to the country, suppressing the Bolsheviks, and other movements in Persia. The relation of Reza Khan with the British Legation developed, particularly when Sir Percy Loraine was the British Minister in Tehran, 1921-1926 (99).

Loraine and the other members of the Legation such as Oriental Secretary, Godfrey Havard, admired the centralisation policy of Reza Khan. They were of opinion that a centralised Government under Reza Khan would secure British interests in Persia and secure the borders to Iraq, India and the Persian Gulf (100).

2.6.4. Reza Khan in Summer-Autumn 1923

After the fall of coup cabinet, Reza Khan, the Minister of War, desired to take the power and form the cabinet. The circumstances did not let him to follow his idea. He, however, consolidated his position by suppressing the political movements and the tribal unrest's in 1921-1923, in the Northern provinces and then in the south. Gradually, the authority of the army and the Central Government was re-established even in remote areas of the country.

As a result of the victory of the army in provincial campaigns and the stationing of the military detachments throughout the country, the Military Commanders appeared as a new factor in local politics and Reza Khan, the Commander of the Persian Army, became the most powerful man in the country.

2.6.4.1. Internal Power Struggle

In summer and autumn 1923, Reza Khan continued to consolidate his position by the extension of his authority in Tehran. It appears that the choice of time by Reza Khan was partly due to the absent of Persian parliament. The fourth legislative period finished in June 1923 and the fifth Majles began in January 1924 (101). He began to challenge the power of the Shah, Crown Prince, the Prime Minister and the shadow cabinet's leaders. It was a tradition in the Qajar Court to send the Crown Prince to Tabriz. During the summer 1923, Ahmad Shah, who was anxious of his future and the rapid growth of Reza Khan's power, intended to revive this tradition and send his brother, the Crown Prince Mohammad Hassan Mirza, to Azarbaijan.

The Shah sent a decree in July 1923 to the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh. After the approval of cabinet, the date of Crown Prince's departure in August as the Governor-General of Azarbaijan was announced. Suddenly, the Minister of War opposed to the journey of the Crown Prince. He was stopped by Reza Khan from proceeding to Tabriz, to prevent a possible tribal resistance to his power. Ahmad Shah was afraid of his future. He prepared to pay another visit to Europe to escape from „possibly final humiliation“. Moshir al-Dowleh, the Prime Minister, and the other constitutionalists endeavoured to persuade the Shah to stay in Tehran and support the cabinet.

The frightened Shah rejected this proposal. It was rumoured that Ahmad Shah would appoint again the Former Prime Minister, Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh, the only man who was able to challenge the power of Reza Khan, as the chief of cabinet before leaving for Europe (102). Suddenly, on 8 October 1923, Ahmad Khan Qavam al-Saltaneh, was arrested by the order of the Minister for War. He was alleged to have plotted against the Minister of War.

Ahmad Shah, however, obtained from Reza Khan the promise that he would take no step against the life of Qavam life without the Shah consent. The same day, Sir Percy Loraine was leaving Tehran for Baghdad and Ahvaz that he was informed of the arrest of Qavam al-Saltaneh.

With the support of the Shah and the cabinet, Qavam al-Saltaneh was released, but he was exiled to Europe two weeks later. At the same time Reza Khan put pressure on Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh, to resign. Moshir al-Dowleh, who did not succeed to persuade the Shah to stay in Tehran, doubted to be able to run the affairs of the

country in the absence of Shah and Majles. On 22 October 1923, he resigned. At this juncture, Loraine had returned from Khuzestan to the capital (103).

In his journey to the south, British Minister facilitated the situation for the Central Government. Simultaneously, Reza Khan removed two Persian Statesmen, Moshir al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Saltaneh, from power stage. Reza Khan made the situation in the capital insecure. He compelled the young Ahmad Shah to appoint him as the new Prime Minister. No one prepared to accept the premiership. With the mediation of Loraine, Ahmad Shah received first a written guarantee for his safety in the Persian soil, then, inevitably, the frightened Shah appointed Reza Khan as the new Prime Minister.

The Imperial Charter was written in 27 October 1923 accordingly. Two days later, Reza Khan introduced his cabinet first and then accompanied the Shah to the port of Anzali and Ahmad Shah left the country. Reza Khan concentrated the power more and more in his hands (104). In his report of the events to Foreign Office, Loraine considered: Reza Khan “a man with a strong and definite will” and “there is a chance of the country’s affairs being put fairly straight” (105).

2. 7. Reza Khan the Prime Minister

For two years Reza Khan was Prime Minister, Minister of War and the Commander in Chief of the Army. During this period the Persian Cabinet was reshuffled and he introduced new faces as minister to Majles, but the policy of reforms continued. Varieties of reform bills of the cabinet were ratified in Parliament. Two years after the coup, Reza Khan the Prime Minister replaced finally his officers to the Swedish in the police force. The army and regularity forces (Gendarmerie and Police) came under his direct command. He, therefore, increased again his power. Reza Khan: “Wished to restore some of the greatness of Iran and to establish an absolute power within the reconstructed nation. His pursuit of these goals was determined and ruthless; any force that stood in the way of his achievement was mercilessly attacked and, the strength of the landowners, Qajars Court, and liberal democratic ideas-all were subject to his attacks. Inevitably, clerical power, too, has to be reduced ”(106).

2.7.1. The President of the Republic?

Reza Khan was not content with his military and political position as the Prime Minister, the Minister of War and the Commander in Chief of the Army. He intended to become the first person in the country, where he would be in the command of the country and no one could jeopardise his position. Some of his advisors and Military Commanders were advocating the establishment of a republic. At the beginning of 1924, Reza Khan approved a campaign in the country in favour of a republic and Reza Khan as the candidate.

The supporters of Reza Khan, particularly the Military Commanders did their best and used various available means throughout the country against the Qajar's rule and formation a republic. Reza Khan, however, realised that though his effort on security in the country was appreciated by the majority in Parliament and even the minority and the neutrals, but the Persian Parliament and the religious leaders run into opposition with the republican movement. The attempt of Reza Khan to establish a republic in March 1924 resulted in a stinging set back.

He underestimated the power of the clergies who rejected the secular example of Turkish republic. Clerical opposition was so strong, that Reza Khan was driven to resign. Although he understood that his absolute control over the army and the regular forces would bring him quickly back into power (107). Very soon, in April 1924, he asked his supporters to abandon the idea of a republic.

2.7.2. Towards Khuzestan

Reza Khan was to finish the question of the tribal chieftains, as a centre of power in the country, particularly in southern Khuzestan. The Government's departments in the provinces were consolidated. The construction and widen of roads to the west and south-west provinces came into practice. For the reasons the military detachments could pass through the new routes. It was still possible to form a consolidated alliance of the Qajar Court, the Minority in the Parliament and the southern chieftains against the increasing monopoly power of the Reza Khan who had the majority of the fifth Majles in his side (most of them came to Parliament with the support of the Military Commanders in the Provinces).

Apparently, Ahmad Shah did not participate in the alliance and did not return to the country either. The oppositions were not united in Parliament and Press and with regard to the approach of Sheikh Khaz'al in politics in the last three decades, usually, no one trusted him in Tehran even the Minority. As soon as Sheikh Khaz'al declared his opposition to the policy of Prime Minister in autumn 1924, Reza Khan did not waste the time and left Tehran for the south.

He assured British that in his campaign to Khuzestan, the installations of the Oil Company would not be jeopardised. With few casualties and chiefly through political correspondences and then the submission of Sheikh Khaz'al and his tribal allies, he brought to an end the southern rebellion in the south. He stationed military detachments and Military Governors throughout Khuzestan in at the end of December 1924 (108).

After his success in Khuzestan, Reza Khan returned triumphant to Tehran in January 1925. Soon, he asked the Parliament to be appointed as the Commander of the Persian army. Though, according to law, this position belonged to the Shah, but the Parliament ratified the bill in February 1925 (109).

2.8. The change of Dynasty

The efforts of the army on security and integrity of the country caused the popularity of the Minister of War among some social strata of the city dwellers such as merchants and increasing Government's employees. Reza Khan came into understanding with the religious leaders in Tehran and Qom and indicated sympathy to the religion ceremonies. Most of the oppositions inside and outside the Parliament were scattered and frightened. Finally, Ahmad Shah Qajar was abdicated by the Persian Parliament in October 1925 and Reza Khan was appointed as the temporarily ruler of the country.

Then, the Constitutional Assembly ratified and declared Reza Khan as the Shah of Persia and the founder of new Pahlavi dynasty at the end of the year 1925. Reza Khan seized the Persian Kingdom in less than five years. He ascended the Peacock throne some months later in April 1926 (110). The presence of the tribal chieftains in the coronation of Reza Shah was ceremonial and they were mostly the honourable prisoners who had no permission to live in the capital.

2.9. Summary

- (1) Since the beginning of the 19th century, the relations of Persia and European states rapidly developed.
- (2) The modern Europe affected strongly on military and political as well as economy and social structure of Persia.
- (3) As a result of two series of war between Russian and Persian forces and two imposed wars by the British, Persia suffered severe territorial loses.
- (4) The military rivalries between Russian and British in Persia took form the economic penetration and political influence. The two colonial powers gained various economic concessions.
- (5) The Persian statesmen and intellectual endeavoured to modernise the political and economy structure of their country. They were not very successful in their efforts in the 19th century.
- (6) At the beginning of the 20th century, the Persian revolution brought a constitutional Monarchy into power and changed the traditional political system. A modern nation-State and Parliamentary system was implemented.
- (7) British and Russian were still very influential in Persia. A British Company discovered oil in southern Persia in 1908. As a result of oil resources, geo-political position of Persia, during the War 1914-1918, Persia became the bottle field of belligerents. This brought many difficulties for Persia even after the War.
- (8) The withdrawal of Russian troops from Persia after the Bolshevik Revolution caused a vacuum of power in northern Persia. British endeavoured to bring Persia in an advisory system under British surveillance.
- (9) The return of Russia into the world politic in 1920 caused the military failure of British in Persia and the withdrawal of British troops from Persia.
- (10) The object of the Military Commander of the coup of February 1921 was to secure the country against the Bolshevik and Gilan Governments in the north and to implement certain military and administration reforms in the country.
- (11) The success of the army in suppression the rebel movements and tribal unrest strengthened the position of the army commanders in the provinces.
- (12) The commander in chief of the army concentrated the civil and military power in his hand. The Qajar dynasty was deposed and the commander in chief became the Shah of Persia.

Part II. Power Struggle

III. The Great Tribes in Fars in 1919-1921

3.1. Fars and the Great War

The fighting was taken place in full scale around Shiraz, Abadeh and Firuzabad during the summer and autumn 1918, between the Qashqa'i tribe under the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh and his allies in the province of Fars against the occupation of Persia and the British forces, the S.P.R. as well as certain local allies. When the belligerents announced Armistice in 11 November 1918, the fighting still continued in neutral Persia including the province of Fars. Very soon, however, the force of resistance movement in Fars: Shiraz, Bushehr, Kazerun, Abadeh and Firuzabad were frustrated by the influenza in autumn 1918. The epidemic of influenza spread throughout the southern Persia in October-December 1918 in which died a high percentage of tribesmen, villagers and city dweller and twenty per cent of Indian troops (1).

The narrow victory of the S.P.R. and British force at the end of the year 1918 was partly due to modern forces equipped with modern arms and heavy artillery and partly due to the assistance of the local rivals of Sowlat al-Dowleh (in the tribe and in the province), the assistance of Governor-General of Fars and finally the important factor was the contagious of disease. It made, therefore, difficult for Sowlat al-Dowleh to continue the fighting. Some of the leaders of this movement in Bushehr hinterland, however, after the recovery continued the struggle until the middle of 1920 and resisted to the British occupation.

3.2. Fars After the Anglo-Qashqa'i War

After the War, the alliance of British and their local friends found the upper hand in the province of Fars, but the power struggle in the Qashqa'i tribe and in the province of Fars by no means continued. The S.P.R. and the British-Indian forces stationed in the major cities and along the commercial roads. The British "Intelligence department in which well organised by the Commanders of the S.P.R. in previous years were active

and the British consulates in the province interfered in the local and tribal affairs of Fars.

The local allies, who supported British policy during the War, retained their official positions including the Governor-General of Fars, Farmanfarma, the Governor of Bushehr, Ahmad Khan Daryabegi, the main rival of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the province, Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk, the chief of confederation of Khamseh and the Khans of Hayat Dawudi. Inside the Qashqa'i, Ahmad Khan Sardar Ehtesham and Ali Khan Sardar Heshmat, the rivals and brothers of deposed Sowlat al-Dowleh, who were recently appointed as Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Qashqa'i as well as some of the Khans of Kashkuli tribe of Qashqa'i also remained in power (2).

Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk, who enjoyed the strong support of British and had a friendly relation with British consulates in Shiraz and Bushehr, was in a very strong position in Fars after the War. He was the deputy of Governor-General of Fars, the Mayor of Shiraz, the Governor of eastern districts of Fars and the chief of Khamseh confederation. The Khans of Kashkuli tribe a branch of Qashqa'i who had a tense relation with the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sowlat al-Dowleh, looked forward to receive the support of Qavam al-Molk. Even the weak Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sardar Ehtesham, listened to his advice.

The opponents of Qavam al-Molk inside the Khamseh confederation, who looked to the Qashqa'i Ilkhani Sowlat al-Dowleh, were severely suppressed. Most of the lesser tribes in Fars had more sympathy to the leadership of Sowlat al-Dowleh, but in the circumstances remained silence. Though, the Qashqa'i tribe was the strongest tribes in Fars before the War, but they were divided into, at least, two branches during the War and afterwards. First the majority, who still supported Sowlat al-Dowleh. Then the minority, who was against him or was inclined to his brothers,

It appears that the British authorities in Fars realised with the present of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the province and the continuation of fighting in Bushehr hinterland and Kazerun the situation in Fars is shaky.

By the order of General Douglas, the British Commander of British force resided in Bushehr, the place of oppositions in Bushehr hinterland was bombarded and then British-Indian force attacked them at the begin of 1919. The bombardment and fighting, however, continued to the summer 1920 when two leaders of the resistance movement

were killed by the S.P.R. in 22 July 1920. Then the level of fighting to some extent reduced in the following months of the year 1920.

At the begin of the year 1919, the British force in Bushehr finally reached to the town of Kazerun, where the people fought during the war several times against British and allies. The arrival of British force was so important that the commander of British force, General Duglas and H.Bill high political officer in British Residency from Bushehr met in Kazerun Colonel Orton the Commander of the S.P.R. and Colonel Hutson the British consul in Shiraz. A modern castle was built to station the British-Indian force there (3).

3.2.1. British and Sowlat-al Dowleh in 1919

After the Anglo-Qashqa'i War, Sowlat al-Dowleh was in a difficult position. He came into contact with Farmanfarma, the Governor-General of Fars, to secure the Ilkhaniship of the tribe again and to reside in Fars. Farmanfarma knew that the tranquility in Fars and the safety of commercial road Bushehr-Shiraz was partly depended to the good will of Sowlat al-dowleh and he was the only person, who was able to pacify the Qashqa'i tribe. Additionally, the return of Sowlat al-Dowleh was not without financial reward for Farmanfarma. Most of the British political and military authorities in Fars preferred Sowlat al-Dowleh to leave Fars for Tehran or even to send him in exile. Farmanfarma discussed with the British authorities in Shiraz on this matter.

On 5 January 1919 Farmanfarma, received a letter from Sowlat al-Dowleh. He disclaims to able the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. He added that he intends to live in his estates. Farmanfarma consulted Captain John Hotson, the British Consul in Shiraz and John Hugo Bill, the Deputy-Political Resident and General Sir Archibald Douglas, the Commander of British force in Fars, who came to Shiraz and responded to Sowlat al-Dowleh that he had held out hopes of a settlement if Sowlat al- Dowleh abstained from giving further trouble. It was decided a direct negotiation between the British and Persian authorities and Sowlat al-Dowleh (4).

Both the Governor-General of Fars and the British Consul in Shiraz had their reasons. From the view point of Hotson, Sowlat al-Dowleh was the only Ilkhani, who

would follow by the Qashqa'is. It was necessary laborious operations by British troops to crush Sowlat al-Dowleh. Sardar Ehtesham, the new appointee Ilkhani proved useless and he was ready to „give up the position of Ilkhani if assured of personal safety and security. Farmanfarma intended to break the Qashqa'i confederation by bringing certain tribal sections under his own influence and increasing the power of headmen.

Captain John Hotson advocated offering Sowlat light term of, as well as hope's restoration as Ilkhani. The new commander of the S.P.R., Colonel Orton, as well as General Douglas and Bill concurred the suggested terms. It is interesting to point out that on 7 January Sir Percy Cox, the British Minister in Tehran, suggested to India Office that British should go easy in negotiation with Ismai'l Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh. The Government of India supported the view of Cox and informed General Officer Commanding Bushehr.

On 19 January 1919, Sir Percy Cox, argued differently and pointed out in his telegram that the term must be dictated rather than negotiated with Sowlat al-Dowleh and must not be such as would reflected on the British and on the Persian Government. Cox was convinced that certain members of the Persian Cabinet had the above mention views. Cox recommended that British should be in no hurry to initiate negotiations with Sowlat al-Dowleh and British troops should remain on the Bushehr-Shiraz line until early spring. When the general situation should have cleared and British should be in a better position to decide on the best solution of the Sowlat al-Dowleh question (5).

On 23 January, General Douglas explained to the Government of India that the lack of a Persian force” to maintain order necessitated an early solution of the Sowlat question “the great difficulty of crusting Sowlat al-Dowleh by military measures, if stiffening of terms caused a breakdown in negotiations, we must be prepared either to face fresh outbreaks of disorder with which the S.P.R. would be unable to cape, or to keep British troops in the country for an indefinite period (6).

3.2.2. British and the S.P.R.

The function and the efficiency of the S.P.R. during the confrontations and afterwards came under many critics by the British authorities in India and Persia. They doubted that the force could guard the British interests (on contrary to the opinion of

Sykes the organiser of the force. British Government, however, postponed the question of the S.P.R. four days after the appointment of Sir Percy Cox as British Minister in Tehran and informed Marling on 22 August 1918 accordingly.

The victory of Allied in the war caused that the Foreign Office to ignore the suggestion of the Government of India on question of the S.P.R. , but, General Sir Percy Sykes the Commander of the S.P.R. was recalled home and immediately he was replaced by colonel Orton. Cox also ignored all previous discussions on this subject and expressed himself in a statement counter to his previous view about Sowlat al-Dowleh and more in accordance with the policy of Foreign Office (7).

As far as available documents indicate the Chairman of Persian Department since 1916 and Acting British Foreign Secretary in 1919, Lord George Curzon did not prepare the immediate withdrawal of the British forces from Persia before building a solid and permanent position for Great Britain. Sir Percy Cox was sent to Tehran to regulate the relation between the two countries. The Curzon suggestions shaped in the form of Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919. With regard to such background Cox asked the British authorities in the southern Persia not to be in hurry and to be severe towards Sowlat al-Dowleh (8).

As early as March 1919, the Deputy-Political Resident in Bushehr, John Bill, as the representative of the British Government and Daryabegi, the Governor-General of the Persian Gulf coast as the representative of the Persian Government went to Bandar-e-Assalu, a small port in the Persian Gulf, to meet Ismai'l Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh Sardar Ashayer, the former Ilkhani of the great tribe of Qashqa'i. He was accused of rebellion against the Central Government and they asked his submission. Sowlat al-Dowleh rejected their view and replied that he had merely obeyed the order of the Ministers and leading Mullahs to fight against the S.P.R. and British forces.

Sowlat al-Dowleh suggested that he goes to Tehran to submit himself to the Persian Government subject to the provision that his life should be spared and that his estates should be secured to his son.

From British point of view, it was not advisable that he should go by land and he was pressed „to go via Mohammareh and Baghdad. Sowlat al-Dowleh was enough wise to remember the destiny of the other opposition leaders who were captured by the British forces and sent to Mesopotamia and India. He, therefore, refused to go via Baghdad. India Office concurred the suggestion that British should go easy in

negotiation with Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh, in that junction and informed General Commanding Bushehr accordingly (9).

Sometime later, Sheikh Khaz'al suggested mediating between Farmanfarma and Sowlat al-Dowleh. The idea was rejected by Farmanfarma, the Governor-General of Fars. Finally it was settled by Farmanfarma and British authorities in Fars and Tehran that Sowlat al-Dowleh to deposit L10.000 in the Imperial Bank of Persia in Shiraz and signs abound on oath, not to interfere in tribal politics.

Sowlat al-Dowleh should send his son, Nasser Khan to Shiraz, (as hostage) to stay with Farmanfarma and live quietly on his estates (10). The new Commander of the S.P.R., Colonel Orton, as well as General Sir Archibald Douglas, the Commander of British troops in Bushehr and John Bill, Deputy- Political Resident in Bushehr, concurred the suggested terms (11).

As far as the correspondences between Farmanfarma and Sowlat al-Dowleh and between the British consul in Shiraz and the Governor-General of Fars indicate that Farmanfarma supported the residence of Sowlat al-Dowleh in Fars. He achieved to consent the British authorities on this question.

3.3. Farmanfarma and the New Ilkhani

In spite of presence of British troops and the S.P.R., the support of Farmanfarma and Qavam al-Molk, the deputy of Governor-General and the chief of Khamseh confederation, the new Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sardar Ehtesham, was unable to pacify the whole confederation of Qashqa'i, some of the tribal chiefs revealed their opposition to Sardar Ehtesham, but under the circumstances they did not come into direct conflict with him. Farmanfarma appointed Nasr-allah Khan, a friendly Khan to the British as kalantar of Dare-shuri tribe of Qashqa'i and dismissed Ayaz Kikha.

The tribe of Dare-shuri rejected the governor-general's decision and rebelled against him. The majority of the tribe also remained with Ayaz Kikha in opposition to Sardar Ehtesham as Ilkhani. Neither Sardar Ehtesham nor Farmanfarma was able to come into conflict or pacify them. Nasr-allah Khan, on contrary to the expectation took no step to try to get his own back again. Ayaz Kikha wrote a letter to the British political Residency in Bushehr in March 1919. He, however, did not go himself to

Bushehr and Lieutenant Colonel Cregson was deputed to meet him in Lirawi. Then Ayaz Kikha sent his son to Shiraz to stay before Farmanfarma.

Sardar Ehtesham asked him to send his eldest son as hostage for the good behaviour of the tribe. Ayaz Kikha did not fulfill the wish of Ilkhani and send his youngest son. Naturally no settlements were achieved. Despite all these events, Sardar Ehtesham and Farmanfarma were compelled to re-appoint Ayaz Kikha as Kalantar of Dare-shuri after the tribe migrated to their summer quarter in 1919.

The tribe of Farsi-Madan did not rise against the S.P.R., but they received Nasser al-Divan Kazeruni and his follow rebels during the Great War and “showed their sympathy plainly“ and British authorities were angry and urged Sardar Ehtesham to take action against Nasser al -Divan, but he refused to do so. He stated: he was too occupied with Dare-shuri tribe and Ayaz Kikha question. He did not want to provoke the Farsi-madan tribe against himself (12).

Finally, in August 1919, Nasser al-Divan went to Shiraz to the House of Qavam al-Molk, who mediated between him and the Governor-General. Farmanfarma received 5.000T from Nasser al-Divan and then sent him to exile to Darab for two years and Qavam al-Molk took the responsibility that he would not leave the town (13). The latest unrest among the confederation of Qashqa’i happened in summer 1920. A considerable number of Dare-shuri tribe drove into the Bakhtiyari country as a result of a conflict with Ali Khan, the Ilbegi (14). Sardar Ehtesham came into negotiation with the Bakhtiyari Khans for the return of Dare-shuri under a suitable guarantee (15).

It appeared that certain Bakhtiyari Khans were encouraging the Dare-shuris to stay where they were. Though Sardar Ehtesham was loyal to the British, but from British point of view: he “did not appear to possess the necessary capability for governing the tribe” (16). The Qashqa’i tribes had begun to migrate southward towards the winter quarters, in autumn 1920. The Ilkhani, Sardar Ehtesham, however, had gone to Isfahan to be treated (17). He was still there and an interregnum of a Governor-General in Fars at such a season was bound to be an incentive to disorders (18).

More over Sowlat al-Dowleh, who resided in Firuzabad, (a small town and one of the winter quarter of Qashqa’is), was seeking to recover the ilkhaniship of the confederation (19). A high robbery happened on Shiraz-Isfahan road near Abadeh and the property of the Persian representative in League of Nations was stolen. The Ilkhani

of Qashqa'i, Sardar Ehtesham, and Ilbegi, Ali Khan Salar Heshmat, had certain differences. They made several conferences on ilkhaniship in early August 1920.

They were still unable to preserve the order among the Qashqa'is. Farmanfarma was not sure of them during his temporary absence from Fars to Bushehr and Khuzestan in May-July 1920. Farmanfarma called them, both, to Shiraz. Then, he asked Sardar Ehtesham and Salar Heshmat to take necessary measure to preserve the order among the Qashqa'i sub-tribes. He assured them of his support. The British consul in Shiraz was present. In this discussion; the both, the Ilkhani and the Ilbegi „informed the conditions on which they may look for British support (20).

3.4. Fars and Events in the North 1920

During the year 1920, certain events in the national level affected on the situation of Fars in general and the tribal leadership in particular. Ahmad Shah was returning from Europe in May 1920. Farmanfarma, the governor-general of Fars, went to Bushehr to welcome the Shah. He accompanied Ahmad Shah from Bushehr on occasion of his passage through Basreh and Mohammareh (Khoramshahr) where Farmanfarma met Sheikh Khaz'al for the first time. However, they had long been known to each other.

Farmanfarma came to know that the new British Minister in Persia, Herman Norman, on the route of his journey to Tehran would visit Sheikh Khaz'al on board of a yacht in Shatt al-Arab water way near Basreh. Farmanfarma postponed his return to Shiraz to make the acquaintance of the new British Minister. It appears due to the new political condition in Tehran, Farmanfarma was not sure of his position, so he made himself available to the new Minister to emphasis on his friendship to the British and neutralise the possible efforts of his opponents in Tehran.

As a result of a private talk with Farmanfarma, Norman wrote: as I expected, Farmanfarma only wished to protest his devotion and that of his sons to His Majesty's Government, which he assured me the whole family has always unwaveringly professed. Farmanfarma told him he think it is possible that on reaching Tehran, Norman might bear certain thing said to his discredit if so Norman was to remember the assurance which Farmanfarma has just given him and to dismiss such calumnies at once from his mind.

Then, Khaz'al talked to Norman that Farmanfarma's professions of devotion to Great Britain are genuine interest and inclination alike counseled a pro-British attitude and he is the most powerful man in the south so is the Prime Minister in the north. Norman concluded that it was evident from the Sheikh Khaz'al's utterances about Farmanfarma that the two had reached a working arrangement on the extension and purpose of which events may throw a further light (21).

Very soon, after the arrival of Ahmad Shah in Tehran, and before the return of Farmanfarma to Shiraz, Vothuq al-Dowleh, due to his internal and international failures, had to resign (22). The defeat and surrender of British troops to the Russian Bolsheviks in Gilan in May 1920 demoralised the position of British in Persia. The critical situation in Northern provinces caused Formation a democrat and constitutional's cabinet in Tehran.

This affected on political situation in southern provinces as well as the tribal leadership in Fars. After his return from Bushehr 1920, Farmanfarma realised that the public feeling had changed and turned against him (23). A man, who a few months ago were considered by Sheikh Khaz'al as the most powerful man in the south (24), lost his supporters. He regretted that the British authorities in Persia (Shiraz) changed their policy and they did not support him against his opponents (for the maintenance of tranquility).

Farmanfarma believed that the notables and grandees of Fars prepared the causing his disposal by the Central Government. He preferred to stay in Fars and secure the family's position as long as possible. He endeavoured to come to understanding with the notable of Fars, apparently, without success (25). Three weeks later, he wrote to his son and informed him: though his position is still stable and the Central Government also expressed to support him, but he was not certain of the future (26).

3.4.1. The Fall of Farmanfarma

Farmanfarma felt his position is increasingly insecure. He invited the local notables nominally to discuss measures to combat the ravages of locusts, but really with a view to obtain their general support. To his disappointment, however, the notables soon began display inconvenient curiosity about the fate of the provincial revenue,

none of which finds its way to central treasury (27). The relation of Farmanfarma with the S.P.R. was also very unsatisfactory at that time (28).

Meanwhile British Legation suggested the disposal of Daryabegi, the governor of the coastal province and the appointment of Mowaqar al-Dowleh and asked the approval of Farmanfarma (29). The appointment of Governor for coast province was in the jurisdiction of the Governor-General of Fars, the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh appointed a new governor for coastal province. Farmanfarma who regarded the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh as temporary, protested to the appointment and Daryabegi was intriguing against his successor probably at the instance of Farmanfarma who had strenuously opposed the changes (30).

Farmanfarma was of opinion that Nassir al-Molk, a notable of Shiraz conspires against him. Nassir al-Molk also provoked Qavam al-Molk, who had a close relation with Farmanfarma for a long time (31). He arranged sessions and succeeded to reconcile between Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh. Farmanfarma realised that the Democrats party activated again and published various pamphlets (32). The oppositions in Shiraz protested against Farmanfarma and his support of the candidacy of Vothuq al-Dowleh in Fars. Farmanfarma applied for two months on leave, because of circumstances. The Government refused to agree.

A notable of Fars wrote a letter to the Persian Cabinet. It appears that Qavam al-Molk sent the letter with the British consent to Tehran, urging the removal of Farmanfarma, and the latter's appropriation of the revenues, is exciting general concern at Tehran, the movement for his recall is gaining strength and with probably be difficult to resist (33). On 22 September 1920, Farmanfarma resigned and informed the Central Government of his resignation for following reasons: certain notable and dignitaries would desire to take Charge of the offices and participate in political affairs as well as election. They were disappointed to achieve their goals as long as Farmanfarma remain in office (34). The recent British consul in Shiraz, Major Weaver since July 1920, had no confidence on him (35). Qavam al-Molk, who was a great assistant to him, was in difficult position (36) and finally the opposition of Democrats in Shiraz.

One day later, he formulated his view slightly different on the events of Fars in which he compelled to resign: (37) about two months ago, the news of Bolshevik and the events of the north reached to Fars. Nassir al-Molk, who had been jailed and was released only after the arrival of Farmanfarma in Shiraz in 1916. He was, however,

unemployed until now, for four years (1916-1920), He gathered the notable of Fars. They discussed the rights of local people in charge of the administration posts, whereas the others come to Fars and take office.

Now, Farmanfarma offered to employ him, but Nassir al-Molk rejected it. Additionally Farmanfarma had quarrel with a section of Democrats. He believed that they were agitated by some notables of Fars who desired to participate in power politics (38). Farmanfarma left the government building on 16 September 1920 and went out of the city in a garden of Qavam al-Molk and six days later resigned (39). British oriental secretary wrote: the resignation of Farmanfarma forced upon him by increasingly volume of local discontent with his rapacity (40).

It appears that the rapacity of Farmanfarma was known to the people of Fars at least since his appointment and the arrival of his assistant, Sardar Mo'tazed. In fact, the new condition in Persia produced an opportunity to protest to the Farmanfarma's way of rule such as rapacity, interference in ballot box andBritish realised that it was convenient to have a new governor-general in Fars to pacify the public feeling in these circumstances. The letter probably from Qavam al-Molk was a gesture of British consent to the dismissal of Farmanfarma.

A year later the British Consul in Shiraz, Chick, wrote: The four years of the regime of Farmanfarma was not an unmixed blessing His insatiable cupidity given free play by the presence of a British military force and the S.P.R. had left a deep impression on the minds of the many harassed by him" he did untold harm by representing himself in many of his actions as under compulsion from the British' against whose tyranny he was protecting their individual interest (41).

The British Minister in Tehran 1921-1926 in following year, Sir Percy Loraine, also wrote: an additional factor working against British is the rankling memory of the Farmanfarma's four years' oppression and extortion which was only rendered possible by British support (42). On June 1921 Chick was in London, he asked the Foreign Office why does not support Great Britain characters such as Farmanfarma. Oliphant wrote: I explained in reply some of the difficulties with which we have to contend owing to the procrastination of successive Persian Governments in coming to a decision regarding the Anglo-Persian Agreement and in view of the financial stringency everywhere (43).

3.5. Mossadeq, New Governor-General of Fars

After the fall of Vothuq al-Dowleh, in early summer 1920, Hasan Moshir al-Dowleh formed the cabinet and offered to Mohammad Mossadeq the post of Minister of Justice. He accepted the post. Mossadeq who resided in Switzerland (1919-1920) where he publicised his opposition to the agreement 1919, left Marseilles for Bombay. He intended to go via Basreh and Baghdad to Tehran.

The shortest route for Tehran was, however, via Caucasus, but the road into Persia was closed. On the board of the ship he saw Sir Percy Cox, the former British Minister in Tehran and now, the British High Commissioner in Baghdad. Cox informed him that the Basreh-Baghdad railway had disrupted by the Arabs. Then Mossadeq sailed from Bombay and landed in Bushehr and proceeded to Shiraz on his way to Tehran (44).

He arrived in Shiraz some weeks after the resignation of Farmanfarma. The Central Government could not find a suitable governor-general for Fars. It appears the empty treasury made it harder for the Persian Government to take a decision. The notable and elderly citizen of Shiraz telegraphed to Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh, and asked him to appoint Mossadeq to the post of Governor-General of Fars. In a presence telegraphic with the Prime Minister, Mossadeq responded to him positively, but he told the notable of Shiraz that he would take the post of Governor-General, if they promise to deal with the public fairly.

They agreed to do so. It is ironic that the personalities who caused the resignation of Farmanfarma, requested his nephew, Mohammad Mossadeq, to admit the governorship of Fars. The presence of a governor-general on the spot was important to superintend migration of tribes to winter quarters which was always apt to give rise to disturbances (45) and reduce petite raids on the roads. Political records of Mossadeq had an important role in offering the governorship of Fars by dignitaries of Shiraz. Moshir al-Dowleh described him to the British Minister as honest, intelligent, capable, well-educated and a very friendly to British (46). Mossadeq himself attributed a part of his success in Fars to having made use of only local staff (47).

He rejected also to receive a monthly 2000T from the Chief of Khamseh confederation Qavam al-Molk; and the same amount from Sowlat al-Dowleh as well as Nassir al-Molk, but Mossadeq asked them to reduce the percentage of taxes to the people in their Charge. Before Mossadeq took the Charge of office in Fars, a great

robbery happened near Abadeh, the property of a Persian politician, Arfa, on his way to Europe was plundered by the Dareshuri's tribesmen of Qashqa'i. By the request of Mossadeq, all property was returned to Arfa al-Dowleh.

Mossadeq had a cordial relation with the British representatives in Fars, Major Weaver and then Major Mead; British Consul in Shiraz and Colonel Fraser, the Commander of the S.P.R. British Minister reported that the appointment of Mossadeq „was agreeable to local notables, and he appears to get on well with the British Consul in Shiraz (48). Mossadeq, however, reminded the British authorities not to interfere in the affairs of the province. They should complain to him, in case of any high robbery and it was his duty to find the solution to the questions. Mossadeq said if they follow the policy of interference he would leave the province of Fars.

He told Major Weaver, as you mentioned previously that the people of Fars hated The S.P.R. and British authorities would like to reduce the public dislike. If so, the S.P.R. should not interfere for any reasons in local affairs otherwise it would increase the public irritation (49). The report of British Minister indicates that the British authorities approved the manner of Mossadeq. Norman reported: now an honest governor-general has taken Farmanfarma's place in Fars and that province has been freed from exaction's which have cripple it for more than four years.

Previous to Mossadeq, British authorities had taken a deposit from certain tribal chiefs in order to keep them quiet. They returned the deposits to Mossadeq and said that reasons for deposits not exist anymore and the tribal chiefs should be obliged to you. More over the chiefs trust you as well (50). Mossadeq implemented a new tribal policy in Fars, as he took office in Shiraz. He realised that Nasser Khan, the son of Sowlat al Dowleh, who fought against British force in Fars, was present among the other dignitaries of Fars was kept a Government hostage with the British consent. He permitted the young Nasser Khan to return to the Qashqa'i tribe (51).

3.5.1. Sowlat al-Dowleh Returned to Power

From Mossadeq point of view the security of Fars required the appointment of Sowlat al Dowleh, Ismai'l Khan, as Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. Farmanfarma also had reached to the same conclusion in the last month of his rule. He agreed to appoint Sardar

Ashayer as Ilkhani, if he would pay 60.000 T as bribe to him. (52). Sowlat al-Dowleh refused to pay so much money to Farmanfarma (53). British, however, wrongly thought that Sowlat al Dowleh succeeded to purchase the support of Governor-General (54). Sowlat al Dowleh who did not ready to any arrangement with Farmanfarma, negotiated with Qavam al-Molk for reconciliation. Nassir al-Molk mediated between the two arch-rivals of Fars, while Farmanfarma was still in office (55). As Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh felt that it is necessary the reconciliation with Qavam al-Molk as preliminary to his reappointment (56), thus Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk obliged himself, in consequence of political changes in the country, to come into term with Sowlat al-Dowleh.

British found it also necessary to compromise with Sowlat al-Dowleh especially when the possibility of seizure of Tehran by the force of the republic of Gilan and the evacuation of capital towards the south and formation of a southern confederation brought under consideration (57). Sowlat al-Dowleh as a nationalist campaigner could not any more was ignored. On arrival of Mossadeq in Shiraz, besides the strong support of Democrats, Sowlat al-Dowleh had reached to understanding with Qavam al-Molk on Mossadeq Governorship.

In fact, the representative of Sowlat al-Dowleh (because he resided in Firuzabad) was among the notables of Fars who encouraged Mossadeq to accept the post of governor-general. Mossadeq agreed to do so, if Qavam al-Molk, Sowlat al-Dowleh and Nassir al-Molk collaborate with his policy on security of Fars, whereas Sardar Ehtesham (Ahmad Khan) still was the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. Mossadeq for the reason of security of Fars wanted to re-appoint Sowlat al-Dowleh as Ilkhani.

Sowlat al-Dowleh had to compromise with his brothers and the kalantars (the chiefs) of Kashkuli tribe, whom British Legation, British forces as well as Qavam al-Molk supported them. They, all, the British, Qavam al-Molk and the brothers of Sowlat for different reasons encouraged the Kashkuli Khans to resist to the rule of Sowlat al-Dowleh. Finally, on 7 December 1920, Mossadeq appointed Nasser Khan, the son of Sowlat al-Dowleh, a youth of twenty as the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and the son of his rival, half-brother, Sardar Ehtesham as Ilbegi (58).

The complicated situation let to such reconciliation between Sardar Ehtesham and Sowlat al-Dowleh. At a formal gathering at Dilgusha (Delgosha) garden the two brothers accepted formally and in writing the settlement. The new Ilkhani and Ilbegi are

both quite young and inexperienced. They will be guided a great deal by their respective fathers (59). It appears that the circumstances in the north lead and obliged the British authorities in Persia to compromise with the nationalists and constitutionalists. Though, the British troops and the S.P.R. were still in Fars, but the British authorities realised that Sowlat al-Dowleh, as the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i has the power and is in a position to keep the tribe quiet.

In the following year, in 1921 the British Minister in Tehran, Herman Norman, 1920-1921 informed Herbert Chick, the British Consul in Shiraz, that in view of Sardar Ehtesham's incompetence, Sowlat al-Dowleh is as present the only possible Ilkhani (60) and the successor of Norman, British Charge d'Affaires Roland Bridgeman, asked Chick in Shiraz that Sardar Ehtesham interests should be adequately guarded by guarantees on the reinstatement of Sowlat al-Dowleh (61).

Ali Khan, the strongest opponent of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the tribe, who enjoyed the British support as Ilbegi during 1918-1920, lost his position. Sowlat al-Dowleh had to grant certain concession to the Kashkuli Khans. The reason of British support of Kashkuli special statue can be possibly seen in the following years agreement of the A.P.O.C. with the Kashkkuli Khans.

In addition to the Mossadeq's approval, British Legation's consent in that juncture was one of the important factors of Sowlat al-Dowleh's success. Sowlat al-Dowleh had to compromise with Qavam al-Molk, his brothers and the chiefs of Kashkuli. The above mentioned source indicates that Sowlat al-Dowleh employed almost all possibilities to achieve at least to defacto Ilkhaniship of Qashqa'i. The British Legation's reason of supporting and compromising with Sowlat al-Dowleh was the Bolshevik menace from the north and the question of transferring the capital from Tehran to Isfahan and formation a confederation of great tribes in the south-west to defend of Central Government and British interests in the south.

Apart from the strong character, the position of the Sowlat al-Dowleh among the Qashqa'i tribesmen and the people of Fars, the disorder in the tribes could not be ignored in any price at that time. Incapability and inefficiency of Sardar Ehtesham and Salar Heshmat facilitated the willing of Sowlat al-Dowleh and British expected with the new agreement, the tribal affairs of the Qashqa'i would be better administered and the confederation would kept in better order (62). Sardar Ehtesham had a share of power as

defacato Ilbegi. Kashkuli Khans kept their position, but paid taxes to Sowlat al-Dowleh, their subservience to him was of a somewhat loose nature.

Sowlat al-Dowleh recognised, by the agreement of December 1920, that Qavam al-Molk should extend his paternal benevolence to the Kashkulis and should even nominate the kalantars of the tribe (63). Sir Percy Loraine, who was appointed as the British Minister in October 1921 and arrived in Tehran in December, informed the Foreign Office that although the Kashkuli tribe pays taxes to Sowlat al-Dowleh their subservience to him is of somewhat loose nature and by an agreement in December 1920, Sowlat al-Dowleh recognised that Qavam al-Molk should extend his paternal benevolence to the Kashkulis and he should even nominate the kalantar of the tribe, but the Kashkulis are too far removed from Qavam al-Molk immediate influence to be able to count on his protection if Sowlat al-Dowleh should ready wish to oppress them (64). For this reason the Kashkuli Khans were afraid of him mortally.

3.5.2. Mossadeq and the Coup Regime

Suddenly, on 22 February 1921, for three days, the telegraphic connections of the province of Fars were cut. Then it was known that the Persian Cossacks seized the power in Tehran and a famous journalist Seyyed Zia al-Din Tabataba'i, who was the civil part of the coup, was appointed as the Prime Minister. Seyyed Zia asked Mossadeq the Governor-General of Fars, to recognise the Coup Regime as legitimate Persian Government.

He threateningly reminded Mossadeq that he had taken sever action against the politicians in Tehran. For two reasons Mossadeq refused to recognise the new Cabinet: (a) the past record of Seyyed Zia al-Din. (b) Now his autocratic way of governing. Mossadeq did not recognise the Coup Cabinet. He resigned and left for Tehran (65). Near the city of Isfahan, he was informed that he would be arrested if he stays in the city. He passed through Isfahan without halting there. Mossadeq, however, waited of his family in a village out of the city, where he received a message from the Governor-General of Isfahan, Sardar Mohtasham, one of the important members of the ruling families of the great nomad tribe of Bakhtiyari.

The Governor-General of Isfahan was aware of the order of the Cabinet. He ignored it, but not openly. In his message, Sardar Mohtasham invited Mossadeq to go to Bakhtiyari-land where he could stay as the guest of the ruling families. Mossadeq accepted the invitation and left for Chahar Mahal and Bakhtiyari mountains. He was received by the Bakhtiyari Khans warmly (66).

Naturally, the Coup Cabinet did not know exactly, how he went to Bakhtiyari and they were not in a position to arrest him. The people of Fars became unhappy of the Mossadeq's resignation. His liberal way of governing and his honesty on financial matter made him very popular in Fars. The people stated: if Mossadeq goes from Shiraz, we would get again into formerly misery days (67).

The newspapers like Estakhr reported and reaffirmed the above mentioned view sometime after the departure of Mossadeq from the city (68). Mossadeq like the other liberal nationalists followed the policy of balance of power in Fars in the absence of a national army. The security of Fars would jeopardise, if the balance of power between Sowlat al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Molk would ignore. He supported Sowlat al Dowleh in the presence of the S.P.R. in Fars and the British consulate. Certainly Sowlat al-Dowleh benefited of the presence of Mossadeq in Fars.

Herbert Chick, who had served in British Legation in Tehran 1906 and Political Residency in Bushehr 1906-1918, was installed in March 1921 as the new British consul in Shiraz, the same month as Mossadeq resigned. He was not pleased with the Mossadeq's action in relation to the coup d'état and his resignation from the governorship of Fars. A coup in which was engineered by the British.

He wrote: Apart from the temporary influence of the Governor-General, was clearly shown in remarkable outburst of "non-co-operation-operation" "with Tehran in February and March 1921 when the coup d'état of Seyyed Zia al-Din took place and met with small resistance elsewhere. Musaddiqes Sultaneh was there as much led as the leader! The only matter for surprise was that such a different stamp of man from Farmanfarma, a demagogue and student of law in Europe, should not put himself at its place"(69).

In another report, Chick wrote about the view of the people in Fars, on the governor-generals and the relation of these statesmen with the British consulate. He reported on the rule of Farmanfarma as rapacious and Nosrat al-Saltaneh as a weak personality. He remained almost silence about Mossadeq who without rapacious,

secured the province from high robbery. Chick remained silent on public satisfaction of Mossadeq rule either (70).

3.6. Governor-General of the Coup Regime

The Prime Minister of the Coup Regime, Seyyed Zia al-Din, had an Anglo-phile attitude during the Great War. He supported also the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 and admired the pro-British Cabinet of Vothuq al Dowleh. Those views reflected in his newspaper Raad and his close relation with the British Legation was fully known to the public. The coup d'état itself was considered as British made. This regime had arrested most of the politicians and journalists, even among them Farmanfarma, who had been knighted the "Grad Cross of British order" and two of his sons.

Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh, the uncle of Ahmad Shah, was appointed as the new Governor-General of Fars. He was instructed and given him "carte blanche" to collect taxes which the new regime badly needed. Nosrat al-Saltaneh proceeded for Isfahan and Abadeh, where he stays about one month. He expected to hear from the Acting Governor-General of Fars, but no one came to welcome him. The reason for delay may be understood on Qavam al-Molk's difficulty with the coup regime in Tehran.

3.6.1. Qavam al Molk and New Governor-General

With regard to the events in Tehran and the arrest of a large number of politicians and the British full support of the Seyyed Zia Cabinet, Qavam al-Molk got the feeling of insecurity on his position, personal safety and property. Qavam al-Molk did not know how the new Governor-General would deal with him. Would he be arrested by the order of Nosrat al-Saltaneh. Secondly like most of the tribal chiefs, Qavam al-Molk had not fully paid his taxes for almost a decade and he was expected by Nosrat al-Saltaneh to put a large amount of taxes on him.

Qavam al-Molk intended to see the British consul to find out the new British policy in this circumstance in Fars, and would ask a written assurance on his safety and the mediation of British authorities on his matters. Qavam al-Molk knew that his friendship was still valuable to the British. He wanted to kill two birds with one shot.

On Saturday 3 April, 1921 Qavam al-Molk visited Consul Chick and told him since Thursday, 30 March, he had come to the conclusion that the British had no confidence on him and he prepare to return to the British the remaining arms supplied to his father and himself, leaving his property to be administered the new Government and going to India with his family.

He continued to say: the chiefs of his Arab tribes and other adherents had been strongly against his return to Shiraz at this juncture. Then they intended to send a force with him. Qavam al-Molk pointed out, on account of assistance in which given to his father and himself he felt indebtedness to the British, otherwise he would have taken up attitude of defense against new regime He continued to say if British do not wish that he goes to India, he requires a guarantee from British that he would not be arrested. Secondly, as regards personal property and tribal districts that with large expenditure for upkeep of the S.P.R.greatly increased sums might be demanded from him (and other Persian payers) beyond his means. In other words he wanted to justify his payments in previous years and still expected a tax reduction in one way or another.

Chick suggested to Qavam al-Molk that the British Consul or a British financial official nominated as arbitrator on that matter. Qavam was willing to accept this suggestion without paying attention that the British had no arbitrary rights in Persia (71). Qavam al-Molk alarmed for his personal safety and his properties and he wanted to take bast (sanctuary) in the British Consulate. Chick dissuaded him not to do so. Finally Qavam al-Molk stated he would proceed to Abadeh to meet Nosrat al-Saltaneh if British gave him a written guarantee.

Chick got in touch with the British Minister on the subject. Chick wired: "Qavam al-Molk was greatly antagonised by the measures of the Cabinet of Seyyed Zia al-Din for the menace which he saw in its program to his own territorial and tribal sway in Fars" and also to imprison of the grandees of Persia. Qavam al-Molk held British support to the Cabinet responsible. Chick realised from conversation with others that Qavam al-Molk was particularly il-impressed, because a personality like Farmanfarma who was knighted Grand Cross of British orders, did not receive good offices of British Legation (72).

Norman talked to Seyyed Zia al-Din immediately. The Prime Minister of War the coup responded positively. Chick wrote to Qavam al-Molk that he was instructed by the British Minister, to give him the assurances in writing as follow: Seyyed Zia al-Din

assured Norman that neither the Persian Government nor the Governor-General has idea of arresting Qavam al-Molk. Seyyed Zia al-Din rejected the official arbitration of British functionaries between the Persian Government and a Persian subject.

He promised, however, that the British financial adviser will be consulted in the matter of revenue collection. Norman authorised Chick to inform Qavam al-Molk that he „can count on the good offices of his Majesty’s Legation and consulate to secure execution of these assurances. Norman asked Qavam al-Molk to send at once a loyal telegram to Seyyed Zia al-Din and proceed to Abadeh to meet the new governor-general of Fars. On 14 April 1921 additional assurances from Seyyed Zia communicated through the British Minister to the British consul. Seyyed Zia al-Din, promised that the claims of Qavam al-Molk would receive favourable consideration. He added that the new finance agent is an old friend of Qavam al-Molk’s family.

Finally Seyyed Zia asked Qavam al-Molk to co-operate whole heartily and energetically with the cabinet and the governor-general of Fars (73). Qavam al-Molk wrote a letter to the consulate in 4 May 1921. He thanked for the British mediation on the affairs of Qavam al-Molk’s jurisdiction and his tax and protection of his interests and his personal dignity. Then he expressed his loyalty to the throne, the cabinet and the governor-general, Nosrat al-Saltaneh (74).

Chick informed the Legation of Qavam al-Molk’s letter. Qavam al-Molk was grateful for the British Minister’s efforts to obtain for him a special settlement and assured position under the new regime. Chick did not waste the time to propound the Sowlat tax question to the Legation and his possible involvement with Government. The settlement of Qavam al-Molk, s taxation, let the way clear for the task of tackling Sowlat al-Dowleh, Sardar Ashayer Qashqa’i regarding his outstanding some 600.000 Ts during the past 10 years. In spring 1921, Sowlat al-Dowleh signed a bond to pay a nearly full tax of the Qashqa’i confederation (75).

Despite the fact that Qavam al-Molk received assurance, he sent his family away from Shiraz and gathered a large force of his Khamseh tribesmen before leaving for Abadeh to bring the governor-general to Shiraz. He arrived in Shiraz 10 May 1920 (76). Qavam al-Molk in his letter of 5 May 1921 pointed out „responsibility for the taxes at present assessed should not be attributed to me in respect of place within my jurisdiction whether tribes of district’s which have been ruined (deprived of all yield) by the

disturbances which happened in recent years or for nomad tribes which for the same reasons have disappeared and became scattered (77).

3.7. Summary

- (1) British and the tribal ally's forces achieved a narrow victory in the Anglo-Qashqa'i War at the end of the year 1918.
- (2) After the Great War, the anti-British pro-British tribal chieftains remained in office. The others lost their political position.
- (3) The Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Ismai'l Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh was deposed. He resided in his private estate in southern Fars, but his elder son had to go to Shiraz.
- (4) With the occupation of Anzali in May 20, 1920 by the Russian Bolsheviks and formation a coalition Government in Gilan, the political condition changed in Tehran, a moderate cabinet was formed by H.Moshir al-Dowleh in July 1920.
- (5) Under the pressure of nobles and Democrat Party in Shiraz, the Governor-General of Fars A.H.Farmanfarma also compelled to resign September 1920, a new Governor- General, Mohammad Mossadeq, came to power.
- (6) M.Mossadeq had a new approach in tribal policy; Sowlat al-Dowleh became defacto Ilkhani of Qashqa'i; British Legation in Tehran consented, and the local tribal rivals in Fars reconciled in the circumstances.
- (7) A military coup was taken place in Tehran on February 21, 1921 and arrested most of politicians. The governor-general of Fars did not recognise the Coup Cabinet in Tehran and resigned.
- (8) M.Mossadeq was invited by the Bakhtiyari khans to go to the Bakhtiyari land. He went to summer quarters of the Bakhtiyari tribe as the guest of the Khans. He left Bakhtiyari land only after the fall of the chief of the Coup Cabinet.
- (9) The chief of the Khamseh confederation did not prepare to receive the Governor General of the Coup Regime unless he would receive a personal guarantee through the British consulate in Shiraz. He was assured and promised on taxation question, his claims would receive with favourable consideration.

IV: The Events of Fars in 1921-1922

4.1. Fars After the Fall of Coup Cabinet

With the resignation of Mossadeq the Coup Cabinet appointed Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh as the new Governor-General of Fars. He collected the taxes of the Province forcefully. The landowners, mullahs and Democrats “were cowed”. Sowlat al-Dowleh signed a bond “to pay a nearly the full tax on tribe”. Exceptionally, the mediation of British saved Qavam al-Molk from paying the full tax. Simultaneously in 23 March 1921 Herbert Chick, who was in Persia since 1906 and was familiar with the local affairs in the south, was appointed as the British Consul in Shiraz.

He followed actively an interference policy even more than his predecessors especially in tribal affairs of Fars. Chick conspired against Sowlat al-Dowleh to break his power. He provoked the opponents and the rivals of Sowlat al-Dowleh, his brothers, Kashkuli Khans, Qavam al-Molk as well as Nosrat al-Saltaneh, the Governor General of Fars, against him.

The British Charge d’Affaires in Tehran, Reginald Bridgeman, warned him and pointed out: “I am strongly opposed to our intervention against Soulat (Sowlat) either in favour of Kashkulis or the Qavam (al-Molk). Soulat was reinstalled with the active co-operation of H. M’s Consul and the Qavam. He is still the strongest unit amongst the Kashgais (Qashqa’i) even though he may be far less powerful than formerly. Sardar Ihtisham (Ehtesham) interests should be adequately safe-guarded by guarantees on reinstallation of Soulat.

Now that Soulat has been reinstalled we cannot support Sardar Ihtisham in such a way as to undermine former, Qavam should be only defendant (1). We should not support him in offensive measures. His supremacy in Fars is beneficial generally to our interests, but that will not facilitate by supporting him in attacking his opponents. Such intervention on our part might even undermine his position” (2).

A short time after the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din’s Cabinet and before the dissolution of the first section of the S.P.R. in August 1921, began the bolder criticise of the British policy in Persia. Chick endeavoured to bring a section of the S.P.R. under the authority of Qavam al-Molk on the time of dissolution of the force. He did his best to

persuade the British Charge d, Affaires, Bridgeman to conclude the oil agreement and formation a guard with the Kashkuli Khans. The disclosure of Chick's actions intensified the anti-British atmosphere in Fars.

The newspapers of Shiraz wrote several articles on British tribal policy in general and in Fars particular in summer and autumn especially in October 1921. They criticised strongly the relation of Chick with the Khans of Kashkuli and Hayat Dawudi. In an article was written: The most important duty of the representatives and Consuls of this beloved power in all part of Persia are to attract the tribes. They invite the tribal chieftains with flattery and enchantments, friendliness and kindness to friendship with British Government and disobedient to their own government. Whichever of tribes surrenders and is deceived, they friendship receives amongst other thing like watches.

Chick informed the British Minister in Tehran that the letters of H.M.s Consul to Persians in country district are being taken from the messengers and handed over to the Democrats for capital to be made out of them. Of course, the leaders of the party are not at all pleased that the consul should possess a personal influence with the chiefs of tribes, and carry weight in the country between Shiraz and the coast (3). Chick pointed out that the British Consulate is placed in an extremely difficult, hostile and isolated situation.

4.2. Dissolution of South Persia Rifles

The news of the S.P.R. dissolution in such circumstances was alarming to the British friends, personalities and British local authorities in Fars as well as Foreign Office and Admiralty. A force, whose idea was raised at the beginning of the 20th century, materialised in 1916 and fully discredited in 1918. In spite of the critical views of the local British authorities in Persia and India, Foreign Office neither disbanded the force nor handed over to the Persian government at the end of the war It was, however, suggested through the Anglo-Persian military commission that the S.P.R. should be form the first unit of the uniform army of Persia under British supervise based on the agreement of 1919.

At the end of 1920 it was clear that the agreement would not be ratified by the Persian Parliament. Then the expenditure of the S.P.R. was a matter of long

correspondences between the India Office, War Office and Foreign Office. Again the question of dissolution of the force was brought forth for discussion. Admiralty prepared a memorandum for the Cabinet and Foreign Office corresponded with Foreign Office and India Office on this matter. Both, Admiralty and War Office considered that the presence of the S.P.R. is extremely important for the safety of the Persian oil fields.

It should be here mentioned that the cost of the force up to 31 March 1921 was paid in equal shares by the British Government and the Government of India (4). India Office was not prepared to pay any further. Winston Churchill, the Secretary of War, did endeavour to persuade the India Office to continue the payment of the Government of India's share of the cost. He argued (on base of the information that he received from Armitage Smith) owing to the fall in Persian exchange the figure is half to the other years. Churchill continued to say that he, the Secretary of War, considered: If India paid half of this figure would become a manageable onethe withdrawal from Persia leading to the loss of northern part of Persia may be attended by the moving of the capital from Tehran to Isfahan. This is surely very much in our (British) interests, but it is impossible unless the S.P.R. was maintained. If they disbanded, the whole of South Persia will be ruined as well as north Persia (5).

India Office responded: because of an intensely critical attitude of Indian public opinion towards all expenditure of Indian revenues outside India, they were unable to pay half the figure any further (6). Curzon considered that it is extreme desirable from British interests in Persia point of view "of maintaining the S.P.R. in a state of reasonable efficiency" (7), but he explained that the financial position in Britain is difficult. Finally Curzon succeeded to convince the Cabinet and Treasury that in view of great importance of steadying position in South Persia. Treasury consented to find a maximum sum of 225.000, to be expended upon South Persia Rifles, with a view either to ultimate dissolution of force or to incorporation in Persian army (8).

The Prime Minister of coup d'état adopted a positive line towards the S.P.R. He called the S.P.R. the South Force and in his first days of premiership ordered the commander of the force in Shiraz to send certain columns and artillery to Tehran, This column, however, reached only to Isfahan (9). He included in the budget of the government a monthly allotment of 200.000 T for the S.P.R., but had little hope of being able to pay it before May 1921 and Norman considered that it is doubtful whether they will be able to pay the whole some regularly for some months to come.

Seyyed Zia fell from power at the end of May 1921 and one of his political prisoners the former Governor-General of Khorassan, Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh, formed the new cabinet. This Cabinet did not prepare to take part in the expenditure of the S.P.R., but also asked British to hand over the force to the Persian Government and the British officers „should leave in the space of some three to six months (10).

Foreign Office prepared to disband the force in three stages in July, September and October 1921 and not to hand over to the Persian Government. The British authorities in Persia; Bushehr, Shiraz and Tehran, as well as the War Office, Admiralty and the A.P.O.C., they, all, anticipated state of serious disorder and high way robbery by nomad tribesmen and bandits and „excessive tolls blackmail by the local Khans and Guards (11).

It was also dangerous to the security of the country by suddenly throwing out the men of the S.P.R. and of their employment (12). The whole question was on security of the oil fields. If British position in the south is to collapse and “the field is to be left open to the Bolsheviks, the reaction on Mesopotamia situation can hardly full to be serious. How are we (British) to count on the continued protection of oil fields if oil fields are threaten, is not certain that War Office will want to send troops from Mesopotamia”(13).

Since April 1921, British treasury granted L 225.000 on condition that the force for a period not exceeding six months would be disbanded (14). Foreign Office informed Norman that the British Government was strongly opposed to proposed sale of any arms or ammunition to the Bakhtiyaris or other tribes and they did not wish to full the arms into the hands of the Persian Government (15). Curzon instructed Norman that he should make best arrangements for the evacuation of arms to coast, if this can be done ... “alternative appears to be destruction either by fire, water or removal of breech blacks” (16).

In fact, the British Government had demanded the Persian Government to pay six years expenditures of the S.P.R. It was strongly rejected by the Persian Government and the two governments reached to no agreement. In spite of previous promises of the British to hand over the arms and ammunitions of the S.P.R. to Persia, they mainly transferred the arms to India or destroyed at the place (17).

4.2.1. Qavam al-Molk and South Persia Rifles

The presence of the S.P.R. and the British military as well as the British financial support enabled Qavam al-Molk to regain his position in Fars, to maintain a tight hold over Khamseh confederation and over eastern Fars where he was granted the governorship, and enabled him influence even among the lesser tribes and certain tribes of Qashqa'i.

The disappearance of the S.P.R. was alarming to him on return a possible force of Gendarmerie or "from attack of sudden arrest "by the Cossacks of the Minister for War. The common interests of the British and the chief of Khamseh tribes caused that the suggestion of Qavam al-Molk received happily by the British consul and the other British authorities in Fars.

On July 1921, Qavam al-Molk told Chick what could be done in the way of raising money in the province and thought 2.000 trained men centered in one or two points". It was suffice, as predicted, for any purpose except the invasion of a large force of Bolshevik. Qavam al-Molk prepared to assume the chief direction of affairs in case of need. Chick reported the suggestion to the British authorities through the Legation. He added: should the present Governor-General's position at any time become impossible, to get Qavam al-Molk appointed Governor-General and he could utilise the Khamseh tribes forces to support his rule.

Were that eventually to occur before the final dissolution of the S.P.R., Qavam al-Molk retain nucleus. As long as the present regime in Tehran lasts and the governor-general is here, Qavam al-Molk would remain in the background (18). The plan of Qavam al-Molk and Chick was reshaped and in September 1921, before the dissolution of the second third of the S.P.R., Qavam al-Molk suggested to the Governor-General of Fars and the Central Government the retention of the remaining third of the force or 1.000 man, "fully equipped" "under the best of their Persian officers". He added he would provide 15.000 T monthly from his taxes. He was willing to exercise a general control. In other words he would being in predominant military position in Fars, if the government would sanction the suggestion. Qavam al-Molk, proposal was in accordance with the British interests, and "special sanction from H.M.'s Government had been given to suggestion of Colonel Fraser, based on the possibility of the

acceptance by the Persian Government of the above proposal, for the retention of some 800 rifles and ammunition to arm special force for Fars”(19).

From the viewpoint of Sowlat al-Dowleh, who was in touch with the Central Government and the fourth Majles on this subject, as well as from the Persian Government point of view this political action of Qavam al-Molk would keep „British influence throughout the retention of a nucleus of its force. Though, Qavam al-Molk was blamed by above mentioned sources and nationalist circles and also the proposal conflicted with the aspiration of the Minister of War, (20) but Chick did endeavour to gain the approval of the Legation for this proposal (21).

Bridgeman, who judge the situation from the spot, finally informed him that the Persian Government officially requested the British Legation to sell no arms and ammunition to any unofficial person. We (British) were unable therefore to assist the Kavam in his plan for a Fars force (22). Meanwhile the Minister for War sent a Lieutenant-Colonel Cossack to Fars to take the command of 400 officers and men of Nizam or regular army. He raised the number to 1100 men and 70 officers, partly from disbanded the S.P.R . The Ministry of War announced 10.000 troops for the south as a part of uniform army.

Qavam al-Molk underestimated the political climate in Tehran and military khunta aspiration, but he made Sowlat al-Dowleh responsible for his failure. Qavam al-Molk prepared to arrange a plot against Sowlat al-Dowleh near Shiraz on autumn migration in 1921. Meanwhile the Ilkhani of Qashqa’i came to know that a secret discussion between the British Consul in Shiraz and the Kashkuli Khans on Exploitation of oil in Dasht-e Qir and the conclusion of an agreement was in process.

4.3. Sowlat al-Dowleh and British Legation

Sowlat al-Dowleh, decided to come into direct talk with the British Legation in Tehran to find a solution for differences as well as the oil agreement (23). He sent a letter and certain verbal message to the British oriental secretary through Sardar Fakher (a member of parliament and later the speaker of Majles). He gave a gesture to establish a friendly relation with the Legation. He wanted to withdraw his deposit L 10.000 from the Imperial Bank of Persia with the approval of British Legation. He objected to the

appointment of his brother, Sardar Ehtesham as the governor of Kazerun, where he was able to intrigue among the Qashqa'i in winter quarter.

Sowlat al-Dowleh expected Chick to strengthen his position and dealing with Qashqa'is through him alone and he objected to the Chick's direct relation with the Kashkuli Khans especially in matter of oil exploitation. He maintained that as Ilkhani he is the only authority with which Chick and the Oil Company should negotiate. Norman agreed to the repayment of the deposit to Sowlat al-Dowleh.

From Norman point of view Sowlat al-Dowleh was "quite untrustworthy „but Sardar Ehtesham was incompetent and Sowlat al-Dowleh was" the only possible Ilkhani so far as British interests allow, he should be supported in any tribal arrangement and British Legation would stand aside and let the friends of Sowlat al-Dowleh in Tehran arrange the removal of Sardar Ehtesham from the Governorship of Karzerun.

Norman did not know what would happen if British try to eliminate Sowlat al-Dowleh, when they make arrangement for the exploitation of oil in the Kashkuli winter quarter. Could Sowlat al-Dowleh interfere the Angle-Persian Oil Company's project or taking a hostile attitude and inciting the Qashqa'i to damage the British interests? (24). Political Resident-Bushier was of opinion that Sowlat al-Dowleh could make difficult situation if he was ignored (25). Norman left Tehran for England in October 1921 and succeeded by a Charge d'Affaires, Reginald Bridgeman, who would stay in Tehran until the arrival of a new Minister.

Chick expressed a different view on Sowlat al-Dowleh: neither Qashqa'is nor Sowlat al-Dowleh are what they were before the war Kashkuli and a large part of Dareshuri are bitterly oppose to Sowlat al-Dowleh. I am inclined, wrote Chick, to agree with the Governor-General of Fars that it is in government's interest to hold balance between brothers“. Qavam al-Molk was secretly supporting the brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh and conveyed Chick that he wanted to keep check on Sowlat al-Dowleh.

Qavam al-Molk was of opinion that he has more influence among Qashqa'is than Sowlat al-Dowleh. Sardar Ehtesham was appointed the governor of Kazerun with object keeping him from "importune for position in Government of tribe". Chick added the Inspector-General of the S.P.R. told him that the British authorities are under obligation to Ihtisham for services when Soulat was fighting us openly, as a result of which he, as being pro-British has lost his former public backing (26).

He suggested that immediate solution would be arrangement between brothers to share tribe. In relation with Kashkulis, he wrote: Kashkulis are in close proximity to Bushehr road and in touch with representative of British interests a long road and exploitation of oil in their winter quarter will make association closer and he would lend his influence with Kashkulis to pay fixed revenue to Ilkhani.

Finally and confidentially he added: Sowlat al Dowleh would like to break semi-independence of Kashkulils by running and disuniting them and now apparently wants us to assist him. Our interest is stable here prompting as soon as the Government is stable here official separation of the Kashkuli clan from the rest of Qashqa'i tribe and placing it under Governor-General, as was proposed in time of late Prime Minister" (27).

The representative of Sowlat al-Dowleh was still proceeding a discussion with the British Legation in order to reach to some sort of understanding and persuade the British authorities to take no side between Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh. The Legation agreed to refrain from interfering in the question of Kazerun Governorship, but they asked Sowlat al-Dowleh to come at some definite arrangement with his brother. The assistance of Consul Chick in tax collecting from Kashkuli was rejected by the representative of Sowlat al-Dowleh.

He argued that the intervention of the consul would cause" to the Kashkulis becoming an appendage of the Consulate and they hoped a meeting may be arranged between the representative of the Oil Company and Sowlat al-Dowleh and the special position of Sowlat al-Dowleh would not be ignored.

4.3.1. New Alliance Against Sowlat al-Dowleh

Sowlat al-Dowleh telegraphed to the Persian Government and the British Legation and stated: he was informed that offensive measures are now being concerted against him at Shiraz during the southern migration of the tribes and that the employment of the S.P.R. against him is being contemplated. He added that he was collecting riflemen. The telegram of the Indo-European telegraph office in Abadeh to the British Legation reaffirmed that Sowlat al-Dowleh was collecting a force and was proceeding towards the south to defend of him.

It appears that the British Charge d'Affaires realised that all opponents of Sowlat al-Dowleh from the S.P.R. in its last days to Qavam al-Molk and the governor-general and ... were united and participated in a plot against Sowlat al-Dowleh. Bridgeman instructed Chick: "I presume that as long as the S.P.R. are under our control they will not be employed against Soulet (28). Bridgeman continued to say that he was strongly opposed to the British intervention against Sowlat al-Dowleh in favour of Kashkulis or Qavam al-Molk.

He added Sowlat al-Dowleh was reinstalled with the active co-operation of H.M.'s Consul and the Qavam and he is still the strongest unit among the Qashqa'i's. and British cannot support Sardar Ehtesham in such a way as to undermine Sowlat al-Dowleh. In relation to Qavam al-Molk he wrote: Qavam "should be only defendant and British should not support him in offensive measures. His supremacy in Fars is beneficial generally to our interests, but that will not be facilitated by our supporting him in attacking his opponent (29). Qavam cannot reasonably object to our refraining from intervention in local squabbles provided we give him our support generally when a direct attack is being made on his interests" (30).

Bridgeman considered that it was necessary to deal with Sowlat al-Dowleh in regard to the oil question in Dasht-e-Qir by assuring him of Chick's desire to abstain from intervention in tribal affairs of Fars and by pacifying the tense relations between the rivals in Fars through advice in order to deal with each other's. He knew well that the "dissolution of the S.P.R. weakened British position in Fars and they could not follow an intervention policy and this matter should be frankly explained to" Qavam al-Molk.

Bridgeman instructed Chick to meet Sowlat al-Dowleh in a non-contentious spirit and urge him to maintain friendly relations with Qavam al-Molk and come into an agreement with Sardar Ehtesham and conciliate with the Governor-General while British agent "bound to support the representative of the Persian Government (31). In response, Chick informed the Legation that Qavam al-Molk (according to the Inspector-General of the S.P.R.) had collected 1200 tribesmen to attack Sowlat al-Dowleh, now (after Chick received a new instruction) Qavam al-Molk "has decided to remain on the defensive, however he refused to withdraw his support of Ali Khan "on the ground that his reputation would be injured.

Chick stated that he had not seen Qavam al-Molk, in other words it means that he had not participated in the plot against Sowlat al-Dowleh. He remained however silent

on the role of the S.P.R. Chick continued to say that the Legation making no reference of Qavam al Molk's plan of a force for Fars and the change of Legation's attitude towards Qavam al-Molk and the support of Sowlat al-Dowleh in a circumstances that the consulate and Governor-General are depended on the good will of Qavam al-Molk due to final dissolution of the S.P.R. that it would take place in 16 October 1921 (32).

In another report Chick informed the Legation of his visit with Qavam al-Molk, the chief of Khamseh confederation. He argued that Sowlat al-Dowleh violated entirely the last winter arrangement that the son of Sardar Ehtesham should be Ilbegi and Ali Khan to have portion for his livelihood. Qavam added it was Sowlat al-Dowleh who informed the Central Government of scheme for retention from 1000 South Persia Rifles in Fars and made Qavam al-Molk greater subject of suspicious. Therefore, he intended to overthrow Sowlat al-Dowleh and to appoint Ali Khan as Ilkhani of Qashqa'i on passing Shiraz. Qavam al-Molk added that he provided Kashkulis with 300 rifles and intended to use all his influence to emancipate them from Sowlat al-Dowleh (33).

The Persian Prime Minister, Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh, instructed the Governor-General of Fars make no distinction in treatment between the two sides and remain neutral and prevent of a conflict (34). Bridgeman made it clear to Chick that the Legation neither support Sowlat al-Dowleh nor altered the attitude towards Qavam al-Molk, but with the disappearance of the S.P.R., British are no longer in a position to support him as effectively as formerly. Bridgeman pointed out: Nevertheless our friendship in future is likely to be as useful to him as it was to his father in pre-South Persia Rifles day. However, we cannot involve ourselves in local feuds in present circumstances (35).

It appears Bridgeman considered that Chick sided with Qavam al-Molk and was meddling actively in the local affairs, therefore he instructed Chick. : A little masterly in activity would appear advisable in the present delicate situation; and I rely on your coolness and tact to keep us of local commitments which we are unable to honour (36).

According to instruction of his superior, Chick visited Sowlat al-Dowleh outside Shiraz. They discussed on robbery, oil agreement and Ali Khan. Chick claimed at least 4 or 5 out of every 10 robbery and telegram superintendent must be Qashqa'i and he asked Sowlat al-Dowleh the compensation of some of them. Sowlat al-Dowleh told Chick that "no one had ever told him that before.

As regard Kashkuli Agreement, Sowlat al-Dowleh said that he would take no responsibilities for working of agreement. Sowlat al-Dowleh pointed out that the Kashkulis visited Dasht-e-Qir only in winter and it was open to him “to send them elsewhere and other tribe instead (37). Chick assured him that weapons, horses etc. For oil guards were property of company and Wilson, Resident Director of the company had sent a letter to Sowlat al-Dowleh and that he would meet him near Firuzabad.

Chick informed the Legation that he has heard that Sowlat al-Dowleh has suggested to the Persian Government: he should be given Charge of caravan road to Bushehr when he would undertake responsibilities for all robberies and he did not reach to an agreement with Qavam al-Molk regarding Ali Khan. Qavam al-Molk held out 300T monthly allowance and Sowlat al-Dowleh said he really could not afford it (38). At the last months of 1921, there were still many undissolved and unclear questions in Qashqa’i leadership, between the two chiefs of the Qashqa’i and Khamseh, and between the Anglo-Sowlat relation particularly on exploration of oil in Qashqa’i winter quarters.

4.4. In Search of Oil in the Province of Fars

For many years the A.P.O.C. made surveys in searching of oil, outside the Bakhtiyari oil fields, in Posht-kuh, Lorestan and Fars. In 1919-1920 the geological survey of the Oil Company fixed definitely near Dalaki on (Dasht-e-Qir) in southern Fars. An area lay 56 km north-west of Dalaki and 48 km north-east of Genaveh (a small port on the Persian Gulf). It is hot and waterless during the summer and was used by Kashkuli tribe of the Qashqa’i confederation as winter quarters.

In the second survey a shorter and easier route for the pipeline and also a road to the coast was chosen that existed via Mishun Goomeroun to Genaveh and it was about 83 km (39). It has been previously mentioned that according to the Oil Concession of the D’Arcy in 1901, the Oil Company would obtain oil field areas through the Persian Government and by the request of the Oil Company the Persian Government would protect the employees and properties of the Company.

Since 1905 the Oil Company, however, under the pretext and the excuse of the Persian Government’s weakness followed the policy of secret agreement and the Company came into direct contact with the local chiefs for land and protection of the

pipeline and concluded two agreements with the Khans of Bakhtiyari, then with Sheikh Khaz'al and finally the Vali of Poshtkuh. As the agreement with the Bakhtiyari was known in Tehran some years later, the Persian Government protested to the Oil Company and did not recognise them either.

4.4.1. Negotiation with Kashkuli Khans

From 1919 onwards an agreement was contemplated with Kashkuli tribe of Qashqa'i confederacy and none else, by Bill, the British Resident at Bushehr. Fear lest, however, that Farmanfarma, the Governor-General of Fars, should demand share. This was apparently the chief reason why negotiations were not concluded with the Khans of Kashkuli in 1919 (40).

With the approval of the British Legation and the assistance of the Consulates in Shiraz and Bushehr, the A.P.O.C. prepared to negotiate with the Kashkuli and Hayat Dawudi Khans, on formation of watch guards to protect the oil installation and pipelines of the Company in 1921. The pipelines should from the winter quarter of the Kashkuli tribe pass through the lands of Hayat Dawudi to the coast of the Persian Gulf. It was intended to form two guards in two centers of Kashkulis and Hayat Dawudis.

The Khans of Hayat Dawudi and the Khans of Kashkuli had a friendly relation with the British Residency in Bushehr for many years especially during the Great War and were helpful to the British forces. Though the policy of secret negotiation and agreement with the chiefs of the tribes was not new in British policy, there was, however, a new and strange element in recent negotiation of the Resident Director of the Oil Company and the British Consulates in Bushehr and Shiraz.

They entered into negotiation with the Kashkuli Khans for land and protection Guard, a sub-tribe of Qashqa'i, who had very limited rights instead of negotiation with the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i who had an arbitrary right to choose the grazing area for the tribes and was channel between outside and the tribe. Sowlat al-Dowleh was informed of the secret negotiation between the British Consulate in Shiraz and the Kashkuli Khans.

The A.P.O.C. prepared, with the mediation of the British Consulates in the south, to conclude an agreement with the Kashkuli Khans on exploitation of oil in Dasht-e Qir

and formation of a protection Guard .Sowlat al-Dowel, who had already at the end of the year 1920 relatively normalised his relation with the British authorities, now he decided a new attempt to improve his relation with the British.

4.5. Attempts of Ilkhani of Qashqa’i

Sowlat al-Dowel realised that the British consulates in Shiraz and Bushehr were deeply involved in the Fars affairs, and the British consul in Shiraz, Herbert Chick particularly had a very close relation with the opponents and the rivals of him. Sowlat al-Dowel found it difficult to do business with the British consul in Shiraz. He sent a representative to meet the British authorities in the Legation on behalf of him. He requested the neutrality and co-operation of the British in certain questions in Fars.

At the same time, he pointed out that he is the only authorised person and holds the responsibility in the tribe Qashqa’i. He wanted to prevent of conclusion of any agreement with the Kashkuli khans and showed his readiness for such responsibility. Norman was still in Tehran that Sardar Fakher, a member and then speaker of Majles, brought the message to the British Legation in September 1921, as it was previously mentioned.

The dialogue of Sowlat al-Dowleh with the Legation was partly fruitful. He succeeded to persuade the Legation to freeze the launch of an attack on him which it was organised in Fars. The message brought to the notice of the British Minister, Herman Norman, to ask how the position of Sowlat al-Dowel among the Qashqa was, is. He asked the Consul Chick what would be happened if British ignored Sowlat al-Dowel in an arrangement with the Kashkuli Khans for exploitation of oil in the winter quarter of the Kashkuli tribe.

Can Sowlat al-Dowel effectively make obstacle to the Oil Company projects or damage the British interests by exciting the Qashqa’i tribesmen a hostile attitude against British political Resident in Bushehr (41). Trevor told the Minister that he had anxiety if Sowlat al-Dowel eliminate while he enables to make the situation extremely difficult to the staffs of Oil Company in Dasht-e-Qir and the surveyors who desire to examine the area between there and Kazerun (42). The telegram of Trevor indicates that the Oil

Company intended to expand the geological survey in a broader area beyond Dasht-e-Qir.

Meanwhile Norman was summoned to England. He left Tehran for London and Reginald Bridgeman took the responsibility of the Legation as Chargé d'Affaires until the arrival of the new Minister, Sir Percy Loraine at the end of the year 1921. As the question of Sowlat al-Dowel raised by Norman, Chick responded to the telegram of the British Minister on 30 September 1921 that the negotiations with the Kashkuli were already for advanced. He also pointed out that Sowlat la-Dowel had not been titular Ilkhani for some years past and he was not now either.

He added that Sowlat al-Dowel was aware that the majority of the Kashkuli Khans with one or two exceptions were opposed to him and the khans would be certainly not agreeable terms without their consent particularly if any payment for protection were to be made to Sowlat al-Dowel by the Company for distribution and money does not reach the Khans.

Finally he suggested that it might be pointed out to Sowlat al-Dowel that he resides for five months in the north of Fars near to Isfahan, for the rest months he stays in eastern Fars at least 320 km far from the oil fields. For Company it would not practicable business to make Sowlat al-Dowel responsible for other side but the Company does not intend to ignore his position (43).

4.5.1. The Second Thought

Bridgeman fell into suspicion on policy in which the Consul Chick was proceeding, but Chick discouraged him by providing him the correspondences of his predecessors. Chick wrote that the major reason that the negotiation did not come to conclusion at that time in 1920 and it was postponed until the summer 1921 was Farmanfarma, the governor-general of Fars who might demand a share. Then the agreement was planned in June 1921 to conclude with the Kashkuli khans, otherwise British officials opinion has been solid as to in evitability of direct agreement with Kashkuli (44).

Wilson, the Director of the A.P.O.C. wrote: During the years 1919-1920 the company sent geologists to the Kashkuli winter quarter and with the knowledge and

approval of Farmanfarma, the Kashkuli Khans provided guards without any question being raised by the Ilkhani and he pointed out the special status of Kashkuli had been recognised in 1920 by the agreement between Sowlat al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Molk and the others that the rights of latter to protect the interest of Kashkulis who are an integral part of Qashqa'i and are under the authorities of the Ilkhani.

Sowlat al-Dowleh knew that the Kashkulis were too far removed from Qavam al-Molk immediate influence to be able to count his protection if Sowlat al-Dowleh should readily wish to oppress them (45). For this reason Kashkuli Khans were afraid of him mortally. Kashkuli khans kept their position and Qavam al-Molk enjoyed still his influence among the Kashkulis. Chick stated in his telegram that Sowlat al-Dowel is no longer a power in the tribes of Fars as he was pre-war time and the principals of the sub-tribes took distance from him by his oppression (46).

From above discussion, one realises that first of all the British political agents in Shiraz, and Bushehr as well as the A.P.O.C. managers postponed the conclusion of the agreement with Kashkuli Khans due to the presence of Farmanfarma in Fars. Secondly, after the decision of the A.P.O.C. on searching of oil in Dasht-e-Qir, they decisively did not ignore to reckon the positions of Sowlat al-Dowleh when and if he returns to power. The southern consulates and the Oil Company intended to exclude Sowlat al-Dowel Qashqa'i from the agreement.

It was the events and the political changes in the months July-August 1920 in the north and Tehran, in which the British authorities in Tehran did not oppose to the return and the replacement of the competent and influential Sowlat al-Dowel ,who had the widely support inside the tribe and in Fars as a whole. A strong leadership in the Qashqa'i tribe was necessary in this junction, if the Bolshevik campaign to be happened. Spite of this fact, the agreement of December 1920, in which it recognised Sowlat al-Dowel as defacto Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, but at the same times imposed somehow a semi-independent of the Kashkulis on him.

In fact, the British southern authorities had been well aware of intention of the A.P.O.C. on searching for oil in Dasht-e-Qir. For this reason they endeavoured to bring the Kashkuli Khans as defacto under Qavam al-Molk in December 1920. Chick argued: Amr-allah Khan Kashkuli was the only Qashqa'i Khan to serve in the S.P.R. and enlist men and now it was largely due to influence of his brothers and himself, who are strong Anglophiles that the rest of Khans combined for Agreement (47).

From Chick point of view, British should undermine the position of Sowlat al-Dowleh as Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i. Chick finally succeeded to persuade the Legation on continuation of tribal policy in Fars in relation to Kashkuli and the preparation for the Agreement with the Kashkuli. The attempt of Sowlat al-Dowleh was in this juncture abortive.

4.6. Hayat Dawudi and Kashkuli Agreements

Finally Bridgeman acknowledged the Chick's local knowledge and long experience of Sowlat al-Dowel and Qashqa'i affairs, let him to proceed the arrangement (48) and be present at the meeting. He got the Kashkuli Khans and Sir Arnold Wilson in Dasht-e-Arzhan in 12-14 October 1921.

The A.P.O.C. concluded two separated Secret Agreements with the (a) Khans of Hayat Dawudi and (b) the Khans of Kashkuli; the First Agreement was arranged by the British consul-general at in Bushehr and the Second by the British Consulate in Shiraz. The British Political Resident in Bushehr, Colonel Trevor wrote: It became necessary for the Company to make Agreement with the Khans of Hayat Dawudi whose territory the road would pass (49).

The Resident Director of the A.P.O.C., Sir Arnold Wilson, assisted by the British vice-consul in Bushehr, Clegg then a senior staff of the A.P.O.C. in Khuzestan, met Heidar Khan Hayat-Dawudi on behalf of his brother and himself at Bandar Rig-Genaveh. After a lengthy discussion, they reached to "a very satisfactory agreement" which was signed in 6 October 1921 the question of a road was settled and also the formation of a road guard by Hayat Dawudi; armed, equipped and paid by the company was agreed (50).

Wilson and Clegg left Bushehr for Chehel-Cheshmeh of Dasht-e-Arzhan near Shiraz in 9 October, where the consul Chick was himself present. They discussed for two days with the Kashkuli Khans. In the end a very satisfactory agreement was made and signed in 14 October 1921. Here also the question of land for drilling, machinery and administration as well as the formation of a guard was agreed (51).

The miscalculation of Chick and the other British diplomatic authorities in Tehran and the South who underestimated the power and the position of Sowlat al-Dowel, blew

up the public opinion in Persia against the British. Sowlat al-Dowleh informed the Shah and Prime Minister as he received the news of secret Agreement between the A.P.O.C. and Kashkuli Khans. Trevor considered the action the successful intrigues of Sowlat al-Dowleh,

In fact the British officials, the consul Chick, the Vice-Consul Clegg and Arnold Wilson, the Director of the A.P.O.C. in Persia, as early as at the meeting in Dasht-e-Arzhan realised that they have to come into understanding with the chief of Qashqa'i. It is interesting to mention that the Kashkuli Khans themselves told Chick on the Agreement's day and he, accordingly, informed the British Charged d Affaires that the only awkward point on which the Kashkuli Khans insisted they are unable to carry out any agreement if the company did not assist them against Sowlat al Dowleh, the defacto Ilkhani (52). It had been hoped that perhaps it would be possible to avoid this, but it soon became obvious that this was impossible (53).

4.6.1. Resident Director and Ilkhani Correspondences

Wilson wrote a letter to Sowlat al-Dowel in 18 October, hoping to see him and then requested the Charge d 'Affaires to pacify the Qashqa'i Ilkhani with his explanation. As a result of discussion between Sardar Fakher (mediator of Sowlat al-Dowel in Tehran) and the Legation authorities, it was suggested a meeting should take place between the British consul in Shiraz and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i to discussing matters in a non-contentious spirit (54).

Wilson wrote in his letter to Sowlat al-Dowel that he hoped to meet him on a view to negotiate with him. Wilson asked the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i not causing the interruption of work of the A.P.O.C. in the Kashkuli winter quarter. Wilson, however, did not mention of the agreement with the Kashkulis and this was no promising word in that respect. He only acknowledge the position of Sowlat al-Dowel in Fars which the Company was not going to ignore and finally he wrote I understand that there are spring of oil at Naugan and elsewhere in your neighbourhood and I hope to investigate them at the same time. (55) It is quite clear from the letter of Wilson that he did not intend to make any concession on Kashkuli Agreement.

Accordingly, Consul Chick met the Ilkhani. He reported the Legation of his meeting. He also informed Wilson in a lengthy and semi-official letter of his discussions. He suggested how British should deal with Sowlat al-Dowleh to bring him to an end. On 29 October 1921, Chick visited the tent of Sardar Ashayer, near Chenar Rahdar, 11 km from Shiraz. The Ilkhani told him that he received the letter of Wilson and he would meet him near Firuzabad.

Sowlat al-Dowel said he would not take responsibility for the working of the Kashkuli Agreement. He repeated that it is open to him to send the sub-tribes to the quarter or may be the other day wants a levy force from the Kashkulis to work for him. He also pointed out that the land of Dasht-e-Qir belongs to the Persian Government. Finally he said with whom was the agreement with Bakhtiyaris, with the Ilkhani? Chick said: I thought it best not to tell him at a first interview that the Kashkulis would not agree to anything he arranged with Company (56), but he told Sowlat al-Dowel of his distance from the oil fields of Dasht-e-Qir.

There is a contradiction on the statements of Chick on Kashkulis. On the one side the Kashkuli Khans stated themselves that they are unable to resist to the Sowlat al-Dowel authority and cannot take responsibility to working of the Agreement without the support of the Company. On the other side Chick spoke of the Kashkuli resistance to any agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh even jointly with them. Certainly, Chick exaggerated the power of Kashkulis. The British policy of *divida et vivru imperia* (rule) equipped Kashkuli. They received the moral and material support of Sowlat's rivals inside and outside the Qashqa'i. Otherwise the Kashkuli Khans confessed themselves of their weak position against the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i.

4.6.2. Ilkhani and Kashkuli Agreement

Sowlat al-Dowleh had been informed on allocation of arms and ammunition to the Kashkulis. Chick spoke of creation a guard to protect the employees and the material of the Company. He asked the Ilkhani to remain silence until the meeting with Wilson. Neither the letter of Wilson nor the visit of Chick persuaded Sowlat al-Dowleh to wait until the meeting with Wilson. None of them promised to negotiate on his participation on the agreement of Dasht-e-Qir. Sowlat al-Dowel considered the action of the A.P.O.C. as interference on his jurisdiction by stimulating a discontent section of a

tribe. With regard to the letter of Chick to Wilson after his meeting with Sowlat al-Dowel to bring him to an end, Qashqa'i Ilkhani was right not to trust Wilson or Chick.

Sowlat al-Dowel was well aware that neither the Governor-General nor the Kargozar, the agent of the Foreign Ministry in Fars were present at Dasht-e-Arzhan and the agreement had been signed secretly without the Persian Government knowledge. Sowlat al-Dowel informed the authorities in Tehran of the Secret Agreement (57). He wrote also a letter to the Governor-General of Fars two days after the meeting with Chick. He informed the Governor-General of the agreement and then he questioned whether this Agreement had been arranged with his permission? Finally Sowlat al-Dowleh stated: though the oil field of Mahur (Dasht-e-Qir is on jurisdiction of the Qashqa'i), but it did nothing to do with Kashkuli Khans and such arrangement could be made only with the Ilkhani for the security and safeguard of the Company according to the order of the governor-general and the Central Government.

Sowlat al-Dowleh knew that the Governor-General had a friendly relation with the British authorities in Fars and he would prefer to remain silence if the news not reaches to the other departments. Sowlat al-Dowel who intended to inform the Persian Government of the agreement, informed the representative of the Foreign Ministry (Kargozar) in Fars.

The Governor-General compelled to write an official letter to the British consulate. He asked Chick whether such agreement had been concluded with the Kashkuli Khans. If so, has the A.P.O.C. such right to make direct arrangement with the small chiefs or they need special permission from government? His second question was on arms which had been given to some Kashkulis whom they were engaged in the service of Anglo Persian Oil Company and was it according to the concession? (58). He annexed a copy of the letter of Sowlat al-Dowleh Sardar Ashayer.

On 7 November 1921, Chick wrote a letter to Governor-General, Nosrat al-Saltaneh. He acknowledged the agreement and added he understood that the company had a right throughout the whole of the south Persia to make such arrangement as it thinks necessary. He denied that arms had been given to any Kashkulis or employed by the company. He pointed out that Arnold Wilson had written to Sowlat al-Dowel and wished to discuss with him. Finally Chick informed the Governor-General that he had no copy of the arrangement which it was untrue and he had received an English copy from Wilson some previous days (59).

Chick wrote two lengthy demi-official letters to Wilson on development of the situation in Fars and the Kashkuli Agreement. He informed Wilson of Sowlat al-Dowleh Sardar Ashayer's (Sowlat al-Dowleh) letter to the Governor-General and a telegram of Nosrat al-Saltaneh to the Persian Government through Kargozar (Chick was mistaken). Then, he mentioned since his meeting with Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Persian Government has threatened the Governor-General of Fars, if he would use force against Sowlat al-Dowleh with the help of Qavam al-Molk and the S.P.R.. He also pointed out that by the Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh made Ahmad Shah to confer a decoration on Sardar Ashayer, Sowlat al-Dowleh. The action of Persian Government concerning Sowlat al-Dowleh was regarded by Chick very foolishly.

Chick was convinced that Sowlat al-Dowleh is strongly anti-British at heart and he has not forgotten the past history and his recent contact with the British Legation was a tactic by fear of the S.P.R. attack. Sowlat al-Dowleh would put obstacles in the way of the A.P.O.C., wrote Chick, as being British penetration disguised even if the Company fill his pockets (60).

The Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh realised that all pro-British personalities, the two brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Khans of Kashkuli tribes and Dareshuris, as well as the heads of Khamseh confederation, Qavam al-Molk and the Governor-General of Fars, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh, who co-operated with the British did effort in the last months of the S.P.R. in Fars to conspire against Sowlat al-Dowleh. Certainly Chick encouraged the opponents of the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. He intended to bring Sowlat al-Dowleh to an end, as he wrote to Wilson.

It is surprising neither Chick nor Wilson nor Trevor did accept the responsibility of their policy with regard the Agreement with the Kashkulis. They did not say that they took measure which it was against the power politic in tribal hierarchy. They did not mention, they did not rely on Sowlat al-Dowleh, while he was a powerful and independent character. Sowlat al-Dowleh was not a personality that the British local authorities could ally with him against the others.

Chick advised Wilson to prepare the representative of the A.P.O.C. to keep a stiff upper lip if they received anything from Sowlat al-Dowleh. From his viewpoint after all the Persian Government to be holden to the Company for legalities and company had a big stick. He said: until the spring these would not be trouble from Sowlat beyond his complains to Tehran. Chick therefore suggested the Resident Director of the Company

not to visit Sowlat al-Dowleh in such circumstances in Fars and wait until the spring migration and Wilson would be on a firmer ground for arguing.

It appears again a non-written alliance and a conspiracy against Sowlat al Dowleh was under way and the information of Qavam al-Saltaneh's Cabinet was not unfounded. Chick wrote: The Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh is strongly anti-Sowlat. Ali Khan, the brother and the rival of Sowlat al-Dowleh, has 1.000 tents in Marvdasht (a plain about 30 km north of Shiraz) and they support him. The Kashkulis are in a bad term with him and three quarters of Dareshuri are still in Bakhtiyari area. Chick believed the position of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the Qashqa'i is far from strong and Qavam al-Molk is incensed against him and back Ali Khan. In spite of the fact, Chick wrote: we must pray for a change of this nationalist wind at Tehran and a chance of Ali Khan being made Ilkhani as Qavam al-Molk wants (61).

4.7. Persian Government and the Agreement

The day after when Chick received an official letter from Kargozar of Fars, who wrote: according to the information the A.P.O.C. has made some agreement with the Kashkulis on Dasht-e-Qir and recruited a number of cavalry (Savar) and riflemen (tofangchi) from the Kashkulis under free command of Amr-allah Khan, who was previously in the S.P.R. And the company has given them on amount of money, cartridges and horses. Kargozar added that he has received a letter from Sardar Ashayer in which he writes the Kashkulis have made an agreement, concerning the oil wells without any rights.

He pointed out: the Kashkulis are not owner of the properties, and the agreements are not reliable. Then he asked whether the A.P.O.C. has concluded any agreement, if so, has the company such rights to conclude agreements direct with the tribes and to arrange for armed forces without the knowledge of local official authorities and the governor-general. What reliability would have the Agreements, when the Kashkulis are not the owners of the land and the leader of the Qashqa'i tribe had no information on the subject? (62). Chick referred the Kargozar to his letter to the Governor-General on this matter (63).

Meanwhile *Asr-e-azadi*, a newspaper published in Shiraz, reported on journey of the British Consul in Shiraz into Kashkuli area concluding Agreement and providing them with arm and ammunition. The newspaper made the public more suspicious of the British activities in Fars. The Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs wrote a letter to the British Charge d'Affaires that under pretext of oil fields, the British consul in Shiraz had been forming a force under the command an-ex-officer of the S.P.R., of tribe Kashkuli in Charge of 50 men and he had been provided with 10.000T, thirty horse and thirty thousand rounds of ammunition in order to levy 300 riflemen. He added if the A.P.O.C. required a force for protection, the matter should be consulted with the Governor General of Fars.

The Kashkulis who had concluded the Agreement with the company and settled on the oil fields, they have pretended the land was belong to them. Finally he pointed out as a result of the agreement, the trouble would be occurred. Then, he asked the Charge d'Affaires to prevent of such direct measure on the Persian soil (64). In respond to the Persian Government, the British Charge d'Affaired denied arms, ammunitions and mules supply to the Kashkulis by the British consul and he requested Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Prime Minister, the publication of a denial by the newspaper *Asr-e-Azadi* on the matter.

The letter of the Foreign Ministry on Chick's action raised certain questions for Bridgeman who wished to know the channel of the information to the Persian Government, secondly if the governor-general of Fars was in the process of the agreement, why the Foreign Ministry wanted an explanation on that matter, and finally he instructed Chick a closer relation with the Governor-General of Fars for smoothing the work of the company. In other words the Legation should try to remove the suspicious of the Persian Government, and to endeavour on keeping them away from interfering on the Kashkuli Agreement (65).

In fact, Chick informed the Governor-General of Fars of the Kashkuli Agreement after his return from Dasht-e-Arzhan. The Governor-General was informed only as a friendly gesture of the Consulate, but it did not mean he would transmit the information to Tehran.

4.8. Government's Tribal Policy in Fars

Bridgegman asked Chick for more information to enable him to reply to the cabinet. Chick showed the text of agreement to the deputy of Governor-General. He wrote, however, officially that he has no copy of the agreement. Chick was sure that the transmission channel of the report to Tehran was not Governor-General. Firstly Nosrat al-Saltaneh was too ill-disposed towards Sowlat and too good to us to be responsible for the information quoted by you (66).

Chick believed as far as the British interests was concerned, Nosrat al-Saltaneh, the Qajar Prince, was his personal friendliness towards British people and British influence in Persia, which may be partly attributed to his reception in London, when with the Shah in 1920, not without private means to keep up the position as are other claimants to the post (67). Nosrat al-Saltaneh, one of the high ranking Prince, the uncle of the Shah and from the British Consul point of view an insignificant in person and with a poor constitution was appointed to the post only due to the aristocracy privilege (68).

Though the Prime Minister (Qavam al-Saltaneh) had instructed the Governor-General of Fars and the Governor of the Gulf Ports to take notice to any rumour, Nosrat al-Saltaneh did not inform the cabinet of the Kashkuli Agreements. As far as the British Documents are concerned, Nosrat al-Saltaneh endeavoured to keep his friendly relation with the British consulate. He conveyed the information's, communications and even instructions from Prime Minister on Kashkuli Agreements to the British Consulate and he advised the British consul and the Legation how they should deal with Sowlat al Dowleh and the government in Tehran (69).

Finally the Governor-General begged the British consul to inform the Charge d'Affaires that he has not communicated the information to Tehran on the Kashkuli Agreement (70). He made the Kargozar in Shiraz and Sardar Ashayer responsible according to a telegram from Qavam al Saltaneh, the Prime Minister (71). Chick considered the friendly attitude of Nosrat al-Saltaneh to the British interests was very valuable and wrote to the Legation: the governor-general is one of our very few friends in Shiraz, and you can have very little idea of opposition and obstacles in town to anything British whether commercial or not (72).

Chick suggested to the British Charge d’Affaires whether it is not probable that the agitation on the Agreement by the Government in Tehran set off for bribes’ etc? However, from the Chick point of view on the base of the Kashkuli Agreement, formation a guard of the men from the tribe to protect the employees, and the property of Oil Company was similar in principle to the Bakhtiyari Agreement and it was necessary in wild mountain region. The Governor-General of Fars could do not otherwise. The government force (Sarbaz), were useless and finally he said are Indian troops desired by Persian Government?

Chick wrote and advised the British Charge d’Affaires on Sowlat al-Dowleh question: I am strongly of opinion that we should not to act solely defensive, but to take firm action but let Persian Government understand that British have had so much trouble with Sowlat in past that if he wants to made difficulties and creation friction for Oil Company ... we shall ask to have Ilkhani changed (73). The British Charge d’Affaires responded to him that the Persian Government have right to complain of secret negotiation with the tribal chiefs took place under a representative of a Consular then he asked Chick whether he couldn’t negotiate with the advice and knowledge of the friendly Governor-General which it caused embracing position for him (74).

Meanwhile Bridgeman intended to take firm line with the Persian Government, but he needed more information on the commander of the guard, ammunition hoses, 10.000T in cash and instructions to levy 300 riflemen He pointed out to Chick that the Oil Company’s wishes to purchase 300 rifles from South Persia Rifles (75). In spite of Bridgeman’s respond, Chick repeated his argument that the Oil Company had no obligation more than any merchant to the Persian Government on their business.

Again and implicitly he defended the Agreement with Kashkuli; based on hereditary anti-Sowlat al-Dowleh of the most Kashkulis, the distance of Sowlat al-Dowleh from the oil field and finally the subsidy and wages by the A.P.O.C. would bring more men to the tribe and strengthen the position and unity among the Kashkuli (now 2. 500 tents) and Sowlat al-Dowleh would not be able to break them as he wishes.

Chick suggested for the interest of Anglo Persian Oil Company to ask the Kashkuli tribe to place under the direct rule of the Governor-General, as the Kashkuli Khan desired as well. Chick regretfully stated if Sardar Ehtesham would remain as the Ilkhani, the Oil Company would not have any difficulties. Chick gave more detail on relation of the Kashkuli friends. The commander of the Oil Guard, Amr -allah Khan,

the son of Haj Mohammad Karim Khan, the representative of Qashqa'i in Majles. He was the only Qashqa'i Khan who served in the South Persia Rifle. Sowlat al Dowleh threatened him to desert the S.P.R. which friendly he did, Amr-allah Khan and his brothers for three years before the conclusion of the agreement had done too much for the Company's surveys.

They are strong Anglophiles and owing to their influence, the other Kashkuli Khans prepared to conclude the agreement. Sowlat al- Dowleh opposed to this family view and action and appropriated one of their village in Sarhad (summer quarter) this summer, therefore his train and loyalty should give him in our eyes all more title to the position (76). Trevor informed Bridgeman that the appointment of Amr-allah Khan, the lieutenant of the S.P.R., was approved by Norman in 6 August 1921 (77).

Wilson followed the view of Chick and asked the Charge d'Affaires to take offensive against Sowlat. He added he does no prospect to do business with Sowlat and possibly differs this visit to Firuzabad. Wilson pointed out that the Persian on principle object to the agreement" as they did to Bakhtiyari Agreement". He informed Bridgeman that the record of proceeding of conference should not be communicated to Persian Government in any form (78).

Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Persian Prime Minister, in a telegram to the Governor-General of Fars instructed him to organise a Guard for the Oil Company in Dasht-e Qir. The Governor-General was blamed by the Prime Minister. Nosrat al-Saltaneh believed it was due to the influence of Moin al-Tojjar on behalf of Sowlat al-Dowleh on Ministers in Tehran that the cabinet made this suggestion. Nosrat al-Saltaneh was regarded by the representative of British in Fars as one of very few friends of British in Shiraz, where opposition and obstacles in town to anything British whether commercial or not (79).

Nosrat al-Saltaneh not only did not take any step that would be considered as opposition to the British interests, but also collaborated with the British consulate in Shiraz against Sowlat al-Dowleh andon the Kashkuli agreement ,he neither protested to the British consulate nor informed the government in Tehran. As the information reached to the cabinet and Majles, he became furious with the informants and he was anxious that the British think that he was the author of reports (80). On the arrangement for Guards he told Chick that he wishes to assist the Oil Company. He would prefer to ask Kashkuli Khans to furnish them (81). In other words he would not

ask the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sowlat al Dowleh, to arrange the guard and somehow he ignored the sense of Central Government's instruction.

Nosrat al-Saltaneh, even, informed Chick (the source of information to Governor-General, however, has not been mentioned) that Sowlat al-Dowleh gave 10.000T to his emissary in Tehran (Gholam Hossein Khan) for bribing members of Majlis and Ministers. Subsequently, some days later, Haj Moin al-Tojjar, who is crony of Qavam al-Saltaneh, was appointed by Sowlat al-Dowleh to watch and further his interests and this was prior to agreement being made (82).

The day after Nosrat al-Saltaneh advised Chick a few cash present to the Ministers concerned by the Company would make the Persian Government quite indifferent to this Agreement (83). It appears that it was to a simplified solution to a complicated question. The important factors had been ignored in this question. The whole of British interference policy in which only a few influential families supported was under question.

Chick in response to the question of the British Charge d'Affaires on organising the Kashkuli guard, he confirmed that 20.000 rounds of ammunitions, 10 horses was given over to Amr-allah Khan who was responsible for the safe custody and received 65T monthly. Chick heard from the Inspector-General of the S.P.R. a few days before left that the A.P.O.C. were negotiating for purchasing of 300 rifles, but Kargozar did not know about it (84).

Trevor rejected the idea of raising force at a time that the existing forces just being disbanded. He confirmed that Sir Arnold Wilson proposed to purchase 300 rifles and corresponding ammunition from the S.P.R. as reserve for use of guards and prospecting parties and Trevor saw no objection As long as intention of company is not to arm a force (85) in Persia to keep arms reserve in Basrah and eventually to utilise most if not all of them outside Persia; the Persian Government can have no objection (86).

Chick informed the Charge d'Affaires that : this was no precedent that local government should be informed of intention to make agreement and the A.P.O.C. had been it done in the case of the several other agreements and Chick under instruction had participated in several business agreement in Bushehr but neither before nor after was local government informed. Chick understood, under concession company are entitled to do business deals with whom they please whether a whole tribes or single person (87).

As Chick realised, it was not anticipated either by Bridgeman or Chick that the opposition of Sowlat al-Dowleh would be supported by the Persian Government. Trevor argued that the Persian Government has never attempted to protect the parties and make their arrangements with tribes (88). As far as the British documents are concerned neither the A.P.O.C. nor the British Legation had ever requested the assistance of the Persian Government. This was the British Government policy as well as the A.P.O.C.

After about two decades, the Persian Government felt gradually strong to resist to the foreign interference. This was something unusual to the British local diplomats. As far as the reports of the British Consulate in Shiraz indicate, Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Prime Minister, and other Ministers in the cabinet were discontent with policy of the governor-general in Fars, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh, especially his tribal policy. They tried to obtain his downfall (89) and the Persian Foreign Ministry instructed the Kargozar of Fars, Assad -allah Mirza, to inform the British Consulate on behalf of the Anglo Persian Oil Company that every proceeding and agreement which the Oil Company wishes to make with them must be with the knowledge of Governor-General of Fars and Sardar Ashayer (90).

In fact, the Persian Government acknowledged the traditional rights of a tribal chief on the affairs of his tribe and tribal region. British authorities were acquainted with this right. Chick instead recognising the mistake of the British policy in relation to the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, stating It is proof that the attitude of the Persian Government is chiefly in the former (Sardar Ashayer) interest (91).

4.9. The Letter of British Legation

On 17 November 1921 Bridgeman responded to the letter of 8 November 1921 of the Persian Foreign Minister, Assad -allah Mirza Moshar al-Saltaneh who, wrote, briefly speaking, according to the information received from Fars, the British Consul is organising a force under the name of the protection of oil fields and a lieutenant of the S.P.R. put in Charge of about fifty men. He received 30,000 ammunition, 30 horses and 10,000T in cash with instructions to levy 300 riflemen. Some agreements concluded with the Kashkulis who pretend to be the owners of the land in question. If a force is required, the matter should be referred to the governor-general of Fars. Finally he

requested the Legation to prevent the Consul from taking such direct measures in the Persian territory (92).

Bridgeman who was embarrassed as he received the letter (see his correspondence with Chick in previous pages) and advised Wilson to come to understanding with the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i (see next page) used a severe language in his response to the Persian Foreign Minister. He wrote: the accusation that the British Consul is organising a force is entirely unfounded.

The Angle-Persian Oil Company has engaged thirty guards for protection with thirty horses, thirty rifles and proportionate ammunition. Amr-allah Khan Kashkuli, the commander of the guard has been given 500 T for the expense and pay of men until their arrival at the site of the boring operation with the instructions of raising 300 riflemen. The payment of 10.000T is entirely incorrect. He added the site of operations of the A.P.O.C. is in the middle of Kashkuli territory.

Bridgeman pointed out that it was neglected by the Foreign Ministry to acquaint the British Legation with the source of the reports. Then, he accused the Kargozar of Fars as responsible for these frivolous Charges against the consul of a friendly power. Then he requested the recall of the Kargozar of Fars for his unsatisfactory record in the past and recent false information. He also was expected the Persian Government would convey to him an expression of regret at the levity for utterly false accusation has been made against British Consul in Shiraz (93).

Bridgeman sent a telegram for Wilson and informed him that he would do his best to counter Sowlat al-Dowleh's influence with Persian Government in Tehran, Bridgeman, however, advised him: it would be better for Wilson to meet Sowlat al-Dowleh immediately after Christmas at Firuzabad and to try and do business with him if he possibly can (94).

From Chick point of view the meeting should take place, in a suitable time, in spring. He argued: Sowlat al-Dowleh is at the moment in a strong position. He has the support of the cabinet and regaining a part of Dareshuris, a tribe of Qashqa'i, and in the meeting he would ask the cancellation of Kashkuli Agreement. Chick suggested the meeting should be suspended until spring migration when Sowlat al Dowleh is in immediate vicinity of Shiraz (and not in Firuzabad the winter quarter of Sowlat al-Dowleh, and distinctly risky place for Wilson).

He would be very careful to avoid difficulty and Wilson would be in a stronger position. If Sowlat al-Dowleh realises that the Persian Government cease to support him in matter of the Kashkuli Agreement in the next few months, he would possibly come to terms with Wilson and he would bargain „for what he needs in return for paying Soulet (Sowlat) subsidy, namely document promising to keep his hands of Kashkuli and Agreement (95). In fact, Bridgeman sent a telegram to the Foreign Office on the request of the Oil Company to purchase three hundred rifles from the stock of South Persia Rifles of stock book value a certain quantity of ammunition at twenty rupees per thousand.

Oliphant wrote in a note that “Lord Curzon sees no objection to proposed, provided that Mr. Montagu (the secretary for the India Office) concurs and agrees to proposed prices of sale” (96). Two weeks later Bridgeman informed the Foreign Office that the Persian Government are considerably agitated by the report that the A.P.O.C. has armed thirty men to guard their new operations in Kashkuli country and that Company intend to arm three hundred more. He continued to say but must point out that if South Persia Rifles arms used to arm Persian subjects in Persian territory, Persian Government will object.

The Persian Government also complained of notices posted at door of Bushehr Residency offering to recruit South Persian Rifles the men for Company. Persian Government pointed out that until their business to maintain order (97).

As far as the British documents are concerned, during the dissolution months of the S.P.R., the British authorities in Persia and their allies’ chieftains in Fars initiated different means (project) to retain or to form at least a nucleus military force to protect the British interests namely the oil fields and to strengthen their position. During the days of the dissolution of the S.P.R., with the approval of the British Legation in Tehran and the support of British consulates in Shiraz and Bushehr the A.P.O.C. formed two guards. The first one was on the oil field of Bidkarz of Kashkuli tribesmen and a Kashkuli Khan of South Persia Rifles as the head of the guards. The second guard was under a Khan of Hayat Dawudi to protect the pipeline in their coastal area. It appears that there were two other proposals.

Qavam al-Molk equipped the Kashkuli with 300 rifles in September 1921. He received his arms, with the approval of British consul in Shiraz, and from the arsenal was given by the British commanders of the S.P.R. and the British Resident in Bushehr.

Chick informed the British Charge d'Affaires of the project accordingly. Simultaneously Qavam al-Molk prepared to invest his tax for a force in Fars. In spite of the approval of local British authorities (the S.P.R. Commanders and the British consulates in the south), the opposition of public in Fars, the Persian Government, the Parliament and the Minister of War prevent the British Legation from the sanction.

As the Government of India and the British Treasury stopped to pay the expenditure of the S.P.R., in accordance with the desire of the War Office and the British Navy, a new project was initiated by the British authorities in the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia and the authorities of the A.P.O.C., prepared to finance and the Persian Gulf Residency to enforce the project. The British Legation asked the permission for the purchase of 300 rifles and ammunitions. Lord Curzon approved it. The Persian Gulf Residency in Bushehr announced the recruitment of 300 men in Bushehr. The project, however, due to the Persian Government's protest never materialised (98).

4.10. Towards a New Solution

The Persian Government ignored the protest of the British Charge d'Affaires, and persisted on the cancellation of the Kashkuli Agreement. The Persian Prime Minister, Qavam al-Saltaneh, informed and instructed the governor-general of Fars: according to the article 14 of the concession of the Company, the protection of the material and machinery in operations and exploitation of oil by the Company is in the responsibility of the Persian Government. According to the article 3 the ownership of land use by the company should be ascertain to whom private or Government is belong and it must be first settled with the Governor-General and "the company is bound to act according to clause 3 and 14 in any district wherever they wish to begin to extract oil (99).

Therefore the agreement with the Kashkulis is contrary to the concession and it must be cancelled and annulled and the Governor-General was to inform the British consulate according (100). British Legation requested the Persian Prime Minister to do nothing irreversible on the matter of agreement, before discussing with the Charge d'Affaires for a solution (101). The Resident Director of the Company, Arnold Wilson, wrote: the status of the Kashkuli land was similar to the Bakhtiyari oil fields. The Persian Government did not protest to the purchase of land from the Bakhtiyari Khans.

The land would not be purchased until oil founded. If the Persian Government decides that the lands belong to the state, the agreement would be changed.

Wilson interpreted the article 14 as the acceptance of certain obligation of the Persian Government, but there was nothing in D'Arcy concession to prevent the Oil Company to conclude Agreement with defacto local authorities for protection. The A.P.O.C. always had done so, and it saved the Persian Government from a heavy expense (102). From Trevor point of view: while the Persian Government had declined to recognise the Bakhtiyari Agreement, they never made slightest attempt to protect Company's work themselves "in Meydan-e- Naftun. When the Oil Company had to operate in tribal areas, it is necessary to come into agreement with tribal chiefs. He added the Kashkulis settle in Dasht-e-Qir and there was no reason to suppose that the land belongs to the Persian Government (103).

Bridgeman informed the Foreign Office of the Kashkuli Agreement of 14 October. He stated Sowlat al-Dowleh was intriguing to bring about dissension with view to bring into partnership himself and the presence of Consul Chick at the meeting between the Resident Director of the Oil Company and the Kashkuli Khans caused the attack on him in the press of Shiraz and the Persian Government „was very suspicious of political nature of the agreement.

The Persian Government took up the line that if any force were necessary should be referred to the Governor General of Fars and the Persian Prime Minister instructed the governor according to articles 14 and 3 the question of guard and land must first be settled with him and the agreement which infringe these articles, must be notified to the consulate as being null and void. Bridgeman hoped to convince the Prime Minister that the agreement is in no sense detrimental to Persian interests (104). The head of the English section in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs was sent to the British Legation to discuss on the Kashkuli Agreement with the British Charge d'Affaires on behalf of the Persian Prime Minister.

He raised the objections to the Agreement (a) the payment of a large sum of money to the Kashkuli Khans would "lead to trouble, (b) the Persian Government wanted to provide necessary guards itself according to the article 14 of the concession. Bridgeman wrote: we cannot object to the Persian Government furnishing Guard and he asked Wilson if he agrees, the Charge d'Affaires, tells the Persian Government. If the

Government carry's out to provide guards and they prove be efficient, the Company would modify the Kashkuli Agreement.

The Company had made Agreement with defacto local authorities because it had not hither to the Persian Government provided the Protection Guard and the Company was justified in concluding Agreement with them (105). Meanwhile the new British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine arrived in Tehran in December 1921. Wilson pointed out the guard of 30 tribesmen protect only the company from petty raids, in other words the operations carry out at several points several kms distance from each other's. The Company relies on goodwill of tribesmen and these forces were the representative of tribesmen and the presence of the Government force would resented the nomads.

If the Government wanted to change the policy, first should" send a representative to Kasr-Shirin, Posht-Kuh, Bakhtiyari and Qeshm who can study the local conditions and make recommendations "and he asked the Charge d'Affaires to refrain the Government from the force, he added the Kalantar of Kashkuli, Fath-allah Khan, as the representative of government cannot be ordered by the Governor-General to provide Guard so as to save face of government (106).

Captain E. Peel, the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz suggested that the British ought to discourage the Persian Government from sending representative in the oil fields to study the conditions. It is possible that the Persian Government dispatch Cossacks to the oil fields (107). Trevor reaffirmed the view of Peel and continued to say : it is high undesirable to take any steps which would encourage Persian Government to send Cossacks to fields he ,however, believed that the dispatch of Mamur (A civil official) to Qasre-e-Shirin would not do any harm to the company (108).

The Persian government received a copy of the agreement between the Oil Company and Heidar Khan Hayat Dawudi. The Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs Moshar al-Saltaneh wrote to the new the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine. He pointed out that the Persian Government could not consent such direct Arrangement of the company with Hayat Dawudi. The Company recognises certain rights for Khans, that they had never possess take ownership of water, land "which either belongs to the Government or to the people. Moreover the Oil Company intends to organise a force through the Khans which were supplied with arms, ammuniton and funds.

This policy of the company is against the sovereign rights of Persia and beyond the spheres of foreign institutions. The agreement was regarded by the Persian

Government, like the Kashkuli Agreement contrary to the articles 3 and 14 of the concession and finally the Foreign Minister pointed out the company should apply to local governors of the provinces for land and protection (109).

In Loraine's opinion the best of dealing with these two questions was for the Resident Director of the Oil Company to come to Tehran and settle them direct with the Persian Government (110). British Minister had previously made this proposed to Wilson in 30 December 1921 and Wilson replied that the climate conditions and pressure of work precludes me from visiting Tehran at present, but I shall be glad to do so at a later date should Persian Government still so desire (111).

In reality Wilson left for England after sometime and he returned to Persia only in the middle of spring 1922. It is a safe guess that he discussed the new circumstances and the question of Sowlat al-Dowleh with the Directors of the Company in London. In the middle of February the relation of Oil Company and Sowlat al-Dowleh on boring in Dast-e-Qir was still unclear and undissolved. The Resident Director of the Company, Wilson, did not travel to Fars to meet Sowlat al Dowleh as he had previously after Christmas scheduled. Again Chick informed Wilson that the Democrats in Shiraz have hostile attitude towards the Governor-General and Oil Company.

He recommended the Wilson-Sowlat al Dowleh negotiation should not take place in Shiraz at this time, unless a desirable settlement had been already in Tehran decided. He mentioned, however, that Sowlat al-Dowleh incline to deal with Wilson owing to unsuccessful result in Tehran (112). In reply Wilson informed Chick that he would not visit Shiraz at least for two months and if he decides to come, he would visit Sowlat al-Dowleh (113). During October-April 1921-1922 Sowlat al Dowleh did in practice nothing against the Khans of Kashkuli and the Oil Company in Dasht-e-Qir.

The British Legation and the Oil Company were waiting for a better condition and even the disposition of Sowlat al- Dowleh as defacto Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. The spring migration passed, but the Oil Company did not come in touch with Sowlat al Dowleh. The Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i determined to display his power to the Company and to punish the Kashkulis and to demonstrate the uselessness of the Kashkuli Agreement on matter of protection.

4.11. New round of Confrontation

The informants who watched closely the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i informed the British Consulate in Shiraz and the British Residency in Bushehr that Sowlat al Dowleh moved towards the winter quarter of Kashkuli on 23 April 1922. The action of Sowlat al-Dowleh caused anxiety among the British Official on disruption of oil boring in Dasht-e-Qir. The traditional opponents of Sowlat al-Dowleh gathered together (Qavam al-Molk, Ali Khan, the half-brother of Sowlat al-Dowleh). It is a safe guess to suggest that the British consulate was initiator of the gathering at this moment. Qavam al-Molk raised 100 cavalry (Savar) in Marvdasht. They went with Ali Khan to join Kashkuli in 25 April 1922 (114).

The news of Sowlat al-Dowleh departure towards Kashkuli winter quarter and Bidkarz oil field reached Bushehr. The British Resident was in opinion if Sowlat al-Dowleh appears on the oil field, some temporary arrangement will be necessary. A definite Agreement can be arranged in the presence of a representative of the Persian Government. But it is not advisable for company to lie itself to Soulet and he might be told that he will be held responsible for damage to company's property and for loss due to stoppage of work, etc. (115).

Simultaneously Chick repeated his opinion to the British Minister that it would be advantageous to the Oil Company if Sowlat al-Dowleh would be remove from the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i even for a short time at this juncture. Both Brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh would be anxious to secure the British support and it is easier to deal with them. The brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh need the aid of the Kashkuli Khans „so this unlikely to make difficulties to agreement with Kashkuli. It would be financially advantageous to the company.

The terms would bind future Ilkhani if and when Sowlat return to power (116). Chick repeated his pessimistic view on impossibility of reaching to any favourable agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh. Juncture is most favourable if you (British Minister-Lorraine) care to act on it (the remove of Sowlat al-Dowleh). British have good ground to express the British opinion to the Persian Government. Since Sowlat al-Dowleh failed to pay the compensation of Qashqa'i robberies of the British merchandise and passengers in last autumn.

In minutes of the Legation fairly stated it would be a good thing to get rid of Sowlat and Loraine wrote: Mr. Havard will try to ascertain from Reza Khan instead Persian Government intend to do about Soulet (117). It is significant that the British Legation resorted to the Minister of War, Reza Khan for the removal of Sowlat al-Dowleh instead to do business with the Foreign Ministry. The Minister appeared gradually as a permanent factor on political and military affairs in the capital. The army had, however, only a small detachment in Shiraz.

Chick did not refrain from any efforts to dismiss Sowlat al-Dowleh as defacto Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. The Qavam al-Molk's, consideration, there was no hesitation to collaborate with Chick on this matter. Once Qavam al-Molk suggested reported Chick to Loraine confidentially, to go for a long trip abroad if the Qashqa'i leader (Sowlat al-Dowleh) was willing to act similarly. From British point of view it was „the idea of killing two birds with one stone. That is of getting rid of Soulet-ed Dowleh and his mischievous influence and also of enabling Sir A. Wilson to treat with a far more tractable negotiator than this chieftain (118). This plan did not materialise.

Shortly, before the return of Wilson from England and his arrival in Fars, Chick persuaded Loraine that the circumstances were favourable for the dismissal of Sowlat al-Dowleh due to certain local complaints against lawlessness and brutality of the tribesmen and his harshness. Some of them formed a committee and complained to Tehran. Chick reported: a change of Ilkhani had been demanded by the committee and he added: change in control of the Qashqa'i is desirable in general British commercial interests and over Soulet's brothers we should have more effectual influence (119).

Trevor wrote: Sowlat al-Dowleh is far from being a satisfactory Ilkhani, but the difficulty is to find anybody better. Sardar Ehtesham proved himself utterly useless, I understand in 1919-1920, and could not keep order in the tribe even in those days when he had the morale support of the S.P.R. Ali Khan Salar Heshmat did not appear to much advantage either as Ilbegi and it is more than doubtful if he be any use as Ilkhani (120).

The British Minister, however, consented to the view of Chick and simultaneously to the complaint of committee, demanded the British consulate compensation from Sowlat al-Dowleh and the British Legation demanded the deposition of him. Chick argued the British merchants and subjects have suffered severely last autumn on the hand of Qashqa'i. Chick reported to the Legation: for about five months ago a group of land owners of Fars established a committee of suffers and a section of influential

clergies of Shiraz, imam Jomee, Reiss al-U'lama, Zia al-odaba and Mirza Hassan-e-Dastgheyb as representatives of the committee complained to the cabinet and deputies of Fars in Majles on the oppressions of certain Qashqa'i tribes on the suffers.

The telegram of committee: for the past five months a large number of landowners and notables of the town have formed a committee in on account of the intolerable oppressions and grievous extortion's of Ismai'l Khan Sardar Ashayer Qashqa'i. They first complained to Sowlat al-Dowleh through clergies, after wards through the governor-general and then the cabinet and Majles.

On continuation of acts from the losses inflicted by Sowlat al-Dowleh the properties of landowners of committee, also the vicinity roads were disturbed by the constantly robberies on the roads of goods and passengers, in order he gain the possession of the southern road like some years ago (road guard). Then they referred to the support of the capital newspapers of Sowlat as misrepresentation without making inquiries, they gave ultimatum to the cabinet and deputies, they would order a general stoppage of work take bast in the telegraph office if not the government appointed a representative hold an inquiry in 4 April 1922 (121).

The Minister of Education as the representative of the government and the deputies of Fars responded to the committee and asked them not to take bast. It is in their opinion undesirable particularly in Fars. They told the committee that the Prime Minister makes telegram to Sowlat al-Dowleh and the government is in consultation with the governor-general of Fars. In another telegram the representative of committee asked the deputies an urgent arrangement should the Prime Minister make, because the migration of the tribes have started and several looting of cattle and flocks around Fasa, Sarvestan, Zarqan, Bushehr road, Jirreh, had happened and some peasants and muleteers were murdered.

There was an exchange of telegrams between Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Prime Minister, speaker of Majles and the Minister of War. The Prime Minister Moshir al-Dowleh assured Sowlat al-Dowleh in his telegram of April the first 1922 that the government does not attention to the newspapers articles in Shiraz against him, Moshir al Dowleh, however, reminded Sowlat al-Dowleh, in his telegram of 23 April 1922, of the constant complains and a list of robberies and he added that Sowlat al Dowleh had done nothing to put an end to complains during all this time. Prime Minister set up a

committee for inquiry, a representative from government, a representative of governor-general and a representative of clergies to arrange for payment of compensation (122).

Though the Ministry of War had only a nucleus force in Fars and the number of military personnel was not considerable, but Sowlat al-Dowleh did understand the importance of Reza Khan, the Minister of War, in political affairs in Tehran. He made correspondence with Reza Khan on defending of himself in the matter of complaints by the committee of sufferers. Reza Khan in a telegram told Sowlat al-Dowleh: in my letters I assured you of the favours of the Ministry of War and asked him the security of the Qashqa'i territory and rendering service to the government. Reza Khan added you should always look for backing of the Ministry of War. Reza Khan ensured Sowlat al-Dowleh again in another telegram and wrote: I shall not withhold the necessary assistance and help to you (123).

The Cabinet (Prime Minister), Majles (speaker) and the press in Tehran supported Sowlat al Dowleh. They realised that the delicate situation of Fars. They did not want to leave Fars to the anti-Sowlat alliance, the rivals and the opponents of him, Qavam al-Molk, the brother of Sowlat al-Dowleh, some of the Kashkuli Khans, all related to the British consulates, in Shiraz and Bushehr, as well as, the Governor-General.

They appreciated the past service of Sowlat al-Dowleh. They only ordered him to bring the tribes in order and pay compensation to the sufferers. They did not consider that the dismissal of Sowlat al-Dowleh would not mean necessary the security of the Fars. On the contrary it was most likely to cause more insecurity. The whole of the matter indicates of a far more complicated situation in Fars. As far as the available documents are concerned, it is rather difficult to judge how far Qashqa'is and Sowlat al-Dowleh was responsible for robberies and how far the opponents of Sowlat al-Dowleh caused the disturbance or exploited of the situation to demonstrate that Sowlat was unable to administrate the confederation of Qashqa'i (124).

Robbery and looting was and is a part of nomadic way of life and none of the chieftains were and are able to prevent of all robberies, particularly in migration time and in drought years. In a discussion between Chick and Sowlat al-Dowleh, British consul was of opinion that from 10 robberies 4 to 5 cases was Qashqa'is. Trevor and Loraine wrote Kashkulis were also responsible for robberies as well as Dare Shuri.

A part of committee had close relation with Qavam al-Molk. Chick wrote: "landowners' resident in Shiraz ... who have carried with them practically all public

sentiment. In the town already largely partisan of Qavam al-Molk, himself a sufferer from Qashqa'i depredations (125). It should be here mentioned that Sowlat al-Dowleh had only a loose influence on Kashkuli and Dare Shirr tribes at this juncture. Finally it should be also pointed out that the solution of the Persian Government to the question was purely political and it does not demonstrate necessarily the reality.

Chick suggested the British Minister: Sowlat al-Dowleh is in a position in which a mere act of deposition coming from the Persian Government would be sufficient to the downfall of Sowlat al-Dowleh and the merest handful of Government troops would be suffice as a nucleus around which to rally the malcontents. Qavam al-Molk and his Khamseh confederation would be ready to clinch the matter if Sowlat al-Dowleh should resist to the Government and show fight (126).

4.12. Reza Khan and Sowlat al-Dowleh

Loraine ascertained that a plan had been submitted to the Persian Government for splitting up the Qashqa'i into four sections, each with one Ilbegi at its head and the position of Ilkhani of the whole tribe being definitely abolished (127). As Loraine received the telegram of Chick on departure of Sowlat al-Dowleh towards the Kashkuli winter quarter, sent the Oriental Secretary, Havard, to ascertain from Reza Khan what the Persian Government intend to do about Sowlat. Fairly of the Legation wrote: "it would be a good thing to get rid of Soulet" (128).

It was pretty certain, wrote Loraine, that Reza Khan would take a purely military view. Reza Khan responded to the British Minister through that Persian Government like nothing better than to break Soulet-ed-Dowleh, but they considered that he would resist deposition forcibly and that they were strong enough to ensure his obedience to their command if matters came to a tussle (129).

The British Legation left the matter to Reza Khan (at this time the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh had resigned for a while) in order to not over persuading, if the attempt had failed, Sowlat al-Dowleh would certainly have come to know of it and this would jeopardise the negotiation with Wilson. Reza Khan sent a message to Loraine and thanked him for his communication and he stated in his view the only safe tactics were to temporise with Soulet-ed-Dowleh, to let him continue to believe that he enjoy

the good graces of the Persian Government and to await a more auspicious occasion for destroying his power. Loraine wrote: I am inclined to think that Reza Khan's view of the case was not an unsound one (130).

Sowlat al-Dowleh took the opportunity (by the instruction of the Persian Government to bring order in the tribes) to punish Kashkulis who had made robberies and raids and for the unauthorised agreement with the Oil Company (131). Sowlat al-Dowleh encamped near Kazerun in 23 April 1922 with 250 horsemen (Savar) and it was increased to 800 men and 400 riflemen (tofangchi). As the news of Sowlat's intention on driving off the Kashkulis from the oil field of Dasht-e-Qir (Bidkars) reached Bushehr, the political Resident conveyed a message to Sowlat al-Dowleh and asked him not to take action against the Kashkulis and jeopardise the operation of the company and informed him that Sir Arnold Wilson would shortly arrive in Baghdad from England.

Sowlat al-Dowleh replied that he was waiting for a long time to meet Wilson, but he could not postpone anymore the migration for summer quarter and he intends to punish the Kashkulis for their robberies on the instruction of Government, but not to damage the interests of the company (132). Sowlat al-Dowleh moved towards Kashkuli winter quarter. Kashkulis who had been previously informed, mostly fled to Boir Ahmadi (country), Sowlat al-Dowleh, however, did not go to the oil field. He stayed only for two days nearby and suddenly turned towards summer quarters.

In Trevor's opinion, the turn of Sowlat al-Dowleh towards north was due to intrigues of governor-general, Qavam al-Molk and Ali Khan who desires to be made Ilkhani and exaggerated rumours that the Kashkulis possessed machine guns (133). This view had any basis or not, does not change the fact that Sowlat al-Dowleh achieved his purpose to prove the uselessness of the Kashkuli agreement on protection of materials and employees of Oil Company.

In fact ,from the beginning the Kashkuli Khan were aware very well that they were unable to protect the employees and machinaries of the Oil Company, if Wilson would not come into a satisfactory solution with the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i, they informed Wilson accordingly during the conclusion of the agreement. Wilson promised to meet Sowlat al-Dowleh after Christmas, but he did not. Due to the suggestion of Chick on waiting for a better circumstance and even a change of Ilkhani, Wilson postponed his visit to Fars.

The chiefs of the Kashkulis were afraid of Sowlat al-Dowleh and they became very nervous if Wilson would not visit Sowlat al-Dowleh before the spring migration. Various calming messages were sent to Sowlat al-Dowleh and Kashkulis chiefs (134). Two of the Kashkuli Khans went to Bushehr to meet Colonel Trevor and discuss the matter with him. He told the Khans that Wilson would arrive about the end of April, it was postponed, however, until the middle of May.

Sir Percy Loraine on his arrival in Tehran had come into negotiation with the Persian Government to secure the Kashkuli Agreement on a further meeting between Wilson and Sowlat al-Dowleh. Wilson returned from England to Baghdad and arrived at Bushehr in 9 May 1922. On consent of the Persian Government and the presence of its representative in the first meeting took place outside Shiraz in 19 May 1922 between the Resident Director of the Oil Company, Sir Arnold Talbot Wilson and the defacto Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh Sardar Ashayer. On 20 May after lengthy discussions, two Agreements were concluded.

4.13. Ilkhani of Qashqa'i and the new Agreement

Sowlat al-Dowleh agreed to protect the employees of the Oil Company in Qashqa'i winter quarters and not only in Kashkuli lands. He receives L.1000 a year. When the oil is founded he will get L.2000 a year and 3 percent shares of Oil Company should the A.P.O.C. form to exploit oil in Qashqa'i territory.

The Agreement of Kashkuli was altered and they lost 3 percent share and L.2000 a year after oil is founded (135). On 24 May Chick wrote: one of the Kashkuli Khan (Hadi Khan) was present and signed the altered agreement, but the rest of them joined Ali Khan were demanding their emancipation from the Governor-General. He added Sowlat al-Dowleh did not allow his brothers share or to admit the Ilbegi, if they come to power they would reject the terms, practically these can be no finality to the agreements with such a tribal organisation as the Qashqa'i unless and until the Ilkhaniship abolished.

If the brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh have been in power, the monetary arrangements would not have been heavy as now and the Kashkuli agreement would have remained unchanged. "The agreement is merely a form of blackmail" in Sir

Wilson word. The Director Resident of the Company regarded Sowlat al-Dowleh quite unreliable in his performance and he would like to see a change of Ilkhani an event that in the natural course of things must occur within three years if not sooner.

After the conclusion of Agreement wrote Wilson Sardar Ashayer as a man of considerable ability and force of character with a good head for business negotiation, he would remain for long time in power and even Nasser Khan to be ousted from ilkhaniship, Sowlat al-Dowleh would continue to exercise Great Power unless the Persian Government supported a rival and it is not a matter of regret that the company made this agreement (136).

From Trevor viewpoint Wilson can arrange the matter with Reza Khan who is all powerful now and will continue to be so in the next Government“. He was more inclined to agree with Wilson than Chick and wrote: Qavam al-Molk and Ali Khan and the others who are intriguing against Sowlat al-Dowleh will find him very tough nuts to crack. (137).

Loraine had pragmatically and favourable opinion of the agreement. He wrote the authorised agreement put an end to antagonism (of Persian Government and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i) to the company and the desires of Sowlat al-Dowleh to gain a share of the company and to tighten his authority over Kashkuli tribe was met. The company solved an awkward situation at comparatively slight expense. Loraine added Wilson was satisfactory with the agreement and if it be ratified, he intend to urge on his company the advisability of remodeling other local Agreements in order to harmonise their character with of the present agreement (138).

Loraine met Wilson, who had gone to Tehran after the Agreement and discussed the matters with him. Loraine considered the meeting with Sowlat al-Dowleh” was both useful and opportune he wrote: I am compelled, to my regret, to record my disagreement with Mr. Chick’s general conclusion. He continued to say I fear that Mr. Chick has been somewhat led astray by his desire, however natural and justifiable on local grounds to see the power and influence of Sowlat al-Dowleh definitely smashed (139).

In fact, some time ago, as Chick insisted on the need for a change of Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Loraine appeared to think that Chick had adopted a partisan attitude in favour of Qavam al-Molk or associated him with local political feeling on the matter (140),

however Chick argued that the reason for his suggestion was only the British commercial interests.

Three days after his report on Qashqa'i agreement Loraine sent a dispatch on the question of Sowlat al-Dowel's personality position as practical head of the tribe. He wrote on friendly relations of Chick with Qavam al-Molk, the rival of Sowlat al-Dowleh: I am well aware of that chieftain's (Qavam al-Molk) good qualities and his uniformly friendly disposition towards our selves (British). He is, however, an intriguer, as all Persians are practically compelled by existing circumstances to be, albeit a far more respectable intriguer than Sowlat al-Dowleh.

My injunction was intended to warn Mr. Chick not necessarily to fall in with Qavam al-Molk's point of view, whatever his friendliness to us (British), and especially to avoid being involved in the perpetual strife and intrigue between the two powerful factions represented by Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al Dowleh respectively which is the course of Fars politics (141). Though it appears that the conclusion of Qashqa'i agreement put an end to certain difficulties in Fars, but, in reality, the question of power politic remained as ambiguous, as past years in Fars.

4.14. A New Attempt against Sowlat

On June the first, ten days after the conclusion of Qashqa'i Agreement, Sowlat al-Dowleh left his camp at Qal'eh Piri, about 20 km from Shiraz, to go to the Garden of imam Jomeh to discuss the matters with the Governor-General of Fars over telephone. Ali Khan, the brother of Ilkhani, attacked the camp of his brother with about 200 men. Before reaching to the garden. Sowlat al-Dowleh received this news, consequently he returned to his camp. Fighting continued between the two sides for two days. Four men from Sowlat were killed and two of Ali Khan's were wounded and some horses of Sowlat al-Dowleh carried off. Sowlat al-Dowleh left for Beyza, a small town, to join the tribe and Ali Khan camped near the Koran Gate of Shiraz with his 180 men of the Kashkuli, Dareshuri and Sheshbuluki.

The Governor-General of Fars brought the fighting to an end and suggested the two sides as well as Qavam al-Molk to the negotiations (142). Again on June the 10th Ali Khan with certain Kashkuli and Dareshuri Khans left his camp near Shiraz. Rumour

unconfirmed of fighting between Nasser Khan and the former near the border of Boir Ahmadi. Sowlat al-Dowleh left Beyza to help his son (143). Trevor considered that the attack was synchronised with the time of Sowlat al-Dowleh trip and in view of the governor-general's hostility to Sowlat al-Dowleh, and his recent efforts to oust him, it almost seems as "this was a treacherous attempt to secure the downfall of Sowlat al-Dowleh and succession of Ali Khan to Ilkhaniship (144). However there is no proof of this so far it will not be surprise if Sowlat al-Dowleh takes measure of reprisals against Kashkuli and Dare Shuri" (145).

The rivalry and feud between the tribal chiefs and the participation of the governor-general as well as British consul on these years were some of the factors of disturbance in Fars and put Sowlat al-Dowleh in a difficult position. All the efforts of Qavam al-Molk, the brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Kashkuli Khans as well as Governor-General and local British authorities to change the Ilkhani from Sowlat al-Dowleh to someone else was without result and at the end of summer of 1922 for several times Sowlat al-Dowleh survived from the complots of his rivals and opponents.

Though, Loraine appraised positively the Qashqa'i agreement and did not consent the (for other reason) the collaboration of Chick with Qavam al-Molk against Sowlat al-Dowleh, but he was waiting to see the destruction of Sowlat al-Dowleh's power by the army and the Minister of War (as far as his correspondences to Foreign Office indicate) and the split of the Qashqa'i without directly involvement of British.

The Minister of War, who intended to expand his power throughout the country and to break the other centers of power particularly the nomad tribe chieftains took the opportunity of British communication on Qashqa'i and Sowlat al-Dowleh with him to develop more and more his relation with the British Legation. He sent a message to the British Minister, after discussing with the Oriental Secretary, we should await for a more auspicious occasion to destroy the power of Sowlat al-Dowleh. With such views and reactions of the Minister for War and the British Minister certainly the future of Qashqa'i agreement was in doubt.

4.15. Summary

- (1) The South Persia Rifles was organised under the British Command in Persia in 1916-1917. The Persian Cabinets did not recognise it as a Persian force and did not prepare to take the financial responsibility. Finally Foreign Office decided to disband the force in three stages during the summer and autumn 1921.
- (2) The chief of Khamseh confederation requested to hold one third of the force. He intended to retain his predominant position in Fars. This suggestion, however, was rejected and criticised by the Persian Cabinet and Minister of War, Persian Parliament and his rivals in Fars.
- (3) Before the dissolution of the third part of the S.P.R., the rivals of the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i in and outside the tribe intended to kill him in a complot. With the support of the Persian Government, Sowlat al-Dowleh succeeded to neutralise the plan.
- (4) The Directors of A.P.O.C. expanded the activities of the Company in the other provinces.
- (5) The Resident Director of the Company concluded an Agreement with the Khans of Hayat Davudi near Bushehr. He also concluded an Agreement with the Khans of Kashkuli tribe, a branch of Qashqa'i, similar to Bakhtiyari on purchasing land and formation a Watch Guard to protect the boring of oil. This Agreement was without the knowledge of Ilkhani of Qashqa'i.
- (6) The Ilkhani of Qashqa'i protested to the Kashkuli Agreement and Persian Government did not recognise both of them.
- (7) It was known that the Oil Company prepare to organise another Protection Guard of 300 men of Kashkulis and purchased 300 rifles from the S.P.R. The British Residency in Bushehr also recruited 300 men of disbanded S.P.R.
- (8) It appears that the Oil Company and the British Residency were not sure of the security in the south in the absence of the S.P.R. and at same time they intended to secure the British position in Fars.
- (9) Immediately, after the dissolution of the S.P.R. an officer of the Ministry of War took the command of 400 Persian forces in Fars. He was ordered to increase the force to 1200 men and it was intended to station 10.000 of the Persian army in the South and take the responsibility for the security.

V: Khuzestan

5.1. British in Khuzestan During the War

With the occupation of Khuzestan by the British forces in 1915, Khaz'al re-established his position in southern Khuzestan. From British view point, during the years 1916-1920 the state of affairs in southern Khuzestan was satisfactory. The difficulties between Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans settled and a friendly relation maintained between the two sides.

British troops stationed in Mahammareh, Ahvaz and Shush. British consulates were involved in local affairs. Since 1915 a Vice-Consul was conferred on the Assistant surgeon resided in Mohammareh and vice-consul in Ahvaz his main function related to the Bakhtiyari Khans (1).

5.1.1. Administration of North Khuzestan

At the beginning of the war, the Bakhtiyari maintained Deputy of Governors in Shushtar and Dezful and a force of Bakhtiyari horsemen maintained the order. The town people and peasants were depended to the good will of the Khans. With the arrival of British forces in 1916 the Bakhtiyari Cavalries left the two towns. When the Mesopotamian expeditionary force landed at Basreh and British troops occupied Mohammareh and Ahvaz, sometime later in 1916 the civil commissioner at Basreh deputed officially a political officer to Dezful and afterward to Shushtar and a detachment of Indian Cavalry located at Shush 32 km south of Dezful and between the two towns (2).

The two Political Officers in Shushtar and Dezful had also a small force in the town. British opened a Justice Department. The complaints should go first to the British Vice-Consulate, and then he would send the pleading for justice to the department of justice. In real terms the affairs of the province were run by the British trustees. They appointed the personalities who supported British policy or were the adherents to Khaz'al. Though, the Persian administration remained without change and a Governor-

General was appointed by the Central Government, he had no real power in the northern Khuzestan (3).

The British Political Officers in Shushtar and Dezful “became De facto Governors of the province” (4). Since April 1915 when consul Trevor gave over Charge of the Mohammareh Consulate, British officers in Khuzestan “supervised from Mesopotamia” and during the years 1917-1920 Wilson „while in Baghdad made a practice of dealing with all Khuzestan affairs as well as those of Bakhtiyari, through or in consultation with Captain Peel, British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz with the results that have been most satisfactory” (5).

British trade increased, the refinery at Abadan doubled in size and the output trebled. The powerful pumping stations were erected at various points along the pipeline and were completed with comfortable quarters for the resident engineers and their staff during and after the war British founded a number of building and institutes in Ahvaz. In 1923-24 there were about two thousand houses and about 100 British resided in this town. As a result of rapid development of Ahvaz, Sheikh Khaz'al spent during the years 1917-1920 „almost as much time at Ahvaz as at Mohammareh” (6).

5.1.2. Southern Khuzestan During the War

In the years 1897-1914 when the Persian Government was in internal crisis and weak, Sheikh Khaz'al expanded gradually his power in southern and centre of Khuzestan. He worked loyally with the British Government and the A.P.O.C., for the current of oil, trade and the tranquillity in Khuzestan as well as the expansion of British influence in southern Persia. For the reasons Khaz'al received the assurance letters from British Government.

During the Great War, Khaz'al did his best to facilitate the situation for British in Khuzestan and Basreh Valayat in Mesopotamia where he had properties gardens and influence (7). British were confident that in the turbulence years of Post-War, he would participate in any British supported alliance.

5.2. Khuzestan After the War

After the war the British Political Residents and the other high military and political British official in Bushehr, Baghdad and in the Persian Gulf visited Khaz'al regularly and consulted on regional politics. The new British Minister in Tehran, Herman Norman, was passing via the Persian Gulf, Mesopotamia and Kermanshah to Tehran. He stayed in Basreh and visited unofficially Sheikh Khaz'al in the second half of May 1920 (8).

His successor, Sir Percy Loraine also on his way to Basreh, Baghdad and Tehran, met the Sheikh Khaz'al twice in Mohammareh and then in Basreh in December 1921 (9). The Persian Government was also aware of this cordial relation, but, they remained silence on this matter, as long as the Central Government was not strong. Ahmad Shah even bestowed him with new decoration and title on his return from Europe in May 1920 (10).

Sheikh Khaz'al expected a reward from the British Government for four years of loyal co-operation. During the War, he accepted nothing from British, but relied on British to do what was right when the world should again be at peace (11).

5.3. Khaz'al Expectation

Apparently, for the first time Sheikh Khaz'al disclosed his desire in 1914 that he would like to be recognised as the Amir of Khuzestan. Despite the fact that the British Government expanded the assurance letter of 1914 to his heir, and in spite of British respect and appreciation of Khaz'al cordial relation, but the efforts and desire of Sheikh Khaz'al to become the Amir of Khuzestan did not gain the support of British authorities.

It appears that the formation of an independent Emirate in southern Khuzestan was not in harmony with the British regional policy against Russia and at same time this policy did not ease the flow of oil and it was even more probable that it would cause many unpredicted problems in the region. He desired, therefore, to be appointed as Amir of Iraq or at least Basreh Velayat. British authorities in the Persian Gulf as well as in Foreign Office rejected the idea and did not take it seriously.

Sir Arnold Wilson who was in favour substantial rewards for Sheikh Khaz'al, but at the same time was pressing for a united Iraq, he argued that Khaz'al is too old and Shi'ah, and Foreign Office added his status "as Persian subject disqualified him for Emirate of Iraq." Though, Sir Arnold Wilson explained British consideration on this matter to Khaz'al in December 1918. He added that the British Government would not risk everything in Persia by a move to tie Khuzestan and Mesopotamia together through Sheikh Khaz'al but he did not lose his hope. (12)

5.3.1. Norman in the Yacht

When in 24 May 1920, Herman Norman, arrived in Basreh, an instruction from Curzon was waiting of him which gave him permission to pay an unofficial visit to Sheikh Khaz'al. The day after, Khaz'al came up as far as Basreh in his yacht, lately given to him by the British authorities as the British Government present with a river steamer for his services during the War. Herman Norman and Major Gilan, the Military governor of Basreh was received by Khaz'al and the following persons, who were waiting of the British Minister.

Prince A.H.Farmanfarma, Governor-General of Fars and his Deputy Ibrahim Khan Qavam al Molk who had accompanied Ahmad Shah from Bushehr on the occasion of his return from Europe and passage through Basreh and Mohammareh. Farmanfarma postponed his return to Shiraz in order to make acquaintance with the new British Minister in Tehran. Then, Norman met the governor-general of Khuzestan, Mo'ayed al Dowleh, and the Kargozar (the representative of Foreign Ministry) of Khuzestan.

The eldest son of Khaz'al, Jaseb and the trusted counsellor of Khaz'al, „a man of business“, Haj Rais al-Tojjar. Addition to Farmanfarma, Khaz'al himself had a private talk with British Minister who congratulated Khaz'al on the decoration and high title of Sardar Aqdas conferred on him by Ahmad Shah and on the gift of yacht by the British Government (13).

Norman added he was especially glad to him to meet Khaz'al, because his name and his reputation for attachment to Great Britain had been known to him for many years and he was authorised once more "to express the satisfaction of His Majesty's

Government at his continued loyal co-operation“ (14). Khaz'al reminded Norman in this occasion of the services which he had rendered to British Government during the war.

Norman added Sheikh Khaz'al was beginning to look for his reward. Norman replied the matter was not one which he was yet in a position to discuss, but Sir Percy Cox would mention to him in Tehran and he would find any case the references to it in the archives of British Legation. As Norman explained Khaz'al's observation, Cox was able to suggest that it might have reference to his" desire to become King of Mesopotamia under a British mandate".

Apparently Farmanfarma was familiar with the Khaz'al's desire as well. At the same time he knew that although British Government have not decided or announced their appointee, but it did not appear that Khaz'al was their choice. In his return to Fars, in respond to a letter from Khaz'al. He wrote: it will not harm to the British policy if they would appoint Khaz'al, a notable and distinction person of Arab, as the Amir of Iraq and Basreh. He added he intends to ask frankly if he meets Cox. He also would write to his son, Firuz Mirza Nosrat al Dowleh, the Persian Foreign Minister, to talk to Cox in this matter if he found a suitable occasion (15).

In fact at the end of the Great War and the defeat of Ottomans, a new political condition was shaped in west Asian region, from Mediterranean to the western border of Persia. British and French troops stationed in the former Ottoman Empire, Mesopotamia, Palestina and Syrian, but the situation was unstable. The Entente Powers agreements during the War on the one hand and the desire of the Arabs, Turks and Kurds in the former Ottomans Empire on the other hand.

The difference of British authorities on the future of the regions as well as Mesopotamia as a unified Kingdom or a divided Mesopotamia into two Arab and Kurdish countries. The future of the Turkey and Bolshevik Russia were among the important post-war issues. On question of the future of Mesopotamia was definitely decided in the Cairo Conference of Colonial Office in 1921.

5.3.2. Khaz'al and Arms Deal

Sheikh Khaz'al sent arms and ammunitions to Ibn-Sa'ud during the War at the request of British and his subject lost many arms, he intended to strengthen his position

against his opponents in the province and the Central Government. He requested the British authorities for arms and ammunitions, four mountain guns and a modern river steamer. Sir Arnold Wilson and Sir Percy Cox were of opinion that with the cheapest price Khaz'al defends the British interests in southern Persia. British authorities in London and India postponed the deliver of arms in one way or another as long as the ratification of the Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919 was hoped. Khaz'al received only a "paddle-wheel steamer in 22 January 1920.

The question of arms responded when British troops had to withdraw from the Persian soil (summer 1921) to get the withdrawal of Russian Bolshevik force. In the aftermath of revolt in Iraq, to assume responsibility for defense of the oil installation, the gift of arms to Sheikh Khaz'al assumed a new importance.

In July 1921, four artillery pieces were delivered with ammunitions, but only in December 1921, Colonel Trevor, the Political Resident in Bushehr, took 5,000 rifles and ammunitions upon himself to order their delivery to Khuzestan province (16). The British Government's authorities succeeded to strengthen the position of a Southern tribe chief in his future struggle.

5.3.3. Mediation in Khaz'al's Taxation

British Government did not fulfil the Khaz'al's wish of Iraq kingdom but, they prepared to mediate between the sheikh and the Persian Government on taxation, custom tariff and the other issues. One of the questions in which it raised by the Central Government after the war was the question of the tribal chieftains' taxation. This subject related to Sheikh Khaz'al as well.

During the Great War and afterwards until 1920, Khaz'al like most tribal chiefs in Persia paid no revenue tax to the Central Government. After the war, the foremost aim of the cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh was to restore order and then to collect arrears (revenue) taxes of tribal chiefs. The Persian Government asked Sheikh Khaz'al to pay his arrears and annual taxes and Khaz'al presented a claim for some 700.000T on account of expenditure "as Sarhaddar or margrave in defending the Persian soil against the enemies.

Khaz'al declared that he is ready to pay his revenue whenever the Government should arrange a satisfactory settlement of this claim. British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Cox, negotiated with the Premier Vothuq al-Dowleh on behalf of Khaz'al in 1919-1920. It was eventually decided that all arrears of taxes of Khaz'al up to Nowruz, 21 March 1920" should be set against his claims and that these after for 6 years he should pay only half his yearly revenue".

Cox informed Khaz'al in a telegram, without waiting the ratification of the cabinet and Vothuq al-Dowleh informed the Finance Minister in a letter dated 12 April 1920 the purport of this decision (17). No official confirmation, however, of this arrangement reached Khaz'al. The cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh did not ratify the arrangement during his tenure of office and „was denounced by his successor, Moshir al Dowleh (18). Vothuq al-Dowleh agreed with the Cox's proposal to reduce the Khaz'al taxes to such a great amount that no other Prime Ministers prepared to ratify it.

It appears two reasons caused Vothuq al-Dowleh to accept this settlement. First of all, he came and remained in power, in spite of oppositions, only with the strong political, military and financial support of British Government and the Legation. Vothuq al-Dowleh, therefore, was not in a position to reject the British Minister's demand. Secondly, it had been foreseen that with the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919, British Government would lend a loan of L2.000.000 to the Persian Government.

Vothuq al-Dowleh, therefore, came to terms in such critical situation and made a friend in this corner of the country. From British point of view, in spite of the fact that the British Government returned to the old policy of maintaining the integrity of Persia against Soviet Russia, this time through the protectorate style the Agreement 1919. This policy did not mean necessarily that the British Government intended to refrain from his relation with the southern tribal chiefs.

The mediation between the Government and the friendly tribal chiefs on tax reduction showed the influence of British to both sides and the Persian Government had to find another source for financial deficits. For more than a year, the question of Khaz'al's arrears revenue remained in abeyance. No cabinet prepared to relinquish such a great amount of tax. In fact, the question of formation of a modern army by the Minister of War, Reza Khan, since the coup d'état 21 February 1921, absorbed a lion share of the Persian Government's incomes. The cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh and his successors had reliance mainly on internal revenue.

At the beginning of July 1921, Consul Peel, who promoted from vice-consul to consul in Ahvaz, went to Tehran with several purposes ahead. In addition to the question of a Bakhtiari police force in which he discussed with Norman, he also negotiated with the Persian authorities in Tehran, with the permission of the British Minister on financial question as well as the governor-general in the north Khuzestan.

Peel had several negotiations with the Prime Minister, Qavam al Saltaneh (3 June 1921-22 January 1922) on recognition of the arrangement made between Cox and Vothuq al-Dowleh regarding the Khaz'al revenue. The Prime Minister pointed out that the original arrangement had never been officially recognised by the cabinet and would never be accepted by the Persian Parliament. He stated the new Governor-General of Khuzestan, Zahir al-Molk, would give entire satisfaction to the Khaz'al revenue.

Qavam al-Saltaneh also stated that "he could get his cabinet to agree to an arrangement whereby all revenue unpaid by the sheikh up to Nowruz 1920 should be wiped off on condition that the sheikh there after paid full revenue". Peel agreed to this and telegraphed to Khaz'al accordingly, but Khaz'al insisted that the original agreement should be adhered.

The revise orders were issued by Qavam al-Saltaneh, and Khaz'al was trying to reimburse himself by obtaining sanction to a revised budget for himself which it would make the Persian Government responsible for much of the expenditure on law and order services in southern Khuzestan hitherto borne by Khaz'al (19). These negotiations had impressed on Khaz'al necessity of paying half his revenue with retrospective effect from Nowruz (21March) 1920 and the treasury of the revenue department was less empty than it had been for many years Khaz'al did not agree with Peel-Qavam al-Saltaneh mutual agreement (20).

In spite of the fact that the British Government returned to the old policy of keeping the integrity of Persia against Russia, through the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 and then the military coup 1921, but it did not mean necessarily to abandon the friendly relation with southern tribal chieftains. British Government indicated their friendship towards the chieftains by mediating between the Central Government and the chieftains on taxation issue or a resumption of tax payment of the chieftains.

5.4. Consolidation of North Khuzestan

Though, the northern Khuzestan was under the influence of several small and great tribes of Posht-kuh and Lorestan and the north-east region and the towns of Dezful, Shushtar and Ramhormoz were under the Bakhtiyari influence, but what distinguished the north part from the south was the political structure of the province. Shushtar was the capital of Khuzestan and the seat of Governor-General. Practically, the Governor-General was able to supervise and implement his authorities on tribal areas and to collect the annual taxations.

In the crisis years 1896-1921, and in the absence a strong military force, he was not in a position to perform his function. Termination of the war gradually prepared a condition that the Central Government to consolidate the governmental departments and re-establishing the authorities in this corner of the country. For the reason and the important role of northern Khuzestan in unification of the province in following years, a short review of the Post-War political process is suitable.

British policy in the northern Khuzestan after the war was the continuation on the line initiated in 1916-1918. The Governor-General and his staff, horsemen, police received their salary from revenue department of Khuzestan in Dezful. This arrangement was made by Sir Percy Cox with the Persian Government for a sum of 3.100 T. monthly from the Mohammareh customs. The assistant political officer at Shushtar was withdrawn in May 1919 and his duties since then performed by the Assistant Political Officer in Dezful. The cavalry detachment at Shush was withdrawn in May 1920 (21). The reduction of the expense and then the question of whole expenses of British in Khuzestan set forth by the Government of India.

The relation between British Vice-Consul and the head of the Persian Administration was not always cordial. Some of them resisted to the British interference, the other compromised for the time. It appears that the judgement of British authorities, on these personalities was rather from British interest point of view. At the beginning of the year 1920, there was the dissension between the new Governor-General of Khuzestan, Mo'ayed al-Dowleh and the head of finance department, a man who was considered by the British Assistant Political Officer in Dezful and Shushtar, Major W. Meade as "a man of the strictest integrity and a really conscientious worker" (22).

The reason for this tension is not known, but it was difficult for Meade to forgive “the Governor-General who “succeeded in jockeying the head of Revenue department a most capable and efficient “and one whom it will be almost impossible to replace. At the same time, Mo’ayed al Dowleh was seriously ill in Shushtar and he was attended by civil surgeon, Khuzestan and was under his care in Ahvaz. Meade reported, however, the illness of Governor-General’ combine with his experiences at Shushtar “induced him to adapt an altered tone towards the British Government - at least outwardly” (23).

After the recovery, governor-general of Khuzestan went to Mohammareh to see the Shah (24). He and the Kargozar of the province also accompanied Khaz’al who went to Basreh by his yacht to receive the new British Minister in Tehran, Herman Norman and attended the banquet of Khaz’al on arrival of Norman (25). The Governor-General of Khuzestan, Prince Mo’ayed al-Dowleh and Kargozar of Khuzestan, both protested their devotion to Great Britain (26). Then Mo’ayed al-Dowleh returned to Shushtar from Ahvaz, wrote Meade, he was “in a very perturbed state of mind”.

The Governor-General “heard that the pro-British cabinet of Vothuq al Dowleh was dissolved and an anti-British one convened in its place. He bitterly bewails the letters he sent to Tehran”, Wrote Meade: “eulogising our (British) regime here and he resumed his former attitude of objecting to our (British) influence in Shushtar and Dezful” (27).

In fact, after the war, as long as Vothuq al-Dowleh was in power (August 1918-June 1920), the cabinet did not raise any objection to the presence of British troops in Persia. It was not unnatural that the Governor-General of Khuzestan and the Kargozar of the province did not oppose to the British occupation and their interference in local affairs. The occupation of Gilan by the Russian Bolshevik in 18 May 1920, however, changed the situation. The Bolshevik Government did not agree to withdraw from the Persian territory so long as British forces maintain on the Persian soil.

Vothuq al-Dowleh, who failed in his attempt to persuade the return of Bolshevik and even a coalition Government was formed by the nationalists and leftist in Gilan, had to resign. The fall of Vothuq al-Dowleh and formation a liberal nationalist cabinet by Moshir al-Dowleh put the whole Anglo-Persian relation in question and the Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919 remained in abeyance. The evacuation of foreign troops from the Persian soil discussed more seriously.

Meanwhile Prince Mo'ayed-al Dowleh, the Governor-General of Khuzestan who was long ill, died at his post in 3 September 1920. The previous occupant of the post, Vaqar al- Saltaneh, who was appointed in November 1917 and arrived in his post at Shushtar at the end of January 1918 to succession to Eyn al-Molk (28), now reappointed. Vaqar al-Saltaneh left Tehran for Shushtar via Isfahan on 21 September 1920. From British view point, he was "on the best of terms with the Legation and with" Khaz'al (29).

5.5. Wilson and the Future of Khuzestan

As the question of Khuzestan's future and the position of British came into discussion in 1920-1921. Wilson, officiate the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, who supervised the British officers in Khuzestan, wrote a memorandum on the political situation of Khuzestan since July 1917. In another report he explained the necessary forces for protection of oilfields and the defence of the A.P.O.C.'s installations.

He endeavoured to indicate that the presence of British troops and British Political Officers were beneficial to the Persians in these years and caused the cordial relation between the two sides. He wrote: "friendly relations with the leading landowners and priests have been maintained and improved" and "the important section of the tribal town and village community desire a maintenance of the present", "where by a British consul officer is enable to exert such influence over the local government as will force it to maintain order and give effect to its elementary duties" (30).

Wilson continued to say in other paragraph „the progress on present lines can only be secured by continuance of the present regime under which it is understood by the public at large that we are determined not to allow this fertile district to lapse into the former anarchy". He proposed :

- “(a) Abadan would probably require a regiment, and the accommodation for the troops to build by Anglo Persian Oil Company at suitable places in each pumping station.
- (b) A Brigade of Infantry and Cavalry Regiment may be regarded, with a Battery of Mountain Artillery.
- (c) A permanent garrison of one Battalion of Indian Infantry to be maintained in the future in Ahvaz. He added, Sheikh Khaz'al would welcome the

maintenance of a permanent garrison at Ahvaz in order to help him. The Persian Government did not raise objection to the presence of British troops in Khuzestan for some years past, and he believed that they would do so in the above connection” (31).

On political level, Wilson wrote: the gradual importance of Ahvaz as a port and its geographical position in relation to Posht-Kuh, Lorestan and Bakhtiyari to Khuzestan and the extension of the Oil Company activities in Posht-Kuh and the implication of Basreh port question. In relation to Mohammareh, Wilson proposed to the Government of India that the vice-consulate Ahvaz promotes Consulate, with a Consul and Vice-consul to deal with Sheikh Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari through Ahvaz Consul.

He added all facilities for the ship should be made in Karun river as well as custom building and construction of a rail way terminus intentionally should be from Ahvaz as a major port and it should be avoided the necessity of constructing a port at Mohammareh “only 32 km away from Basreh” (32).

Only a short time later, on 27 November 1920, Norman sent a lengthy telegram to the southern consulates through the Political Resident in Bushehr. He instructed them that they should remain aloof from the Persian affairs in the circumstances that the question of Anglo-Persian Agreement's relation was ahead (33). Even a year later Peel wrote: “Our (British) interference with the administration was the cause of numerous complaints made to H. B's Minister in Tehran” (34).

5.5.1. Evacuation from Khuzestan

Colonel Trevor asked the Government of India for early decision on Wilson proposal of protecting oilfields in Khuzestan through military and political presence. The viceroy of India deprecated Wilson's proposal for location of permanent garrison in Khuzestan as unnecessary, politically unsound and contrary to His Majesty's Government's policy of evacuating troops from Persia. “We (viceroy) consider that in normal times protection of oilfields should be secured through the sheikh of Mohammareh, whom we (British) supplied with arms and the Bakhtiyaris who seem to be fully alive to both their responsibilities and interests in the matter”.

Viceroy suggested that Trevor to be instructed to work out a suitable scheme in consultation with Anglo-Persian Oil Company. Of course it was natural that “in times of crisis, military assistance should be furnished from Mesopotamia” (35). At the same time, credits were made by the Mesopotamian Administration for the maintenance of law and order service, but from the beginning the financial year 1921-22 (until March 21) these credits caused entirely (36).

As the Government of India caused the payment in 1921, the chiefs of the mentioned tribes besieged each month of the first half of the year 1921, the British vice-consulate in Dezful for their subsidies. In the years 1916-1920, the cost of Sagvand Levy in the north Khuzestan was monthly 1000T, the subsidies also paid to the chiefs of the Sagvand, Amaleh Lor and certain Arab tribes altogether 1170T a month.

The Persian Government made formal sanction, the budget of 1000T for the Sagvand Levy, “but the monthly Charge for the subsidies had never admitted” (37). This was one of the topic of that consul Peel discussed negotiated in Tehran in July 1921 with Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Prime Minister, in order to persuade the cabinet to recognise the arrangement made by British with the chiefs of the tribes in the north Khuzestan and the appointment of a capable Governor-General.

In fact, after the Great War, the Persian Governments determined to extend the authority of the Central Government even in remote areas. After the coup d'état this process accelerated and the Persian Government paid more attention to the provinces in gradual withdrawal of foreign troops and the establishment of law and order. The Prime Minister, Qavam al-Saltaneh, appointed a “capable Governor-General, Zahir al-Molk and a deputy governor in Dezful, Mirza Abd_allah Khan, ,, a man of quite exceptional ability and integrity” wrote Peel.

On his arrival, the Governor-General endeavoured to set the administration on its feet. In spite of financial difficulty, the Central Government accepted in full, as well as the budget of Khuzestan, by the efforts of the Governor-General, in order to give no pretext to the local British authorities to interfere in the local affairs. The British Consul in Ahvaz instructed the vice-consul in Dezful to hand over the Sagvand Levy to the new Deputy Governor as well as the affairs of the tribal chiefs in the vicinity of Dezful as well as monthly subsidies to the Sagvand, Lor and Arab chiefs (38).

British troops left Khuzestan in the same year, 1921 (39). In Wilson's proposal, this was an explanation on the process of Ahvaz development and importance

of this city in future. This view point paid the attention of British Minister in Tehran. Norman urged Foreign Office that the necessary facilities to be provided at Ahvaz as early as possible so as to allow the British consular representation over the whole of Khuzestan as well as Bakhtiyari and Lorestan being unified under the consul in Ahvaz (40). India Office approved in principle for reorganisation and accepted Norman's contention that consul in Ahvaz should be for Bakhtiyari affairs, under direct of Tehran (41). Curzon concurred with the Montagu's proposal to approve the action (42).

The policy of unification the southern Khuzestan under Khaz'al was welcome by the British local authorities and it was in harmony with the British interests who wished the tranquillity of the region to secure the trade and industrial activities of British enterprise as well as British political influence.

5. 6. Summary

- (1) After the occupation of Khuzestan 1915, two British Political Officers and a small force was sent to Shushtar and Dezful. Though, the administration of Khuzestan remained unchanged during War, but a Governor-General lost part of his power.
- (2) The city of Ahvaz developed and the size of population increased during the War. British trade increased and the refinery at Abadan doubled in size and the output trebled.
- (3) Sheikh Khaz'al did his best to facilitate the situation for the British in southern Khuzestan and Basreh Valayat. Appeared that he enjoys of a very strong position, but in real terms he was rather too venerable and was too much depended on British support.
- (4) British policy in the northern Khuzestan after the war was the continuation on the line initiated in 1916-1918. The British Political Officers in Shushtar and then in Dezful and the cavalry detachment was withdrawn in 1919-1920. The relation between the heads of Persian administration and British political officers was not always cordial. They resisted some time or compromised to the British interference. It was depended to the political atmosphere.
- (5) After the War, with the presence of British forces in Khuzestan and southern Persia made Sheikh Khaz'al more comfortable in his position. It appeared that he enjoys of a very strong position, but in real terms he was rather too venerable and was too much depended on British support.
- (6) So long as the Persian Government was weak and the Persian troops did not return to Khuzestan, Khaz'al did not care to pay his arrears and annual taxes.
- (7) Sheikh Khaz'al, who co-operated with the British forces in Khuzestan and Iraq during the War 1914-1918, now expected to be appointed as Amir of Iraq. The desire of Sheikh Khaz'al was rejected by the British Government due to his age, his Shi'ah' religion and his status as Persian subject.
- (8) Sheikh Khaz'al received Yacht, arms, ammunitions and artillery pieces especially after the withdrawal of British troops and the dissolution of the S.P.R. in 1921.
- (9) India Office rejected the proposal of the Persian Gulf Officers, who were in 1921 in favour of continuation presence of British forces in Khuzestan.
- (10) British troops left Khuzestan in 1921. British Vice-Consulate prompted to consulate due to important of the city.

(11) Persian Government appointed a capable Governor-General for Khuzestan and a Deputy Governor for Dezful. On his arrival, the Governor-General endeavoured to set the administration on its feet.

VI: Bakhtiyari in 1919-1920

6.1. Sardar Zafar the Ilkhani in 1917-1919

When the Armistice announced in November 1918, Sardar Zafar was nearly one and half year Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari. Apparently British authorities trusted him as a man, who was able to secure tranquillity in the oil fields in such unstable international situation after the Russian revolutions. He suppressed the political oppositions as well as brigand groups in Bakhtiyari commercial route in that corner of Persia. British authorities facilitated the situation for him by putting financial credit and arms at his disposal. He was successful in his efforts and at the same times he could establish his position by creating a private army.

In an expedition against Kohgiluyeh tribes by the Bakhtiyaris in summer 1918, the Bakhtiyari force was equipped with a mountain battery under the command of a British officer and at the disposal of Sardar Zafar and Sardar Ashja, the Ilkhani and Ilbegi. The British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, accompanied the force to Kohgiluyeh. It was aimed to punish the Tayyebi tribe, who plundered many caravans in Bakhtiyari road. Their strong holds were occupied. Hostages were taken and arrears of revenue collected. A completely successful expedition and no organised robberies by Kohgiluyeh tribes occurred between the autumn of 1918 and the autumn 1920 (1).

During the last weeks of expedition coincided with the news of British seizure of Shiraz and Abadeh against the Qashqa'i force and the others under Sowlat al-Dowleh. Captain Peel requested the help of Sardar Zafar to wire to Amir Mojahed to proceed at once to Abadeh with 500 cavalry and affection it relief and he did accordingly. Meanwhile Sardar Zafar offered to place a force of 500 cavalry at the British disposal.

A month later, in autumn 1918, British Government agreed to finance the force to be stationed in Chahar Mahal and to suppress the activities of the brigands at Isfahan districts and the unobedient elements in Bakhtiyari land and maintaining the authority of the Ilkhani and Ilbegi. The subsidy was continued until March 1919, although the brigands were destroyed finally in August 1919. Vice-Consul Peel was of opinion after the war that Bakhtiyari cavalries proved very expensive to the British Government, but

profitable to Sardar Zafar and Ashja. After the armistice signed he considered that Sardar Zafar was more expensive as Ilkhani „than British Government could afford (2).

After the war the situation was not acute in Bakhtiyari land from British point of view and the subsidies for the cavalries were cut in the first place. British considered that Sardar Zafar is an expensive Ilkhani, but still useful. They prepare to find new source of income for him. As the subsidies were cut, British Consul-General in Isfahan, Colonel Haig, and British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, proceeded to Tehran to secure the Governorship of province Isfahan for him with Vothuq al-Dowleh. Sardar Jang, however, became the Governor-General of Isfahan and subsequently Sardar Zafar was given Yazd province while continuing to hold the Ilkhaniship of Bakhtiyari.

British authorities asked Sardar Zafar to co-operate with Sardar Jang to suppress the Brigands and promised a high British order if he did so. Sardar Zafar received the governorship of Yazd and sent his son as his deputy to Yazd. His son was accompanied by an assistant and the Bakhtiyari cavalries. The two young men and the Bakhtiyari force caused a great discontent among the public as well as the land owners by imposing high taxes and took bribe (3).

In spring 1919, Ja'far Qoli Sardar Ass'ad III came to assist Nasser Khan Sardar Jang, the Governor-General of Isfahan. His aspiration was a good motive to induce the tribesmen in resisting and defend. Sardar Zafar also co-operated and he received a K.B.E. for his services. A mix of South Persia Rifles force under the command of Lieutenant Colonel W. Fraser was ordered to proceeding to Isfahan to assist the Bakhtiyari Khans in fighting against Reza Jozani and Ja'far Qoli. The expedition was a brilliant success and the complete breaking up of gang. Both leaders of brigands were captured and executed. The column returned to Shiraz at the end of August 1919 (4). The campaign against Reza Jozani and Jafar Qoli was a part of Vothuq al-Dowleh Cabinet to eradicate the brigands and bandits throughout the country.

In two years in office, Sardar Zafar organised a private army from his relatives (Bastegan) This force strengthened his position in the Bakhtiyari. It appears that with rely on his private force and the support of certain Bakhtiyari Khans he intended to make his position as Ilkhani fix and permanent. The two ruling Bakhtiyari families were discontent with the agreement 1912. They preferred to return to the agreement 1894 that they would be in a better financial and political position in the tribe. The War was over and British could not justify their support of a specific person any more.

It is interesting to point out that the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, who was responsible for the affairs of Bakhtiyari and was the staunch supporter of Sardar Zafar. He changed his view and opposed to the appointment of him as Ilkhani. He argued that Sardar Zafar was an expensive Ilkhani and he was not as efficient as he states and he is not as pro-British as he pretend. He is rather an opportunist, who uses the circumstances for his interests.

The judgments of the other British diplomats, who were in touch with Sardar Zafar are positive and for his co-operation he was decorated with a British medallion. Certain British diplomats in those years were engaged too much in local affairs in which did not related to their responsibilities. They would expect that the local friendly personalities listen to their advice. At the same time they should causing no financial expense for them. It appears that although Sardar Zafar was in a good relation with the British Legation, but his interests like other Bakhtiyari khans played an important role in his decisions.

Peel did not desire to remember that the service of Sardar Zafar, was beneficial to the British interests. The time of rising of Qashqa'is, the other tribes as well as city dwellers and many farmers in Fars against British troops and South Persia Rifles, Sardar Zafar could retain the Bakhtiyaris pacify.

Sardar Zafar kept the Bakhtiyaris out of the conflict and suppressed the Kohgiluyeh tribes accordingly at the time of rising in Fars. He did support Vothuq al-Dowleh Cabinet and co-operated with the Central Government and the British authorities in Persia to destroy the Brigands around the Isfahan. He did not oppose to the Agreement of 1919 while he was the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari.

If he and his two predecessors were virtually dictators in Bakhtiyari, it was the policy of British who ignored the balance of power inside the Bakhtiyari between the two ruling families and the desire of the majority. In addition to his ability, his loyalty to the British interests caused that the Legation considers Sardar Zafar again as a nominee for Ilkhani in summer 1920.

British Consulates in Bushehr and Ahvaz and the representatives of the A.P.O.C. empowered the Ilkhani and Ilbegi and ignored the interests of the other Bakhtiyari Khan in Khans caused a deep discontent among the two ruling families who lost their share of Bakhtiyari revenues and power. The Khans showed their opposition, but at the time British authorities ignored this view of Khans in Ilkhaniship 1912, 1915 and 1917.

As Sardar Zafar was appointed in 1917, British local authorities particularly the British vice-consul in Ahvaz, Captain Eldery Peel, contributed a great share on the legend of British deep obligation to Sardar Zafar and his powerful influence in the Bakhtiyari tribe. The other Senior Khans, however, „not caring to strain further their relation with British Legation“ any more this time by opposing Sardar Zafar. They did their best secretly towards him and found a willing tool in Amir Mojahed (5).

6.1.1. Sardar Zafar and the Ilkhaniship in 1919

The leading Bakhtiyari Khans gathered in Isfahan for a general meeting in June-July 1919. The Commission Agreement restated the equal rights of the two families. Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar and Soltan Mohammad Khan Sardar Ashja as Ilkhani and Ilbegi were in a minority. They consented to put their seal to the agreement. Sardar Zafar and his Ilbegi, Sardar ‘Ashja’, were no longer able to count on British financial support and were dissatisfied with the arrangements of summer 1919 in Isfahan, tendered their resignations in November 1919. The Bakhtiyati tribe was virtually without Ilkhani and Ilbegi until the summer 1920.

Due to political crisis in Tehran, the differences on Ilkhaniship remained, but no one was appointed until the general meeting of the Bakhtiyari Khans in Isfahan in summer 1920, when the Russian Bolshevik occupied the province of Gilan. Sardar Zafar and Sardar Ashja, however, were ... official Ilkhani and Ilbegi (6).

As far as the correspondences between British Consul-General in Isfahan and Sardar Ashja indicate that Sardar Ashja’ who stayed in Bakhtiyari land, to some extends run the affairs of Bakhtiyari and due to an excellent harvest and the severe handling of 1918 the Kohgiluyeh tribes did not serious disturbance occur. Peel was of opinion that Sardar Zafar who was very ambitious to make himself supreme in Bakhtiyari, introduced the system of followers Bastegan which compelled the other Khans to follow suit (7). In fact, Sardar Zafar co-operated with the Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh in 1919 to suppress the brigands and extend the authority of the Central Government.

Sardar Zafar did endeavour to be retention as Ilkhani by the Vothuq al-Dowleh and with the support of British Legation without attention to the opposition of the majority of the other Khans. Apparently his friendship and loyalty to the British and the

Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh was so important that Sir Percy Cox, the British Minister in Tehran 1918-1920, ignored the advice of British Consul-General in Isfahan in that circumstance and intended to recognise Sardar Zafar as Ilkhani (8).

As the Bakhtiyari Khans were informed of the activities of Sardar Zafar in Tehran, some of them sent telegram and openly protested to the British Legation. They threatened if Sardar Zafar were appointed by the Persian Government and were support by the British Legation. Among the signatories the telegram was Sardar Ashja, the Ilbeygi, it would be lead into blood shade in Bakhtiyari. They also informed Sheikh Khaz'al accordingly.

F. Crow, the Consul General in Isfahan, was directed by P. Cox to inform Sardar Ashja that the British Minister was displeased at his action. Then Crow threatened, reproached and advised him to act differently. He wrote that the British Minister expressed surprise that Sardar Ashja joined with certain khans, some whom were openly hostile to the British Government during the war, in sending a telegram protesting and threatening to the retention of Ilkhani and he would know who was to blame for if a thing occurred. British Minister pointed out to Sardar Ashja that he should work in harmony with the Ilkhani and if he had any cause of complaint against the Ilkhani he ought to go to Tehran and make it and not to join in an intrigue with Amir Mojahed, Sardar Moazzam and Shahab al-Saltaneh.

“For it shows that you still maintain your hostile attitude of former days when you were governor of Isfahan and allowed the plundering of the Imperial Bank of Persia of Isfahan and took no steps recover the stolen money”(9).

Sardar Ashja responded to the British Consul-General in Isfahan that he co-operated for three years with Sardar Zafar and he did his best to give his service to the Persian Government as well as to safeguard the British interests and he will do as he had promised to the British Minister. Sardar Ashja was of opinion that Sardar Zafar had spoiled the rights of the two ruling families and Ashja pointed out to him without any results. Then he informed the British Legation of the matters telegraphic and in writing. He intended to go to Tehran, but for the sake of order in Bakhtiyari his cousins and brothers asked him not to leave the Bakhtiyari country.

In relation to his Governorship and the guard of the Imperial Bank in Isfahan in 1915, Gendarmerie was responsible to safeguard the Imperial Bank and the British consulate. However, the suddenly rising of the Gendarmes in Isfahan and the arrival of

Mojahedin in Isfahan a force of some thousands men with artillery, we were not in a position to confronted with them. Additionally, he was so ill that no one hoped of his life. In spite of this fact, he informed the Persian Government on time (10).

Sir Percy Cox, the British Minister in Tehran stated: none of the opponents of Sardar Zafar had not so far been able to formulate any definite accusation against him and beside that many of them were openly the enemies of Great Britain during the war He warned Sardar Ashja of his alliance with British enemies and finally he said: "Persian Government may not decide to return Sardar Zafar as Ilkhani. They are aware of the existence of an extensive intrigue against him" (11). With regard to the strong opposition of the Bakhtiyari Khans inside the tribe of Bakhtiyari, Vothuq al-Dowleh preferred not to retention Sardar Zafar as Ilkhani and postponed the matter until the summer 1920, when the Bakhtiyari khans would gather for a general meeting in Isfahan.

The occupation of Gilan by the Russian Bolshevik force in May 1920 and the surrounding of British force and the reactivates of Bolsheviks caused the anxiety of certain khans in Bakhtiyari tribe in the absence of a real Ilkhani and Ilbegi. Ja'far Qoli Khan Sardar Ass'ad III, the Governor-General of Kerman who enjoyed the friendly attitude of British requested the British consul in Kerman, Major Arthur Grey to inform Sir Percy Cox, the British Minister in Tehran of his anxious about the effect of Bolshevistic activities which it may have on younger Khans in Bakhtiyari land. He suggested in such circumstances the only khans who can be relied to maintain order in the tribe ... Sardar Jang and Sardar Zafar. If Sardar Jang was being appointed Ilkhani Amir Jang should be his Ilbegi (12).

Meanwhile Ahmad Shah returned from his European journey and the new British Minister, Herman Norman also reached the capital at the end of June 1920. Some days later, Vothuq al-Dowleh had to resign and the moderate Moshir al-Dowleh formed the new Cabinet (13).

6.2. A New Ilkhani for Bakhtiyari in 1920

At the end of summer 1920, the Bakhtiyari Khans had protracted discussions with the new Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh. Sardar Jang, the Governor-General of Isfahan also was summoned to Tehran for conference. The question of Bakhtiyari tax and the

claims of the khans were the subjects of negotiation. They did not achieve to any settlement on the khans' conflicting claims.

It was decided that the Bakhtiyari Khan to assemble in Isfahan for a general meeting of the two ruling families to settle their differences. Before the departure, the Bakhtiyari Khans called on British Minister, Herman Norman, to say good-bye and assure him of their desire to co-operate loyally with British Government in future "which it is to be feared", wrote Norman in one instance at least were "lacking in sincerity"(14).

On his return from Tehran, Sardar Jang, the governor-general of Isfahan visited British Consul-General in Isfahan, Francis Crow, and "expressed his very friendly sentiments" and "declared his intention of working in co-operations with us (British)". The general election of new legislative period was proceeding in Isfahan under the direction of Sardar Jang. British Consul-General was of opinion that the Governor-General was under priestly influence and was "promoting the election of undesirable deputies". British Consul-General took the opportunity and made suitable representations to Sardar Jang (15).

At that time the Bakhtiyari road was unsafe and Behbahan was in a state of anarchy. Sardar Ashja, acting Ilkhani, and Morteza Qoli Khan, acting Ilbegi, were in a difficult situation to restrain some minor Bakhtiyari Khans who were quite out of hand and the Kohgiluyeh tribes, "who descend frequently on to the Lynch road". Norman was of opinion that the restoration of order depends largely on a general settlement of the Bakhtiyari Khan's disputes (16).

British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, E. Peel accused Sardar Zafar that he has done his best during the last three months to discredit Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham, the Governor-General of Isfahan, inciting his own bastagan to rob and pillage in Isfahan districts. The condition of Bakhtiyari road, however, improved (17) and throughout the autumn 1920- summer 1921 remained completely safe (18).

Again in summer of the year 1921, a negotiation was taking place between the cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh and the representative of the Bakhtiyari Khans on three subjects: 1. "the remission of revenues unpaid during the last 15 years. 2. The payment of personal pensions and 3. The maintenance of 50 cavalry at Shushtar"(19).

The Bakhtiyari Khans gathered in Isfahan in September and at the beginning of autumn 1920. Regarding to "the Commission Agreement" of 1919 with two cardinal

points: equality of the two families and the regeneration of the tribe. The Bakhtiyari Khans returned somehow to the old agreement. The elderly Samsam al-Saltaneh was the Ilkhani of the Bakhtiyari. While he resided in Tehran, Lotf Ali Khan Amir Mofakham of Haji Ilkhani was acted as Ilkhani and Morteza Qoli Khan the son of Samsam al-Saltaneh as the representative of his father as Ilbegi.

If Amir Mofakham was absent, Sardar Ashja was his deputy. If Samsam al-Saltaneh compelled to leave the capital, “he should return at once to Bakhtiyari and would naturally resume the office of Ilbegi”(20). They chose Amir Mofakham and Morteza Qoli Khan as Ilkhani and Ilbegi for the year 1920-1921 by the old arrangement of 1894 still stood and submitted for the approval of the Persian Government (21).

Captain Peel wrote: Amir Mofakham and his assistant, Morteza Qoli Khan, “are an excellent combination. During their tenure the situation in Kohgiluyeh and on the Lynch road has been better than I have ever known it”. Peel realised that they had the most cordial reception and “responsible spirit animating every discussion” and they were prepared to accept and carry out the plans of British Minister may concern with Samsam al Saltaneh and Sardar Ashja.

They were ready to co-operate with any plan which the Legation desire and Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Ashja operate. Dr.Young the representative of the A.P.O.C. in the oilfields in relation to local and Bakhtiyari affairs found them most satisfactory to deal with in regard to all matters affecting the Oil Company (22).

6.2.1. The Choice of Ilkhani

It was customarily that a competent for favourite and not necessarily eldest Khan of the ruling family was designated as the Ilkhani by the Shah. The Agreement of 1894 reflected none of these viewpoints, but rather the internal structure of the two factions. There was a considerable number of Khans eligible for the Ilkhaniship, due to polygamy system or the costume of having more than one wife among the ruling families (23).

The Bakhtiyari Khans married mainly the daughters or sisters of influential personalities in that tribe to consolidate their position by obtaining new relatives with their supporter Bastegan. Hossein Qoli Khan and his two brothers had twenty-nine sons (24). The sons of Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani were altogether fifteen and the third

generation males of the two ruling factions were eighty. It reached to about two hundreds in 20s (25).

The Agreement of 1894 reduced only the tension between the Senior Khans of the both factions who received their equal share of the incomes, but the claimant Khans to the Governorship of Bakhtiyari still endeavoured to destabilise the situation and to win the Central Government and then British support to gain a post of Governorship of that ... this brought a considerable political power and financial revenues. The sources of these years have mentioned about the frequent quarrel between the two factions or between the families inside a faction on Governorship and financial question (26).

As a result of so many tribal and non-tribal revenue income, (road tolls, oil guard, land sale, 3% the profit of the 3% shares in two subsidiary companies and the government's post and Governorship of the Bakhtiyari), the Senior Khans became among the richest Persians chieftains and aristocrats. They gained many new estates in Bakhtiyari and adjacent provinces and built palaces and castles, in the mountainous Bakhtiyari and in their villages as well as villas in Tehran, Isfahan and so on.

Their residences were furnished and decorated with the expensive facilities and furniture's. Since the constitutional revolution, the Khans governed in the most southern and central provinces and cities. They were appointed as Minister and Prime Minister where the other southern chieftains limited to their tribal territory and certain districts or at best a part of a their province (27).

6.3. Bakhtiyari Khans and Bolsheviks

After the Bolshevik revolution, especially after the occupation of Gilan 1920 by the Russian and Persian Bolsheviks, the British local officials intended to prevent of possible Bolshevik propaganda by improving the situation. British tribal policy in Bakhtiyari during the war caused friction and dissatisfaction between the ruling families and British, between senior khans and younger Khans and caused frustration of tribesmen and the peasants in adjacent provinces where the Bakhtiyari Khans had estates.

First of all, since 1912, under British pressure the Ilkhani and Ilbegi were not designated according to the Agreement 1894. The majority of the Bakhtiyari Khans

were against the policy of British who only supported her designate Ilkhani against the other. British Consul-General in Isfahan, Crow, had a journey through the Bakhtiyari country and had many conversations with the Bakhtiyari Khans at the end of the year 1919. He wrote a letter to the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Cox, and informed him of his conclusion: As a fair distribution among the khans of revenue received from the tribesmen. It is the principle on which the khans split. “A revival of the former advisory consul of four, elected by common consent, to assist the Ilkhani and Ilbegi in administration matters” (28).

All the tribal taxes and non-tribal must be paid into a common chest under the supervision of the council to defray the expenses of the Bakhtiyari Government according to tribal custom and the repairs of the road. The financial matters should be arranged by the council after consultation with the khans in conjunction with the Ilkhani and Ilbegi on a fix and equitable basis agreeable to the parties, interest (29). Second obstacle to the progress of the il (tribe) was the continued absence of leading Bakhtiyari Khans, who raised their money in Bakhtiyari and for the most part spent it outside the country (30).

Their alienation to the nomadic way of life, staying in palace and cities and their women using veil like other city dwellers, but at the same time keeping retainers system of Bastegan. Each khan uses to take care of their maternal uncles and cousins, they were usually headman of the sub-tribes and each one had a number of horsemen. A part of them was the retainers of the Khan and these horsemen were the force of the Khan when he called them (31). In fact, the Bastegan system “battered on the khans themselves and on the wretch peasantry”, who had to pay their salary.

The peasants of the Bakhtiyari khans and the Bakhtiyari tribesmen, who were reduced to poverty by the policy of the Khans, were discontent of the situation. In the middle of the year 1921, Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Ashja were instructed by the Ilkhani and Ilbegi to negotiate with the Persian Government with a view to the resignation of all outside governorship. It was expected as the leading Khans return to their homes in Bakhtiyari the reduction of the „Bastegan “would be facilitated (32).

As a result of polygamy system among the ruling families of Bakhtiyari, the number of Khans of Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani faction increased in three generation to two hundred. It was a question for senior Khans how they could respond to the wishes younger khans. Francis Crow, the British Consul-General in Isfahan, in his journey to

Bakhtiyari in 1919 realised that these was a rising generation of uneducated and semi-educated young Khans who were kept in force unemployment and were prone to mischief. Then he suggested to British Minister: “might be usefully employed in various Persian state office or in Gendarmerie“(33).

Some of the Senior Khans sent their sons on their behalf as governor. Sardar Zafar sent his son Amir Hossein Khan to Yazd (Na’in and Ardakan) as the Governor the province 1919 (34). Arak was given to Sardar Mohtasham Bakhtiyari. He sent his son to Soltanabad on September to govern the province on his behalf (35). The Governorship of Bakhtiyari as whole and younger Khans particularly in any measure was not satisfactory.

There was a certain talk in Bakhtiyari about revolution and coup d’état against the Central Government. The Khans hinted to the consul that such action would leave British influence dominant in Persia. „Under Bakhtiyari administration at cheap price rifles with ammunitions and few guns and machine guns“. British Consul wrote that he did not take this talk seriously (36).

With regard to the suggestions for the improvement of the situation in Bakhtiyari, the Khans returned to the agreement in 1920-1922. The quarrel between the Khans, however, did not come to an end. The appearance of a new powerful Central Government with an army on which stationed not far from the Bakhtiyari land.

As Fitzpatrick was in Dehkord in summer 1922 the Commission of the Bakhtiyari Khans appointed provisionally the following members of the two families for the administration of the tribes and recovery of the revenue (37).

From Haji Ilkhani family		From Ilkhani family	
Amir Mofakham	Ilkhani	Sardar Zafar	Ilbegi
Shahab al Saltaneh	Nayeb (assistant)	Amir Mojahed	Financial responsible
Sardar Mohtasham	Financial responsible	Amir Jang	Member
Sardar Fateh	Member	Sardar Eqbal	Member
Sardar Ashraf	Member		

At this juncture the Bakhtiyari Khans who resided in Bakhtiyari land did not know of the Central Government intention on the vacant of Kohgiluyeh Governorship as if a Bakhtiyari Khan or a non-Bakhtiyari Governor from Tehran would be appointed.

The Bakhtiyari road was gradually insecure and thefts were on the increase. Despite of the fact that the number of guard and riflemen being increased.

On autumn 1922, the Bakhtiyari Khans deprived from the Governorship of the provinces with the exception of Isfahan and Behbahan. Most of the Khan stayed in Bakhtiyari, but the question of the Bastegan was still alive and undisolved. The external revenues of the Khans not only did not help to the improvement of the tribesmen and peasants, but also due to the formation of "Bastegan" force and the building of palaces, they had to pay more taxes and as forced labour had to serve the Khans (38).

6.3.1. Younger Khans and Social Reforms

The Social Democrats and Bolshevik propaganda reached in the Bakhtiyari land and the younger Khans formed a party "Setareh-e-Bakhtiyari" the star of Bakhtiyari, the pamphlet of the organisation reached to the British Legation, when new British Charge d'Affaires Reginal Bridgeman succeeded to the British Minister, Herman Norman who left the Legation for England at the end of the September 1921. The view point of the pamphlet was radical Socialist and the articles were more suitable to an industrial-agricultural society than a nomadic community (39). As far as British documents are concerned, there is a reference to the younger khans by the senior Khans.

At the end of the March 1921, the senior Khans who were present in the Bakhtiyari winter quarters told the political advisor of the A.P.O.C. Dr. Young, that they intend to withdraw protection and labour from the oilfields for the reason that the benefit derived inadequate as compared with the responsibility entailed and they it better „to sever their connection with the company rather than continue to incur the odium of the Persian Government and of the Junior Khans, it will know, are constantly pressing them for more money" (40).

During the Bakhtiyari tour in summer 1922, British consul in Ahvaz, Fitzpatrick, in his visit of Dehkord and participation in annual session of the Bakhtiyari Khans, he reported: the society of Junior Khans or Setareh-e-Bakhtiyari still exist. They held a secret session. They stress still on social reforms and encouraged the Senior Khans to undertake the improvement of communications and road and even to establish an electric scheme and a telephone service between Isfahan and Chahar Mahal.

The Junior Khans of Setareh-e-Bakhtiyari realised that without the co-operation of Senior Khans nothing can be done and Senior Khans remarked to the British Consul that the Setareh is dead. Fitzpatrick was of opinion that some of the younger Khans, notably Habib-Allah Khan and Amir Mansur Khan worked hard, but the other Junior Khans had dangerous view. The son of Amir Mojahed, Rahim Khan spoke of civil war „as the only road to the regeneration of Persian” (41).

A year later, the British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine, expressed his view on the new generation of Khans and Bakhtiyari.

”The younger Bakhtiyari Khans grown up in 20s, showed a keen desire to take their share in the affairs of the tribe, a desire by no means welcomed by their elders, had formed an association amongst themselves, called the Setareh Bakhtiyari, and through it were bringing pressure on the elder Khans which the latter did their best to parry.

The desire of the part of younger Khans to share in the profitable administration of the country was keenly resented, and they were characterised as Bolshevik, and the report was sedulously spread that the Setareh Bakhtiyari was a Bolshevik institution. The program of the institution was social reforms improved road, communications and a telephone system from Isfahan to Dehkord. The elder khans had to give way in part, and the telephone system was laid, as also a motor road from Isfahan to Dehkord and later an agreement was come to where by the elder and younger Khans of both the Ilkhani and Haji Ilkhani branches should participate in the general administration of Bakhtiyaristan. This Arrangement, however, has so far only existed on paper, with the consequent result that the family quarrels still continue”(42).

6.4. British and New Circumstances in Persia

In spring 1920, the Bolshevik force first recaptured the Caucasus region and the Baku oil. Then at the second half of May of 1920, the Bolshevik occupied the coastal province of Gilan and the ships of white Russians. The British forces in Anzali port surrendered to the Bolshevik who let them leave Gilan province for the Iranian plateau. As a result a Moderate Cabinet came to power in Tehran. They reached to an Agreement with the Bolshevik who agreed to evacuate from the Persian territory.

Bolsheviks, however, proclaimed the presence of British troops in Persia could jeopardise the Russian territory. The Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919 the presence of

British troops and South Persia Rifles in Persia also caused British unpopularity. The surrendering of British force to the Bolshevik was a lost of prestige. The War Office prepared to evacuate from Persian territory. The protection of British interests in Persia in new circumstances and fighting against the Bolsheviks came into consideration. Various plans were suggested. One of them (a) was engineering a coup d'état which it took place in 21 February 1921 before the evacuation of British troops. (b) Formation a Bakhtiari Police Force under British command and the formation a union of southern and central tribes of Persia. Major Noel, the Political Officer of Indian Government was sent to Persia to study the second plan.

On 20 December 1920 George Percy Churchill, one of the expert on Persian affairs in Eastern Department of Foreign Office, wrote a memorandum. He had served in British Legation in Tehran several years' 1903-1919. Due to his Persian knowledge and as Oriental Secretary he had a close relation with many of Persians, wrote a memorandum. He endeavoured to examine the positions of British forces in north-west, from are to be withdrawn in spring 1921.

He pointed out that a Persian envoy in Moscow is negotiating a treaty with Soviet Russia and the Persians endeavour "to make terms with the Bolsheviks", but Bolsheviks may on evacuation of British force from Qazvin, with the aid of their Persian allies in Gilan make British position and that of the Shah and Persian Government untenable at Tehran by means of propaganda, agents and sympathisers in Tehran.

"The Government is likely to collapse and the Shah to flee to Europe "and a species of Soviet will be formed under Persian democratic leaders who eventually absorb the Bolshevik elements in northern Persia. The Gendarmerie, Central Brigade, Tehran police and the other forces are not to be counted and the Persian military forces in the north are unreliable.

George Churchill considered in addition to the pre dominant position of British in Persia, the political interests are defence of Indian and the protection of Mesopotamia and the hostile propaganda by the Shi'ah co-religionists", who will have been poisoned by Bolshevik doctrines disrupted India and Mesopotamia especially the combine with Kemalist forces and Kurdish tribes of western Persia make the British position in Mesopotamia insecure.

The A.P.O.C. and the Imperial Bank of Persia and a number of minor trading institutions "would be seriously threatened". In addition to the Persian debt to the

British Government, “all the expenditure incurred in Persia, such as the cost of our (British) establishments, Secret Service, and the other expenditure will have been wasted“. He suggested to the British Government to instruct British Minister in Tehran to withdraw the Legation to Isfahan, where” he should endeavour to induce the Shah and the Persian Government to set up the capital” (43).

“British Minister might be instructed to get into touch at once with the leading friendly chiefs of the Bakhtiyari tribe with the object of finding out what financial assistance and what military equipment and officers would be required by him to ensure that the Bakhtiyari could be counted on to support the Shah and his government in central and southern Persia“. British Government might arrive at some understanding a selected British officer at once to the Bakhtiyari country to take Charge of this part of the work.

A considerable number of The S.P.R. should be sent to Isfahan. This plan would protect the Oil Company’s wells at Shushtar, but the Hamadan road open and it might „to send a Bakhtiyari force to the west to deal with any hostile movement these in conjunction with the Shahsavands operating from north“. He suggested all idea of governing Persia with and through Majles and Democrats should be at this stage entirely abandoned a Government of strong men whose name are known and heard among the great tribes. These men (like Ain-ed-Dowleh) usually corrupt and rapacious, but they are the only people who can deal with the tribal chiefs (44).

Lancelot Oliphant, the head of the department commented: “Mr. Churchill memo is written with great local experience. Until recently the Bakhtiyari were certainly a force when reckoned with, but it is not easy to say whether have in any way been tempered with of late, if not, it ought to be possible to use them with skilful handling. Colonel Haig was for some times general consul at Isfahan, and Major Noel has also had experience among them. It would I think be well to address Mr. Norman on the subject of the constructive part of this memo, while emphasising the fact that nothing has as yet been definitely decided and also consult India Office and War Office“ (45).

Lord Curzon commented “Mr. Churchill memo raises large issues on which I hesitate to express a hasty opinion. It will require careful consideration from many points of view. I see no objection to awaiting the observation of the Norman, the War Office and the India Office in the first instance” (46).

Though an urgent telegram to Norman, Foreign Office asked his opinion on withdrawal to Isfahan, “a possible agreement with Bakhtiyari chieftains the”utilisation of the South Persia Rifle in southern part „and to character and compositions of Persian Government strong to carry out such a policy” (47).

Meanwhile Curzon received the draft of Perso-Soviet agreement in which it abrogated all treaties between Russia and Persia and between Russia and the other powers concerning Persia and Soviet Russia cancellation all Russian concessions. Though the negotiation in Moscow between Persia and the Soviet Government created some doubt on Curzon “as to whether British retreat would be followed by immediate Bolshevik advance upon Tehran”, “but prospects of this must be so attractive to Russian that they could hardly be expected to for go the occasion“ and these will be no military forces to resist to the Bolshevik advance and finally asked again the view of Norman on ”entering into agreement with Bakhtiyari chieftains and utilising South Persia Rifles to protect approaches to oilfields and hold southern parts of the country” (48).

6.5. Ahmad Shah remained in Tehran

On 6 January 1921 British Foreign Office and British Cabinet received a memorandum from Admiralty dated 24 December 1920 on British policy in Mesopotamia and “the extreme importance of safeguarding the South Persia oilfields“. At same time Norman reported that Ahmad “Shah alarmed by reports of intended evacuation of European women”. The Shah was of the opinion that as soon as British troops leave, the Bolshevik would certainly come here and he was caught by Bolsheviks. Shah considered that “he would fare no better if he fell into power of Bakhtiyari, he therefore refused categorically in any circumstances to go to Isfahan with Persian Government if they moved there” (49).

In respond to the Curzon’s question, Norman stated: “I am strongly of opinion that all European and American women and children here and all men whose presence is not essential should be evacuated”. However, the Persian Prime Minister thought that Isfahan is a suitable seat to form Government and with the help of Gendarmerie and police repel and invader. Norman believed this plan to be impracticable.

They are not be trusted and “Bakhtiyari would be constant source of danger for they are essentially unfriendly and, even if subsidised could not be relied on, except perhaps to protect oilfields, in which they have an interest. Norman suggested after the departure of British troops, Shiraz would appear to be the most suitable seat for a non-Bolshevik Government. The distance offers some guarantee against invasion especially that The S.P.R. is there. These would be a better chance of enlisting services of surrounding tribes through Qavam al Molk than of ensuring fidelity of Bakhtiyari further north” (50).

In fact, the same day, 8 January 1921, the Persian Prime Minister had conveyed a message from the Shah that he had decided to move the Government to Shiraz, by way of Isfahan and if British would not consent, he would flee to Mesopotamia. Three days later, Ahmad Shah informed Norman that “he found most people whom he had consulted opposed to plan of transferring Government immediately to Shiraz, he had given up the idea” (51).

Curzon instructed Norman If and when the Persian Government decides to leave Tehran “you should urge them to establish themselves at Isfahan”, Bakhtiyari road furnishes additional means of communication and „in view of present unsatisfactory attitude of Bakhtiyaris. The presence of Major Noel in that part of country may have steadying effect. I am asking India Office to instruct him to start without delay and place himself under your orders”. “Should Persian Government proceed to Isfahan, presence there of portion of South Persia Rifles would presumably be desirable” (52).

Norman reported: recently the khans of Bakhtiyari have made overtures, and induce course to British Consul-General, Isfahan, so it may be possible to reach a satisfactory agreement with them if British Government are prepare to find the money. It may be possible to allay apprehensions of Ahmad Shah sufficiently induce him to withdraw his objection of possible transfer of Government to Isfahan. In addition to Curzon’s adoption of Norman suggestion on dispatching some of The S.P.R. to Isfahan that “more than anything else reconciles the Shah to go to Isfahan (53).

The Foreign and political department of India, however, suggested the Persian Government “should be induced to stand fast in Tehran to the last possible moment”. In fact, neither Persian (Government, Shah and people) intended to leave the capital, nor European Legation in Tehran, nor British authorities related to the Persian officers in London, Delhi and Baghdad agree to the evacuation of British Legation and the Persian

Government. It was only Norman, British Minister, who endeavoured to justify his plan on evacuation of the Legation and British citizen (54).

He also, endeavoured to get the consent of European colleagues or counterpart to his plan and he persuaded the Persian Government to transferring the Government to Isfahan or Shiraz. And General Commanding Nurper Force (General Ironside), who shares this view and already was making necessary arrangement, otherwise. Some of European colleagues did not share this opinion. Norman wrote: “two or three Europeans whose opinion I value do not believe arrival of Bolsheviks would necessarily be attended with danger to foreign lives or property”. Norman also realised that the evacuation “will doubtless increase panic here” (55).

Curzon telegraphed to Norman: “We cannot understand here why there should be a general *saufe qui peut* at Tehran. Shah, who is the most timid man in Persia, has decided to stay. A Persian Government is about to be formed. It has concluded, or is on the verge of concluding, a treaty with the Bolsheviks, why then should the latter invade there be general scuttle from Tehran? It may be that our interests would be better served by Persian Government acting under our influence at Isfahan or elsewhere. But you do not appear to regard this solution as likely, will not damage to our prestige, of which you complain, only be enhanced by participate retreat and abandonment of whole of northern Persia to an enemy, whose advance is by no means certain, and a revolution which can possibly still be avoided?” (56).

It is rather difficult to find out the reason of Norman-Ironside of creating panic in Tehran in that juncture. It is certain that the supreme assembly of Persia responded positively in a cession to the Perso-Soviet treaty and postponed and somehow rejected the Anglo-Persian agreement 1919. The closure of British financial Institute like Imperial Bank of Persia caused a great chaos and anxiety in Tehran. Was it a pressure move to gain the approval of Anglo-Persian Agreement or was it an episode of a plan of the coup d'état in 21 February 1921?

6.6. Norman's View on Bakhtiyari Khans

Norman modified his view on the khans of Bakhtiyari. He pointed out that he was chiefly thinking of the attitude of the Khans during the War, when nearly all sided with the central powers and only two remained faithful to British. Bakhtiyari Khans made tentative proposal to the British consul-general in Isfahan and to Norman to co-operate with British in the collapse of Persian Government with Bolsheviks. These suggestions involve handing over to Bakhtiyaris as much as Persia can be saved from Bolsheviks with a Qajar Prince as a puppet Shah.

The Khans of Bakhtiyari did not know whether they are able to accept the responsibility for the capital, but they intended to come to an agreement with Qashqa'i through Qavam al Molk. They can with British financial supports hold Isfahan and the south. Norman suggested in case of the collapse the Government in Tehran "we could perhaps satisfy Bakhtiyaris financially by transferring to them oil royalties at present paid to Persian Government. It would, however, also be necessary to subsidise Kawam al Mulk in order to keep Fars in the scheme".

Norman pointed out to Foreign Office Bakhtiyari Governors, where ever exist, are hated for their oppression. It is to be feared their rule everywhere incline the people to welcome Bolsheviks. The Bakhtiyari Government also means the end of the attempt to reform the administration. Finally he concluded that the Bakhtiyari Khans are essentially untrust worthy, self-interested and so disunited that it is uncertain how long the Senior Khans are able to maintain the authority over younger ones. He suggested Major Noel first come to Tehran to see him as well as most of the more important Khans would be in Tehran by the time (57).

The High Commissioner in Mesopotamia, Sir Percy Cox expressed his view in a rather lengthy telegram. Cox believed that the British should abandon the evacuation of women and ... until the early summer and British should rally their adherents in Tehran among moderate Nationalists and non-Bolshevik elements. British should devise another agreement which no Majles will accept and it is possible that such agreement may involve a change of Shah or dynasty and Cox added: "and I do not think that we should hesitate in giving it. In any case, attitude of Bakhtiyaris will be an important factor.

Cox was absolutely disagreeing with the Norman's attitude of Bakhtiyaris that they are essentially unfriendly. He said: "I believe they are fully alive to advantages of friendly relations with us, provided their interests are safeguarded and promoted, the majority of them could be got to participate with us in any scheme.

Cox suggested if the above policy fails British should let northern Persia go Bolshevik and to maintain British interest and effective influence in the sphere in which they mainly exist from frontier near Khanikin through Kermanshah, Khuramabad, Isfahan, Yazd, Kerman and soon and to stabilise situation in that area. British can endeavour to ensure safety of their numerous and vital oil interests near Qasr-e-Shirin, in Posht-kuh, in Arabestan and in Bakhtiyari country. In another word, Cox speaks of secret agreement of 1915 on partition of Persia between Russia and Britain.

Cox pointed out: Maintenance of close relations with Bakhtiyaris is essential to both parties and it should not be forget that Isfahan, Yazd and Kerman are now in the hands of Bakhtiyari governors. In the event of a collapse of Central Government in Tehran and the flight of the Shah, "we should allow the Vali of Pusht-kuh, the Sheikh of Mohammareh and the Bakhtiyaris to declare their independence or their separation from Government of Tehran, and should encourage them to make a three cornered pact among themselves to stand together to maintain their own interests and resist Bolshevik aggression.

We should probably do well to have Kashgais. All four elements are mainly tribal and already practically independents. They would only need a hint to induce turbulent tribes to take action, but for us it would be important that they should act together. Such a confederation would offer a very formidable bulkward to Bolshevik aggression as well as protection of our own material and legitimate interests in Persia. All the chief British companies with commercial activities in Persia should be called together for discussion of the subject and the amount of co-operation may be expected from them" (58).

George Churchill commented: "in no circumstances can we hope for the maintenance of the S.P.R. out of British funds after March 31 nor is it all likely that we shall obtain No subsidies for the Bakhtiyaris". "If H.M. Minister is forced to withdraw from Tehran and is not strengthened by the S.P.R. the Bakhtiyaris will not be amenable to his influence and any developments that occur will necessarily take place to a large extent independently of us". He wrote in a minute that Sir Percy Cox came to much the

same conclusion as Foreign Office did early this year for the future of Persia, but in elaborating:

- (a) Cabinet expenditure to save remnants of situation, connivance of the South Persia Rifles subsidies to Bakhtiyaris and others.
- (b) A possible change of dynasty.
- (c) The independence of the Bakhtiyaris.
- (d) The necessary of a new Agreement with Persia.

George Churchill referred to the activities of group (Oil Company) represented by Admiral Slade and wrote in a Minute Admiral Slade and Sir C. Green way are coming to see me tomorrow rather expected. They are going to talk about what the Oil Company could do (59).

On 8 February 1921, Curzon informed Norman that he was endeavouring to hasten Major Noel's departure for Tehran, but in the meanwhile I can give no undertaking on the question of subsidies or royalties to which you refer (60). Some months later, after the Cairo conference Noel arrived in Khuzestan.

It is interesting to mention that George Churchill in his memorandum of 20 December 1920 considered Sheikh Khaz'al as a part of his plan. Sir Percy Cox also reached to almost the same conclusion in his memorandum in January 1921 without the knowledge of Churchill's memorandum. Some months later, in April 1921 Walter Smart, the deputy of Oriental Secretary in Tehran regarded Sheikh Khaz'al as an important column in his plan for the southern part of Persia (61).

6.7. Summary

- (1) The Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari, Sardar Zafar, in 1917-1918, created a private army of his relatives. Some other Senior Khans followed the same policy.
- (2) In co-operation with the British political and military authorities, in a successful expedition against Kohgiluyeh tribes, the Bakhtiyari forces occupied the strong holds of Tayebi tribe, took hostages and collected arrears of revenue and annual taxes in summer 1918.
- (3) Sardar Zafar secured tranquillity in Bakhtiyari land, commercial route and oil-field.
- (4) After the War, Sardar Zafar remained in his position to the summer 1920
- (5) In spring 1919, the Bakhtiyari Governor-General of Isfahan, with the assistance of Sardar Zafar and Sardar Ass'ad and S.P.R. succeeded in breaking up of gang. The leader of the brigands was captured and executed.
- (6) The leading Bakhtiyari Khans of ruling families were discontent with the agreement of 1912. In a general meeting in summer 1919 the majority agreed to return to the agreement of 1894. This decision postponed to summer 1920 due to the opposition of Sardar Zafar and the British Minister, Sir Percy Cox.
- (7) In summer 1920 the political atmosphere changed and Cox went to Baghdad as High Commissioner. In a gathering in Isfahan the new Ilkhani and Ilbegi were chosen. The agreement of 1894 reduced the tension between the Senior Khans of the both factions, who received their equal share of the incomes.
- (8) Polygamy system and new sources of incomes complicated the political and social relations in Bakhtiyari tribes and caused more tension and quarrel between the two ruling families and between senior and younger Khans.
- (9) The younger Khans formed a political association and requested some social reforms in the tribe to improve the situation. Only a few of their suggestions were implemented.
- (10) It has been prepared by the British to form a southern tribal confederation and to organise a Bakhtiyari Police Force to secure the central and southern Persia against any attack by the Bolsheviks.
- (11) The Bakhtiyari Khans intended to come to an arrangement with the chief of Qashqa'i through Qavam al-Molk. With British financial supports, they can hold Isfahan and the south.

(12) The chiefs of the five great tribes in the south-west Persia were the partners in the southern confederation proposal.

VII: Bakhtiyaris and Southern Confederation

7.1. The Southern Consulates and Bolsheviks

Captain Peel, the British Vice-Consul, in Ahvaz, informed Norman that he has not seen the Bakhtiyari Khan for some time. Dr. Young (a physician and Political Agent of the A.P.O.C., who lived in Khuzestan since 1905), however, has recently visited the Khans of Bakhtiyari. He was of opinion that the possibility of Bakhtiyari tribes being infected with Bolshevism is dreaded by the Khans. They would make an effort to seize and hold Isfahan. Khans do not want money from British, they are using Ramhormoz revenues for the expenses of the Kohgiluyeh expedition, but they asked for Lirawi revenue about 4.200 T this year (1920) only.

Dr. Young suggested their request for guns from British authority or Sheikh of Mohammareh may be ignored. The Khans asked for arms and ammunition given to Sardar Zafar and Sardar Ashja in 1919 for suppression of brigands. They desired Sardar Zafar to hand over machine gun as did Sardar Ashja. All Bakhtiyari Khans favoured the present arrangement with the Central Government which works well except Sardar Zafar who considered a new arrangement is necessary. Dr Young added: "We should not on no account pay any heed to Zafar who endeavouring to renew family feud". "A united Bakhtiyari, friendly to us, will be an invaluable asset if trouble increases in the north" (1).

In their opinion, Captain Eardley Peel, British vice-consul in Ahvaz, and Dr. Young, the Political Advisor of the Oil Company, both, the Bakhtiyari Khans would be forced their own interests to keep on British side as they fear of the spread of Bolshevik ideas in their tribes. They considered that it is not advisable for British to subsidise or encourage the Khans to make any alliance and under the circumstances can be the Bakhtiyaris controlled from Ahvaz and utilised as a buffer across south-west Persia. If they are controlled from Tehran, British policy must be influenced by the events in the capital.

In view of Lieutenant-Colonel Arthur Trevor, the British political Resident in the Persian Gulf Bushehr, if the Persian Government collapsed before the Bolsheviks then the evacuation of Tehran become necessary and British policy with the Bakhtiyaris will

have to be controlled from the south. Trevor came into conclusion that it would be better to control British Bakhtiyari policy from the beginning from the south. In other words, it means control by the Political Resident in Bushehr near the oilfields (2).

In another telegram to the British Minister, Peel, repeated and expanded his view. He wrote: The suggestion that the British should bribe Bakhtiyaris to hold south with assistance of Qavam al-Molk is somewhat alarming. In any case, Bakhtiyari will form such alliances as they find it necessary to consolidate their position whether with Qashqa'i, Sheikh of Mohammareh and others. Without British intervention and responsibility, British influence can be employed in a friendly way rather than in stimulating greed and ambitions of Bakhtiyari Khans. Their own interests without any bribes from British will sufficient inducement to them to form barrow across south west.

He pointed out: by negotiating with khans in their own country certainly can be better results obtain rather than in Tehran. Then he reaffirmed and British Bakhtiyari policy in last two years (1919-1920) of refusing to sacrifice Bakhtiyari as a whole to personal interests of one or more khans. He added any proposal from Sardar Zafar may be to upset present agreement in Bakhtiyari. Peel went on to say: As long as Morteza Qoli Khan represented the Ilkhani, British have the strongest possible hold over his father Samsam whose words and actions adopt themselves to fluctuating conditions in Tehran and nothing to do with the khans in Bakhtiyari. Peel stated: "the surest was of disunity khans and enabling each faction to fleece us without any material benefit is to let them think we have something valuable of offer" (3).

Peel proceeding to Behbahan and met the Khans of Bakhtiyari and fully discussed the situation of Persia with them. Then he sent a "very secret" telegram to Norman and informed him of the Khans' view. He realised that the dominant anxiety is to prevent the spread of Bolshevism in Persia. They would like to see something to be done in Tehran in order to prevent of the spread of Bolshevism. Though, they were themselves reluctant to march on Tehran, as this would open to the suspicion of aiming at sovereignty with the help of the British. If Ahmad Shah leaves the capital, the Bakhtiyari Khans would concentrate at Isfahan. "They wish to act throughout as the trustees of the Persian constitution"; the Khans support a policy which cut the ground from under the feet of Bolsheviks and rehabilitate British prestige in Persia.

The Khans were of opinion "that the only solution which will save Persia is" "Morgan Shuster's regime backed by an American loan and abandonment of the Persian

agreement". It is a counter blast to the Russo-Persian Agreement, can the Persian administration reform still be carried out. The Bakhtiyaris enable to take a strong lose in support of the constitution through Samsam al-Saltaneh. The Shah will remain in Tehran the Persian administrative reform can still carry out British altruism will be vinchcated. Finally Peel mentioned: "The Khans will any circumstances their utmost to protect British interests and they will not move without fullest consultation with us" (4).

Though Norman was satisfy on the attitude of Bakhtiyari as a whole, but he considered, their views on American Loan and on the Anglo-Persian Agreement crudeness. He added the new Prime Minister, Seyyed Zia al-Din is unlikely to agree with the khans on the subject of an American Loan (5).

Meanwhile an anti-Bolshevik coup was engineered and the Cossack Force under the command of Reza Khan captured the capital in 21 February 1921 without almost any resistance from Gendarmerie and Police Force. The Bakhtiyari Khans, who had several governorship in the central and southern Persia, none of them raised against the coup regime in Tehran. The tribe, the Ilkhani, the Ilbegi and some of the Khans resided in Bakhtiyari winter quarter when the Military Coup took place in Tehran.

7.2. The Changes in Bakhtiyari

In spite of the fact that the coup it was engineer by the British officers and officials in Qazvin and Tehran, Major Noel, the political officer of Indian Government arrival in Persia at the beginning of spring 1921. He met the Khans and passed through Bakhtiyari and went to Isfahan and then Tehran to see the British Minister. While Major Noel reached to the oilfields, the representative of the A.P.O.C., Dr. Young, was negotiating in with the Bakhtiyari governors, the Ilkhani and Ilbegi, on purchasing of land for Company.

On 18 April 1921, when the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Colonel Arthur Trevor also reached Meydan-e-Naftun, the Ilkhani and Ilbegi were still negotiating with Dr. Young. The agreement was signed by the representative of the A.P.O.C., Dr. Young and Amir Mofakham and Shahab al-Saltaneh in the presence of the Trevor, Peel and Noel. The Political Resident considered the agreement "eminently satisfactory" (6) and Peel regarded the agreement as "a most satisfactory" (7).

The Bakhtiyari Khans asked the Oil Company to reduce in future the further business done with the Khans in Isfahan and the payments would be made through the Ahvaz branch of “the Imperial Bank of Persia“, and the Oil Company agreed to do so. Trevor reported: nearly all business with the A.P.O.C. refers to the oilfields area has always been dealt by Ahvaz Consulate and very few matters will be dealt with at Isfahan. The Khans very much preferred to deal with Peel, the Vice-Consul, Ahvaz, than any other officer. The representatives of the Anglo-Persian Company were of the same opinion.

Trevor continued to say: “I am convinced “that Vice-Consul Peel is the proper person to deal with the cases, being on the spot and if he deals with Anglo-Persian Oil Company-Bakhtiyari question. He suggested: “he may as well”, “deal with all Bakhtiyari matters which cannot be disposed of at capital. He also suggested the change of the Ahvaz Vice-Consulate into Consulate. A Vice-Consul can do all routine Ahvaz matters and the consul should continue to deal with Bakhtiyari matters, to meet the Khans at fields or Ramuz (Ram-Hormoz) in the cold weather and make short tours in Bakhtiyari.

Trevor was of opinion that it is easier to deal with nomad tribes from their “Garmsir” “winter quarters” and Peel is the man to do principle part of the Bakhtiyari work. He knows the principal official of the A.P.O.C. Sheikh Khaz’al would be also in a better position to deal with the A.P.O.C. and Bakhtiyari. He added a special Bakhtiyari Vice-Consul in Isfahan should visit the Bakhtiyari winter quarter which would involve extra expense. In other words he suggested the appointment of Captain Peel as Consul and the change of Ahvaz Vice-Consulate into Consulate. As he previously had suggested dealing with the Bakhtiyari affairs from the south. In fact, he suggested an Ahvaz consulate, and Peel as consul under the Persian Gulf Resident in which it deal directly with the oil affairs (from oilfields to the pipeline).

It appears that he disagreed to the mission of Noel. He wrote: “an officer specially told off to the Bakhtiyaris and travelling about with them might easily take the Bakhtiyari point of view too much” (8). Trevor confirmed the view of Peel on Bakhtiyari affairs. It should be, however, here mentioned that Colonel Arnold Wilson had previously in October 1920 pointed out the importance of Ahvaz. He wrote the British consul in Khuzestan should reside in future in Ahvaz instead Khorramshahr (Mohammareh) with a Vice-Consul who would be responsible for local affairs. He

continued to say: “whereas Mohammareh has shown no tendency to grow” and consular and political work has shown a tendency to decrease, “Ahvaz has quadrupled in size during the past six years and there is every indication that this rate of progress will be remained” (9).

Meanwhile the suggestion of Trevor was accepted and in July the first 1921 the vice-consulate changed into consulate and Captain Peel was appointed as the new consul (10). Norman, however, after hearing the views of Major Noel and Captain Peel in Tehran, emphasised the close inter-connection between Bakhtiyari and the Persian question. He therefore, suggested the British relations with the Bakhtiyari being controlled from Tehran and the British Consul in Ahvaz should be directly under the Legation in Tehran for Bakhtiyari affairs and he should be provided with staff and facilities to enable him to leave consulate “in charge of Vice-Consul “to visit Bakhtiyari during the summer and pay a yearly visit to Tehran.

Norman disagreed to the Trevor recommends the exclusion of south Arabistan from Jurisdiction of the conclusion in Ahvaz. He urged that the facilities be provided so as the whole of Arabistan, Bakhtiyari and Lorestan “being unified under the consul at Ahvaz” (11). Meanwhile in Tehran, Sardar Zafar, who realised that the cabinet of Seyyed Zia al-Din was supported by the British Legation, endeavoured to secure the governor-general of Isfahan for himself. The cabinet of Seyyed Zia al-Din received only by a few influential personalities. Norman supported Sardar Zafar with regard to the recent disquiets in the province of Isfahan. Before the appointments take place, Norman wanted to know the view of Vice-Consul in Ahvaz.

He questioned Peel in his telegram: what effect do you think the appointment of Sardar Zafar will have among Bakhtiyaris and who are the most suitable candidates for Ilkhani and Ilbegi in view to the new situation? It appears that Sardar Zafar was so confident of his appointment that he asked the British Minister the opinion of Captain Peel about an Acting Governor pending his arrival to Isfahan. He even suggested the financial agent and the Commander of Gendarmerie to be considered (12). As far as British documents are concerned both parties (Political Resident and Vice-Consul-Ahvaz, as well as Bakhtiyari Khans; acting Ilkhani and Ilbegi and so on...) were for different reasons oppose to the appointment.

Trevor wrote: the Khans were very much perturbed at the possibility of Sardar Zafar being provided with arms and funds by the Persian Government to pacify

Bakhtiyari land and crush the Bakhtiyari Khans by playing off one against the other and exploiting the old family feuds. The Khans added they were ready to carry out the legitimate demands of the Persian Government and they would like to co-operate with the Central Government in introducing reforms in Bakhtiyari before any coercive steps were taken place. Trevor told the khans that he had no news of any such intentions of the Persian Government, but he asked the Vice-Consul to bring the wishes of the Khans to the notice of British Minister. Simultaneously he added: “obviously the very best way to counter it or any other attack on Bakhtiyari liberties was to compose their differences and present on united front” (13).

Peel responded his views a week later. Possibly on live to his absence from Ahvaz. In fact, three days after the telegram of 20 April 21, the time which Trevor and Peel had left the oilfields, Norman sent another telegram stating that Sardar Zafar had practically been appointed the Governor of Isfahan. Peel stated: If Zafar must have a Governorship, could it not be Kerman? The Khans would welcome this provided the Governorships held by Bakhtiyari Khans were divided equally the two ruling families. Peel added: Isfahan “would be too close to Bakhtiyari” and Sardar Zafar “manipulate Bakhtiyari politics to his own personal advantage with disastrous result to all concerned” (14).

Trevor went on to say that Sardar Zafar to be given a Governorship at all. He pointed out: “I know that Sardar Zafar is not wanted at Kerman”, his previous tenure having been disastrous (15). Peel informed the British Minister that the silence of Persian Government towards Bakhtiyari and the cryptic telegrams from Sardar Zafar have led the Bakhtiyari Khans here to suspect that the Persian Government “contemplates using Zafar as an instrument for imposing its will on Bakhtiyari”.

The Khans wished that the demands of Persian Government “may be communicated to them through Samsam, the head of their tribe. The Khans hoped that British Minister dissuade the Persian Government from giving Sardar Zafar a mandate supported by troops to make Bakhtiyari to the line”. Peel, as previously mentioned, informed the Legation of a most satisfactory agreement between Oil Company (Dr. Young) and khans (Ilkhani Amir Mofakham and Ilbegi Shahab al-Saltaneh) and he added British relations with the tribe generally are most satisfactory. He requested: “In the circumstances I beg that no steps to disturb the status que in Bakhtiyari may be lightly undertaken” (16).

As far as the telegram of British Consul-General in Isfahan, Francis Crow, is concerned neither the Persian Government nor Sardar Zafar intended to crush the Bakhtiyari at least in the circumstances. It appears, Norman was persuaded by the complain of Crow of the Bakhtiyari governor's weakness in Isfahan to ask the pro-British Prime Minister, Seyyed Zia al-Din, to appoint a new governor to Isfahan (had this action related to the complaint of Crow and the reaction of Norman and Seyyed Zia against Sardar Mohtasham and his invitation of Mossadeq to go to Bakhtiyari?). Sardar Zafar was one of the most powerful Khans among the two Bakhtiyari ruling families and friendly to the British Legation.

Crow informed Peel that "I am in the dark as the ultimate intentions of Persian Government" towards Bakhtiyaris. They propose to leave things in status que for the present and the Prime Minister is undoubtedly busy. In other words Norman dissuaded the decision of Seyyed Zia al-Din. Crow pointed out: we had serious cause for complaint against the Bakhtiyari Government in Isfahan "for not keeping better order". The khans could have restrained those who took part in holding up of Colonel Fraser and in attack of financial advisors Caravan and in carrying off member of governor-general of Fars suite.

Crow said: "I consider that some drastic action is imperative here", "If it is inconvenient to replace Muhtashim by Zafar perhaps Persian Government will make other arrangements". He continued to say: "I do not feel inclined to overlook what has occurred so close to town and whole business appears to me very discreditable to Bakhtiyari regime" (17). Crow telegraphed to Norman and supported the request of Peel as to maintaining the status que in Bakhtiyari for the present until Peel goes to Tehran and discusses the matter with him. He wrote: "I think that khans should be made to understand that reason for change of Governors is ..." (18).

A few days after the conclusion of the Agreement on land purchasing between the Oil Company and Ilkhani-Ilbegi, the question of appointing a new Ilkhani and a governor for Isfahan was propounded by the Persian Government and British Legation.

The opposition of Captain Peel to any change in the position of the two ruling families and also his opposition to the Major Noel's plan on formation a Bakhtiyari force, persuaded him, with the permission of British Resident in Bushehr to proceed to Tehran before the end of June 1921 in order to discuss the British "future policy in Bakhtiyari and Arabistan" (19).

The Bakhtiyari tribe with the Ilkhani and Ilbegi as well as some of the Khans started annual migration to summer quarter, where they received Mossadeq the former governor-general of Fars. Though at this juncture the question of Governorship of Bakhtiyari remained in abeyance, Sardar Zafar did continue to gain the Governorship of Isfahan. The Bakhtiyari Khans were of opinion that one of the chief causes of dissension amongst themselves was the competition for outsiders Governorships and they expected the Persian Government to dividing Governorships equally between the two ruling families otherwise “they would infinitely prefer to fore goal Governorships” (20).

From Vice-Consul in Ahvaz point of view Sardar Zafar was a “disruptive force in Bakhtiyari politics and an ambitious man who “make himself supreme in Bakhtiyari at the expense of his brothers and cousins“. The effort of Sardar Zafar in his recent attempt to seize the Governorship of Bakhtiyari for himself with the support of Seyyed Zia al-Din a plan justifiable from Persian Government’s view point, and the height of treachery in Bakhtiyari eyes. During the spring’s months Sardar Zafar did his best to discredit Sardar Mohtahsam by inciting his own “Bastegan” to rob and pillage in the Isfahan district to make a way for obtaining the Governorship of Isfahan where he set for the moment his heart (21).

The Bakhtiyari Khans who governed on several provinces in central and southern Persia, they recognised the coup cabinet under Prime Minister, Seyyed Zia al-Din. The khans, however, received in Bakhtiyari land the former Governor-General of Fars, Mohammad Mossadeq who did not recognise the cabinet of Seyyed Zia al-Din. Amir Mofakham, the acting Ilkhani, received Mossadeq warmly and he was the guest of Bakhtiyari Khans until the fall of Seyyed Zia al Din which it happened very soon at the beginning of June 1921.

Mossadeq proceeded to Isfahan with Sardar Ashja. Mossadeg visited Sardar Mohtasham to thank him for the trouble, then he and Sardar Ashja left the city for Tehran. He was invited to participate in the new cabinet as finance Minister (22). The action of the khans against the coup regime limited to tribal hospitality. They neither arrange a movement nor a complot against the Coup Cabinet.

7.3. The Past Activities

Neither the suggestion of George Churchill on 20 November 1920 on formation a Bakhtiyari force under a British officer nor then the suggestion of Lancelot Oliphant on sending Major Noel or Haig to the Bakhtiyari territory was new or expected idea formation a Bakhtiyari force returned to the Great War and Major Noel was for more than a decade dealt with the Persian affairs. Lieutenant-Colonel Edward William Charles Noel (born 14 April 1886) was one of the most active British officers of political department of the Government of India, who acquainted with the Persian language and dialects. He was second assistants to the political Resident-Bushehr 1911-1912 and 1915. Once by the order of the Government of India he took a detachment of 22 men increase to the number of consulate Guard Shiraz (23).

Then, it was heard from him during the Great War as a German mission entered to Lorestan and then Khuzestan, among them former German consul in Bushehr, W. Wassmuss and now in Shiraz. The German mission aimed to encourage the Persian against British colonial activities in Persia. In Dezful, the capital and the old city of Khuzestan at that time, and the residency of the Governor of the province, the Germans met a number of Bakhtiyari Khans and they reached to certain mutual understanding. The German mission moved to Shushtar, another town in northern Khuzestan and one of the residential as winter quarter of the Bakhtiyaris.

British authorities, however, were informed of the German mission and Wassmuss presence in Shushtar. Cox knew Wassmuss as he was in Bushehr. Cox sent a detachment to arrest the Germans, but the German mission had left the town for Behbahan to the border south east of Khuzestan and British arrived in empty house. A pro-British chief invited the Germans to his residency. He ordered to arrest the mission and then informed British Political Residency in the Persian Gulf-Bushehr. British cavaliers left the port for Behbahan. Wassmuss succeeded to escape and then went to Borazjan. Captain Noel, who had spent a lot of time among the tribes in Persia, and was known as a fearless and brave officer, was sent voluntarily to capture Wassmuss. Immediately he and his cavalry left Bushehr for Borazjan. The British cavalry arrested Wassmuss in a village near the town and informed Noel.

He ordered to take Wassmuss to Bushehr without delay. During the journey, in a dawn, Wassmuss suddenly jumped on his horse and disappeared. Noel did not succeed

to find him. British Resident, Cox, recalled Noel to Bushehr. Then he was appointed as acting consul in Ahvaz in 1915 (24). A number of Bakhtiyari joined the anti-Anglo-Russian force of Persian and supporter of Turko-German. On 2 September 1915 the force was defeated to the west of Isfahan by the Russian garrison of the place.

On the other hand British considered that it was possible that the Turkish Government might send the regular troops "to assist the revolutionary movement". Captain Noel of the Indian Political Department under the order of Sir Charles Marling, British Minister in Tehran, had been sent to Bakhtiyari. He succeeded to raise several hundred Bakhtiyari tribesmen. They persuaded the defeated revolutionaries "with a success that promised to upset the German plans"(25). Simultaneously, on September 1916, Sir Percy Sykes accelerate his march and reached Isfahan at the request of British consul in this city. In spite of the operation, British authorities considered that in the Bakhtiyari territory the situation was not all together satisfactory. The security of oilfields in Bakhtiyari land had the first priority in British policy. Marling decided the financial support of the Bakhtiyari Khans.

In December 1916, Captain Noel suggested raising a force of Bakhtiyari levies under British officers whose primary duty to maintain order along the Lynch road. This project met with the approval of British authorities in Persia and then at the end of January 1917 the British Government approved it. However, the scheme never materialised and was abandoned in May 1917 (26). At the same month, on May 1917, Percy Sykes-Horton suggested to Marling the expansion of South Persia Rifles by absorbing the unregular troops from Bakhtiyaris and Sistanis. This project did not shape at its juncture.

After the Bolshevik revolution, Captain Noel was sent by the order of Marling to Gilan and Caucasus to gather the necessary information's and to arrange certain duties before the campaign of Donester Force. In his return from Baku, Noel stayed in Anzali, but in civil cloth. The Jangalis received information's that Captain Noel prepares to organise the assassination of Mirza Kuchek Khan, the leader of Jangal's movement. On 18 March the Jangalis arrested him. Captain Noel escaped twice from his prison, but he was captured (27). Captain Noel was freed only after the cease fire between Jangalis and Donester Force.

Incidentally, the day of Noel's arrest, the Persian Government, the Cabinet of Mostowfi asked the evacuation of British forces from the Persian territory. The Persian

Government informed the British of his intention on formation a national army in Persia. Four days later, the Persia Committee decided to consult Marling on raising a Bakhtiyari levy corps and the Foreign Office informed the commanding officer of force that the British Government had decided to raise a Bakhtiyari force to protect the position of Great Britain in Persia (28). Curzon, the Chairman of Eastern Committee objected strongly to such policy and did not authorise such a telegram.

At the beginning of 1921, Foreign Office requested India Office to lend Major Noel to organise a Bakhtiyari force and create a southern federation of the tribes. India Office agreed but, pointed out Noel will be wanted eventually for the Kurdish Commission in Cairo (29). Major Noel was in England at the time. He, therefore, did not return to India, but reached into Persia in April 1921. First he participated in Cairo Conference in March 1921. Winston Churchill, the new Colonial Secretary, chaired the Conference. Noel was consulted on Kurdistan issue. He favoured the formation a Kurdistan as a buffer state, but Cox and Bell wanted Kurdistan to form a part of Iraq (30).

He left Cairo for Persia and after his mission in Persia Noel went to Iraq. He was accused of involving in Lorestan insurgence in 1922 and Bakhtiyari 1931. He was Consul in Kerman 1929-1931. The Persian Government was not happy with the Residence of Noel in Persia. After the occupation of Persia by the Allies, he was the chief of British farms in Khuzestan in 1941.

Before arriving in Persia in spring 1921, Major Noel wrote a letter to Arnold Wilson, the Resident Director of the A.P.O.C., on the subject of Bakhtiyari Khans' discontentment of the A.P.O.C. Then as he stayed in Bakhtiyari country, he wrote two memoranda on the subject and of the Bakhtiyari Khans shares in the Bakhtiyari Oil Company and first Exploitation Company. He had also some correspondence with the Directors of the A.P.O.C. in London this subject. Some telegraphic correspondence took place between Major Noel and the Political Advisor of Oil Company Dr. Young and between him and the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel on the subject of an advance to the Khans, the question of the retention of their scrip (31).

Major Noel arrived in Persia in April 1921. He went to winter quarter of Bakhtiyari in the north east Khuzestan and the foot hill of Zagros. In his report, Noel has mentioned that he met in low land the khans as well as Lieutenant Colonel Trevor, British Political Resident in Bushehr and Captain Peel Vice-Consul in Ahvaz. They all

three were the eye-witness of an agreement on purchasing land between the Ilkhani and Ilbegi Amir Mofakham and Morteza Qoli Khan, and the political advisor and the representative of the A.P.O.C. Dr. Young in the second half of April 1921. Major Noel joined the Bakhtiyaris on annual migration to highland or summer quarter (32). In fact, Major Noel came at first to the Bakhtiyari to study the situation before shaping his proposals to the British Minister in Tehran.

He met the majority of Khans and a „passage through Bakhtiyari“. He met the Ilkhani Amir Mofakham and Ilbegi Morteza Qoli Khan as well as Amir Mojahed and “the minor khans who accompanied these Senior Khans in the lowland. He discussed the situation with the British resident in the Persian Gulf, Lieutenant Colonel Trevor and British Vice-Consul-Ahvaz, Captain Peel and the political advisor of the A.P.O.C., Dr. Young.

Then, he travelled through Bakhtiyari country during the annual migration. He had the opportunity to watch carefully „the internal relation and the relations between the tribesmen and the chiefs. On his arrival in Bakhtiyari highland he saw Sardar Ashja, Sardar Jang and Shahab al-Saltaneh. Finally he met Sardar Mohtasham, the Governor of Isfahan. Noel discussed with the Khans the recent political developments and the question of Bolshevism in Persia. Then he prepared a memorandum in Isfahan in 12 May 1921 on the situation in Bakhtiyari before living for Tehran (33). The proposal of Noel was based on his previous analysis and memorandum.

7. 3.1. Noel’s view on Bakhtiyari Tribe

Noel stated: It is four years since he was in Bakhtiyari and the most striking feature was the increase in ill feeling among the tribesmen toward the Khans. He added: “True, the ill feeling to the chiefs is of such long standing as to be characterised as symptomatic”, however, as recorded by Vice-Consul-Ahvaz 1911 “while the proposal loyalty of the tribesmen to their chiefs is despicable, it is still not for a moment that they would in consequence acquiesce with any outside power.

Noel agreed that the khans might be able to rally the tribesmen in the face of an outside danger, but at the same time added the feeling of disloyalty and dissatisfaction had been increasing “so steadily as to make the present situation unstable “and it

renders” to break up from within if not from without“, so they fear of Bolshevism and ready to work with British to protect them against it (34). He argues, in spite of the feudal and autocratic character of the tribe it is at the same time strongly patriarchal which it implies a very “strong undercurrent of democracy”. A tribe is nothing more than a large family. The younger members must pay respect to the elders.

They feel the elders bound to them “by the ties of a common life and common interests“. The present breach was precisely due to the disappearance of these ties. The fathers of the present Khans lived with the wives and children in black goat hair tent and migrated annually twice with the tribesmen. They knew their tribesmen intimately and settled the disputes in virtue of their knowledge. No the Khans settled down in palaces in Chahar Mahal quite distinct from Bakhtiyari and many of Khans resided more or less permanent in Tehran and they visit Bakhtiyari intervals. Their wives veiled like Persians and send their children to Europe (35).

The Khans no longer accompany the tribesmen in annual migration. The position of Khans “as leaders, arbitrators and rulers “no longer depend on their natural abilities and qualifications for a task, but upon a family arrangement designed. The Bakhtiyari tribesmen argued that the present political position of the Khans is due to their participation and support of the khans since the Constitutional Revolution, but they did not “share with the Khans in the same way as they shared things in Bakhtiyari itself“.

This question first arose in 1908 and Khans who conscious of maintaining their power, did attempt “to do so by intermarriage and by money. Hence arose the system of “Bastakani” (Bastegan), “the building up of a body of retainers by a system of doles and intermarriage. Noel believed by certain personal experience like discussion with the brother in law of Samsam al Saltaneh “to live in a palace and send his children to Europe and take a hand at governing the provinces”. “The tribesman feels that the democratic basis of tribal life has been violated, he realises that the khans while ready to appeal to his feelings of clansmanship, are not ready to allow the principle of clansmanship full play when it comes to dividing the booty“, that the tribesmen “will never be content with cash” (36).

In recent years the Bakhtiyari “revenues as well as the tolls on the Lynch road chiefly expended on keeping the “Bastegan “quite”. The tribesmen received large salaries and yet dissatisfied and at the same time the Khans would be pleased to free themselves of Bastegan system and yearly dole. Also the Khans, had no interest to

spend Penny money on the most elemental needs of the tribe such as Il route, where it was kept in good repair during the rule of the father of the khans. “Now it is left to look after itself. “The real interest of the Khans” “lies in their lucrative private properties which situated outside Bakhtiyari”. “As long as he sees his chief, who is often his connection by marriage, elevated to a position which he cannot share”.

Finally he reached into conclusion and suggested: It will be necessary for British to interfere into the breach between Khans and tribesmen and to alter radically the present system of tribal government. He believed that the tribesmen would welcome it and the khans due to their fear of Bolshevism would not oppose to such step. He added “the first and most important step would be the raising of a Bakhtiyari police force under British Officers and the exercise of a general control over the revenues of the country” (37).

Noel was of opinion that the “British prestige stand high among Bakhtiyaris”. It would lose ground if it were identified with nothing more than a policy of preserving the khans in their evil ways“. He believed: “the most striking feature in Bakhtiyari was the increase in good feeling to the Oil Company and ...“since he was in Bakhtiyari for four years ago. With such view Noel went to see Norman, the British Minister, and explain his proposals and receive his instructions.

Noel arrived in Tehran after the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din and his escape to Europe. He founded the British Minister “very pessimistic as regard the future and the prospects of preventing the north Bolsheviks”. It appears that the Persian Cossack and its command had not stabilised themselves when the coup cabinet fell. Norman told Noel to go ahead with his plan on Bakhtiyari force by laying “the foundation of a Bakhtiyari dam to stem the incoming Bolshevik tide” (38).

From Norman point of view the Russian Soviet Government was developing with alarming and unexpected speed in the northern provinces of Persia, “unless timely measures are taken to check by the maintenance of the S.P.R. “and “by adaptation of measures for more costly and for more open to objection from a political view “in order that the British interests commercial and political “especially the oilfields can be saved from destruction” (39).

Not only British interests in Persia were at attack, but British position in India should be affected “by disappearance of the force, because it offers the only secure foundation for the local arrangement which are necessary to prevent the penetration of

Bolshevism”. The chief aim of the Russian Soviet Government is to be the destruction of the British Empire by expelling the British from India (40).

7.3.2. Proposals of Noel and Smart

Major Noel discussed informally with the Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran. He reached into conclusion that the relations between khans and tribesmen were bad. Without British mediation, the tribesmen easily amenable to Bolshevik propaganda. The old divisions between the khans make them ready to Bolshevik agents. Bakhtiyari police force, about 500 strong, as the khans tentatively told Noel, should be under British Officers to secure the internal order of Bakhtiyari tribes. Noel told smart that: this force would be under supervising of British Consul in Bakhtiyari “to improve the lot of tribesmen „and “maintain the authority and unity of the ruling families“. Noel stated: the Khans “haunted by the specter of Bolshevism „and “would welcome British interventions on these lines” (41).

The properties of the Khans were most by outside the Bakhtiyari country, and khans, Noel thought, would “not object to being relieved of the internal responsibility“ of the Bakhtiyari tribe “provided they could count on its support when needed”. The costs of the police force as Major Noel estimated, was about 25.000T annually or about L 50.000. The Khan told Noel and the Legation that they are willing “to contribute substantially to the maintenance of the force provided Bakhtiyari tax and the tax of certain districts outside the Bakhtiyari under their jurisdiction are entirely assigned to that object“(42). In his return to Bakhtiyari high land Noel wrote a demi-official letter to Peel, Vice-Consul-Ahvaz, and explained his proposals on organise the Bakhtiyari against Bolshevism in order Peel can “as non-committal with the khans as possible“. As far as the proposals of Noel indicate, he modified his view in regard to the khans and the A.P.O.C.:

- (a) Noel proposed the formation Bakhtiyari police force strength of 700 under British Officers.
- (b) The control of Bakhtiyari revenue by British political Officer.
- (c) Setting up a commission as Peel had put forward in 1919.

- (d) To include the areas of Kohgiluyeh, Chahar Mahal and Burburud to Bakhtiyari.
- (e) The Bakhtiyari Khans would receive the financial assistance for two years to enable them to raise the Bakhtiyari force, then the salaries (Mawajeb) of the Bastegan in one year “can be very greatly reduced” The Bakhtiyari will be financially a self-supporting unit. In other words with the help of the khans, British would create a police force under the British command and the force would be paid salaries from the Bakhtiyari revenue and toll which at the present distributed to the Bastegan and it will be controlled by British political Officers and the Khans who assist to the British. In other words, British would rule over an expanded Bakhtiyari territory by a force under British command, a force which it would be paid from the tax and yield of Bakhtiyaris revenue which it would be controlled by a British Officer and it is paid at the present to the Bastegan. Briefly speaking, British would rule the Bakhtiyaris and the others through the Persian pocket.
- (f) Finally he wrote the „Oil Company to offer the khans a 5% royalty instead of the 3% percent shareholding, if the police force has come into being after two years. He added: the unity among the Khans is necessary if the scheme gets going. Noel discussed on first five points with Khans and they agreed on principal.
- (g) Noel and the Khans were convinced that the proposition could not put into practice if Sardar Zafar was not placated.

Khans suggested: giving him the governorship or appointing him as Ilkhani with Sardar Mohtasham as Ilbegi. Mohtasham agreed to the second proposal. Noel was in favour of number one and gets Samsam al-Saltaneh back to Bakhtiyari land as Ilkhani, the other day he discussed the matter with Samsam al-Saltaneh and he agreed to reside in Bakhtiyari (43).

Despite his previous statements on high prestige of British and good feeling on Anglo-Persian Oil Company in Bakhtiyari and the disloyalty of tribesmen towards the khans, Noel realised that he is enable to form Bakhtiyari police form only if the Khans assist him. The Noel suggestion to Anglo-Persian Oil Company on change of 3% shareholding of Bakhtiyari Khan to 5% loyalty had not any ground or relations to his

other proposals and Noel did not explain the reasons for his proposition. However, the other correspondences indicate the discontent of the khans of the agreement of 1905 and 1909.

7.4. A Defence Plan of the South

Meanwhile Oriental Secretary of British Legation, Walter Smart prepared a memorandum on the situation in Persia. He reached almost to the same conclusion as Norman. He wrote: the withdrawals of Russian missions, now in Tehran and the Northern provinces are expose to the activities of Russian agents. These also the menace of ever-present military intervention of Russian to the capital and British “are practically unarmed” in the north. Then he suggested the consolidation of British position in the south.

Smart stated: the consolidation of British situation in the south depends principally on the S.P.R. and the Bakhtiyaris. The city of Isfahan is the centre of Bakhtiyari politics and the meeting place of southern highways. Fortunately, the Cabinet of Seyyed Zia al-Din, the late cabinet, transferred some detachments of the S.P.R. to Isfahan and they still remain there. With the dissolution of the S.P.R., the Russian agents in Isfahan will undermine, the insecure Bakhtiyari tribal system, with the result that the safety of the oilfields will be compromised and a British force will probably be required to protect these vital interests.

The expense of such force “will be far in excess of modest sums required by the S.P.R.” The dissolution of the S.P.R. will throw Fars into anarchy, weaken British influence, injure the British trade and “reduce the customs revenues which form the security for British loans and expose the province to Russian penetration”. With the maintenance of South Persia Rifles, this is a fair prospect of a consolidated south favour to the British interests. An arrangement with the Bakhtiyari Khans is necessary to stabilise the internal situation of the Bakhtiyari country and for their co-operation in the Governorship at the present held by the Khans in Arak, Isfahan, Yazd and Kerman.

It would be necessary, wrote Smart, a similar arrangement with the semi-independent and hereditary ruler of Quanta and Seistan, Showkat al Molk, who is entirely in British camp, to preserve the south east ward against the Russian Bolshevik

penetration. In fact, the question of a raising police force largely from British disbanded levies had already been discussed by the British Legation, Showkat al-Molk and Seyyed Zia Government. Seyyed Zia “approved the scheme, proved the cost of the force was defrayed from local tax” (44).

The isolated and independent Posht-Kuh and the anarchy Lorestan provide effective barriers in the west and north of this area in Kermanshah and Kurdistan can Mesopotamia exercise a steadily influence. It was essential for Smart that throughout the southern “British influence should be exercised”. It appears for a consolidated south; Smart would like to promote Sarem al-Dowleh, the son of Zel al-Soltan and the present head of the family, if it would be necessary as the chief of sovereign of the southern confederation.

Although Sarem al-Dowleh has no military force at his disposal and the prestige of Prince was now of little weight, wrote Smart, but “he was not without utility”. He has held ministerial posts and “he has an English education and his horizon is wider than of local chieftain”. Major Noel suggested that he might be sent to Fars. Both, Sarem al-Dowleh and the Khans of Bakhtiyari had “expressed willingness to abandon their long feud in view of the Bolshevik peril”. The bulk of Sarem’s property near Isfahan would ensure his co-operation with us (British).

It might be possible for British to give Qavam al-Molk such guarantees as would induce him to accept Sarem al-Dowleh as Governor-General and forget his hostility. However, it appears neither Bakhtiyari nor Qavam al-Molk are likely to acquiesce in his domination. Smart was in view that the keeping Sarem within British southern system is advisable and the disposal of Sarem can be considered at the proper moment in detail. In regard to Qavam al-Molk, Smart stated: he must be the pivot of British policy in Fars. He alone has the stability, the material force and the local interest required to hold the province in co-operation with British.

The Persian Gulf ports were dominated by the British and Arabestan (Khuzestan) under the eyes of the Sheikh Khaz’al is equally secure. The Russians and the Persian nationalist in the north fight against a southern consolidation. British should endeavour to force the Persian Government to finance South Persia Rifles and to assign the Bakhtiyari revenue to the Bakhtiyari police force and the Seistan customs to Showkat al-Molk’s local levies and finally the expenditure of all southern revenues on the south. British should endeavour to give effect to this policy by diplomatic methods, but in vital

issues we must prepare to disregard the Tehran Government if it proves unnameable (45).

The southern consolidation need not necessarily be effected by a dramatic break with the north, unless the Bolsheviks play their cards and provoke such secession. British should, as in Pre-War days, fight for the south in Tehran. It is possible that the Russian influences may so predominant in Tehran that the British and south would be compelled to break with the Central Government. A loosely-connected confederation would then administer the south in alliance with British and independently of the Tehran Government.

It appears, as a result of the strong position of Bolsheviks in the northern provinces, in that time the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din, the uncertain position of Reza Khan and the Persian Cossacks who were still unable to break up the Bolshevik forces, Norman and Smart widen and completed the policy of strengthening the southern chieftains. Therefore they suggested to Foreign Office to bring the chiefs under an umbrella and a Prince as the head of southern confederation and under British guidance and influence.

British Legation's proposals resulting partition of Persia similar the Conventions of 1907 and 1915. From this view point Norman let Noel to discuss the Bakhtiyari khans in Tehran and then to go to Bakhtiyari land to form the Bakhtiyari police force. On 27 June 1921, British Minister, Herman Norman, sent a dispatch to Foreign Office, enclosing a report prepared by Major Noel on his recent journey through the Bakhtiyari country and his impressions on Bakhtiyari tribal affairs as well as the formation of 700 Bakhtiyari police force (46).

7.5. Opposition from Ahvaz

Meanwhile Noel had to postpone his plan due to Armitage-Smith request. Noel informed Peel that: "I have not been able to get on with my scheme owing to pleadings of Armitage-Smith who wanted a little more grace to work for united Persia" (47). Peel, as Vice-Consul-Ahvaz, who was engaged in Bakhtiyari affairs since 1917 reacted to the Noel's proposal negatively. In a telegram to Norman he wrote: Noel's proposal in

connection with Bakhtiyari against Bolshevism is dangerous to the British interests in Bakhtiyari.

He requested Norman “no definite decision be taken and nothing done to arouse the cupidity of the Khans“ and informed the Minister that he had prepare a memo on this subject in which he would hand him on his arrival in Tehran in less than three weeks in 15 July (48). Peel stated: as regard to the question of royalty, it is almost certain that the director of the Company will not agree and share remaining in the Company’s hand.

Meanwhile Peel drafted a scrupulously fair agreement by the request of managing agents. This was approved by Ilkhani, Ilbegi and Sardar Jang. They begged the Khans resided in Tehran to accept in letters which he was carrying to Tehran. Peel added that his agreements did not raise question of royalty (49). Captain Peel who was requisitioned by Major Noel in 1917 from the Indian Government to assist him in raising police forces, then was appointed as the Vice-Consul-Ahvaz and was responsible for Bakhtiyari affairs. He opposed strongly to Noel’s proposals and put forward an eight point’s proposal to form a Bakhtiyari politic to enable the Khans to defend of Bakhtiyari land.

The following criticism was to offer on the Noel’s proposals. Neither the appointment of Sardar Zafar as Ilkhani, nor governor of Isfahan was advocated by Peel. He regarded Sardar Zafar as disruptive force in Bakhtiyari politics for three decades and he made himself supreme in Bakhtiyari “at the expense of his brothers and cousins“. Amir Mofakham and Morteza Qoli Khan were an excellent combination. The situation in Lynch road and Kohgiluyeh were very satisfactory. Dr. Young founded “then the most satisfactory to deal with in all matters affecting the Oil Company“.

Peel also had more cardinal reception than before. He added: they prepare to accept to carry out British plans may concert with Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Ashja. Peel pointed out that Isfahan is too close to Bakhtiyari “for a disintegration influence of Sardar Zafar“. The only suitable Governorship is Kerman “which is sufficiently far from Bakhtiyari“. If Sardar Zafar was appointed to Kerman, Yazd should be given to Amir Mojahed. It should be here mentioned that if an Ilkhani was satisfactory to the British local authorities, he was not necessarily beneficial to the Bakhtiyari Khans and the tribes as whole.

For example it has written that the above Ilkhani and Ilbegi did not share the income of Anglo-Persian Oil Company's land purchasing 1920 with the other Khans (50). Peel was of opinion that the invasion of Persia by Bolshevik forces would be necessary more comprehensive measures. Peel believed that the experience of the Great War showed that the tribesmen of Persia fight best under their chiefs. "It is extremely difficult to instil into them the discipline which British officers would compel to try and enforce". "The police would almost inevitably be recruited from the ranks of the Bastegan. An individual marked out for punishment would at once seek redress from his patron, and if a British officer invoked the authority of Ilkhani and Ilbegi and obtained their support the latter would at once be involved with the patron in question".

Another difficult question was that of plunder, which all tribesmen looked upon as their legitimate reward for risking life and property in battle. The Bakhtiyari revenue system, said Peel, was devised by Hossein Qoli Khan and admirably suited and worked to the nomad tribe of Bakhtiyari. It should only revise to allow for subsequent redistribution of wealth with the result of overtaxed and under taxed tribes. The share of all profits and losses of administration among the two ruling family members as well as pay and allowances to Bastegan does not provide a surplus for public works, but the dissolution of Bastegan in these days of Bolshevik propaganda cause for discontent.

Besides that the formation of a Bakhtiyari police force under British Officers and the control of Bakhtiyari revenue by political officer would cut the right of Ilkhani and Ilbegi and "amount practically to a mild form of mandate" (51) and the Khans would swiftly repudiate as they realised. If a financial advisor appointed to form the Bakhtiyari, incomes, he should not be a British civil servant, but an outsider who would be paid by the Khans. It is necessary to make control of revenue and other reforms to finance a Bakhtiyari police force for two years mean taking money from British pocket and „putting it into the pockets of the Khans „for the reason that the Bastegan of the Bakhtiyari Khans were enlisted first and the khans would stop to pay allowances to them from the time of enlistment.

He continued to say, the khan defending of their home, why British should pay for it. "After all, why should we in these days of retrenchment pay the Khans to defend their hearths and homes"? The provisions of "Commission Agreement" was entirely the work of the Khans themselves "except for a few alterations" it can be useful after abolition of the "Bastegan and the resignation of all outside Governorship" (52).

The integration certain are as to the Bakhtiyari shall be recognising the status quo and the Kohgiluyeh required one more expedition and etc. The exception is Burbound in which the Bakhtiyari Khans pay revenue to the Persian Government. Finally Peel pointed out that the Oil Company's concession and the Bakhtiyari Agreement of 1905 are two different propositions. The Khan holding 3 per cent share and not royalty.

In the world value of oil increase and if the companies make greater profits, their dividends subsequently will increase. The Khans could claim that the Bakhtiyari Oil Company and First Exploitation Company are not paid by Anglo-Persian Oil Company "a price which approximates to the world price" "This remains to be proved". The 3 per cent shareholding by Bakhtiyari Khans was well known to the Vali of Posht-Kuh on the time of agreement and it was used a model. The company would be faced with a demand for a 5 per cent royalty, where they wish to work in Persia (53). Peel proposed the following points:

- (a) The immediate resignation of all outside governorships of the Khans to effect a concentration instead of defussion of strength and to remove the cause of dissension between the two rival families.
- (b) If it is decided for other reasons Isfahan and Irak should remain in Haji Ilkhani family, and Kerman and Yazd being given to Sardar Zafar and Yazd to Amir Mojahed. Sardar Ass'ad, "the leading personality amongst the Bakhtiyari Khans after" Samsam al-Saltaneh and his presence will be required nearer the centre of Bakhtiyari land "possess enough public spirit to give up Kerman" if it is pointed out to him that the situation demand.
- (c) The Ilkhani and Ilbegi should remain as at present and Samsam al-Saltaneh should remain in Tehran unless he compelled to leave the capital then he resumes automatically office of Ilkhani with Amir Mofakham as Ilbegi.
- (d) The British Government assistance should be "in the shape of rifles, ammunition, and if necessary two mountain guns, but not money, except the offer of compensation to relatives of Bakhtiyari killed in action". The present Ilkhani and Ilbegi would certainly not demand money for the

services of their soars“. The proposals are not intended to constitute a modified mandate over Bakhtiyari for term of years.

- (e) In serious fighting, British must be prepared to place a mountain battery at the disposal of the Khans and one or two British officers to advise the khans on points of strategy and “to co-ordinate the operations of the Bakhtiyari force with those of other friendly force which may be operating in the neighbourhood”.
- (f) To encourage the Khan to set up the commission in which it will follow a financial reform and a gradual reduction of Bastegan and to replace by a homogeneous force under the order of Ilkhani and Ilbegi.
- (g) The dissolution of the Bastegan must take place by the Khan on their return to Bakhtiyari and the renunciation of outside Governorships, provided no one receives Persian or British Government’s support at the expense of the others.

In Peel’s opinion “the Khans will not brook control“, but they listen to the true advise. He added if a financial adviser is ever appointed to assist the Bakhtiyaris, he should “on outsider engaged under contract and paid by themselves „and not a paid staff of British Government.

The last article of Major Noel proposal on formation a Bakhtiyari force was: „The Oil Company to offer the Khans a 5% royalty instead of the present 3% shareholding“. Apparently there was no connection between this article and the rest of Noel’s proposal. Noel did not explain the reasons for the proposition to the A.P.O.C. Peel also responded to Noel on this matter, but he was not surprised of the question at all.

7.6. The Old Differences

In fact, as Noel received the instruction to go to Bakhtiyari land and form a Bakhtiyari police force, he who well aware of the Khans dissatisfaction with the agreements of 1905 and 1909. He knew also that the Khans had still so much influence on Bakhtiyari tribesmen, but the formation of Bakhtiyari force without their consent, could not be performed, but also the co-operation of Bakhtiyari khans in such

circumstance was unavoidable. To draw the attention of the Khans to a mutual co-operation against the Bolsheviks, he found it was necessary to find a solution to the Bakhtiyari question in relation to the Oil Company. Before his arrival to Persia, on 31 March 1921, he sent a letter to Sir Arnold Wilson, the Manager Director of the company in Persia. In this letter he pointed out that the Khans “had been very unfairly treated by the company“(54).

As he stayed in Bakhtiyari land and then proceeded to Tehran, he wrote a memorandum on the subject of the agreement between the Bakhtiyari Khans and the British consul-general in Isfahan. He wrote again another memorandum on relation to three day after the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din. It is probable that he wrote this memo on his arrival in Tehran. He had certain telegraphic correspondence with political advisor of the company, Dr. Young who wrote a memorandum as well in respond to Noel. With British vice-consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel and finally Major Noel had some correspondence with the director of the A.P.O.C. in London (55).

After the drilling stopped near Kermanshah in 1904, in spite of two producing well, due to the question of shipment, the D’Arcy Oil Syndicate shifted the drilling to Bakhtiyari winter quarter where the Morgan and D’Arcy geologists had recommended. The drilling began in 1905 and reached to oil in 1908 (56). Instead asking the Persian Government for protection guard and land purchasing, the British Consul-General in Isfahan Preach and the representative of the concessionaire (D’Arcy) Oil Syndicate engineer G.B. Reynolds came into direct negotiation with the Bakhtiyari Khans without the knowledge of Central Government (57).

On 15 November 1905 an agreement signed by the Khans and Preece. The Bakhtiyari Khans obtained 3 per cent the shares of the First Exploitation Company. The object of Noel was to consider the question of the Khans interests in the A.P.O.C. from the viewpoint of Bolshevik propaganda campaign, whose first object will be Anglo-Persian Oil Company the only real industry in Persia. The Company might argued that question of revising the terms of the agreement “which were only extracted by the Khans by blackmail “and the Persian Government has not recognised the agreement and “khans have no valid right to royalty or payment of any sort” (58).

The southern oilfields is isolated, but contact with the Khans will be at first in Tehran and then in Isfahan and Chahar Mahal by promoting ill-feeling between the Bakhtiyari khans and the Oil Company through suggestions that they were “robbed and

exploited“ therefore the cognition present psychology of the Khans towards the Oil Company and the agreement are important. The Khans have always been convinced, wrote Noel, that the 1905 agreement was unfair to their legitimate interests and that “Mr. Preece duped them or to use their own expression “rubbed syrup into their hands. Sardar Ass’ad told Grand Duff:

“At the time of the signature of the Agreement, Mr. Preece was their guest and out of regard for him they had given way in certain important matters to excite the avarice and cupidity of the khans without realising what they were undertaking” British Consul-General Isfahan wrote in his dispatch of 20 November 1905 to the Legation “I was never more pleased in my life, as I did not think I was ever going to bring it off and on such advantageous terms. I am much be held to the chiefs for their consideration of me, they knew that I was ill and suffering, and so gave in to me on my many points” (59).

The second point of the Khans against the agreement 1905 was that” a 5 per cent holding of the shares had been practically agreed between themselves and Mr. Preece, when the latter, taking advantage of a pause in the negotiations, succeeded in fomenting their family jealousies and then, by cleverly playing off one faction against the other, he managed to get them to agree to a reduced figure of 3 percent instead of 5 percent”.

The general tenor of Mr. Preece report, wrote Noel, confirm of the Khans that he “took advantage of their family quarrels to manoeuvre them into signing a document they would not have agreed to ordinary circumstances”. He added the British consul-general was embarrassed at an severing the Khan’s very legitimate questions the meaning of fully paid-shares and his frankly expressed „surprised beyond measures at getting such good terms all go to support the khans complaint to Mr. Grant Duff“.

Finally he wrote: “I trust that the above will not appear as an ex-parte statement or that I should give the impression that I am supporting the khan ... I am only trying to indicate a very real source of possible danger ... and Bolsheviks will not be slow to make use of. I have been aware of the Khan’s feeling on this subject as far back as 1916, but I did not raise the question until now on the principle of “let sleeping dogs lie “especially when we were their only people who could rouse them, but now that a third party in the shape of ... Bolshevik agitator ... if the Bolshevik rouses them in his own way, we are the first people whom they will want to bitten” (60).

In the second memorandum, Noel wrote: The Khans hold 3 per cent of the shares in Bakhtiyari Oil Company (capital £ 700.000) and the First Exploitation Company

(capital 44.000 T) the total holding amounts to £ 37.520 which stands in the name of four khans. These four original shares had “been divided into ten by a family agreement“. The Oil Company, however take no cognisance and these are financial groups who would offer from £25 to £ 30 for a £ 1 share. Therefore the Khans holdings might to worth up to a million sterlings. The Khan’s dividends was about £ 10.000 in 1920 in compare to 16 percent royalty of Persian Government amount to £ 400.000 and “it is not subject to income tax, excess profit duty and depreciation Charges“. Recently the Khans heard that the Persian Government obtained a refund of £ 1.000.000 from the company. The Khans began to argue that they should be entitled to a proportional wind fall (the Khans were firmly convinced that the agreement was unfair and according to world standards they were entitled to 5 instead of 3 per cent) (61).

Only with an inspection of the books of the two subsidiary companies by a qualified accountant and expert was possible to express as if the Bakhtiyari Khans had any valid claims, but from Noel viewpoint politically it was important a clear statement given to the khans question. The real cause of the Bakhtiyari Khans anxiety is in the reluctance of the company to part with the share. Their efforts to obtain of it became obstinate. They suspected the company of unfavourable motive to Bakhtiyari interests. “The scrip once in the hands of the Khans would tend to lose its even distribution between the leading members of the two ruling families”.

Then Noel suggested the solution to the present difficulty would be for the Oil Company to change the Khans, holdings “from the basis of a share interest to a royalty interest”. The advantage of the agreement would not be alienable in the way that shares are. “It would be very desirable, indeed if the oil company could be induced to offer the khans a 5 per cent royalty on the profits of the FEC and B.O.C. instead of their 3 per cent” (62). At the end of two of three years an efficient police force was in existence and the revenue system of Bakhtiyari was put in on “a sound footing” and the increased royalty dependent to internal reforms.

7.7. The New Solution?

In respond to the memo of Noel and Stuart Morgan, wrote Dr. Young, the Political Advisor of the Oil Company: strictly speaking, Samsam al-Saltaneh is the only Bakhtiyari khans in Tehran who signed the agreement 1905. Sardar Zafar, Sardar Eqbal,

Amir Jang and the younger generation have no authority to raise the subject and have not any share been issued in their names. The younger generation, Sardar Iqbal and Amir Jang had no right of interference in this matter.

Sardar Mohtasham, Sardar Ashja, Amir Mofakham, Sardar Jang, Amir Mojahed and Sardar Ass´ad, most of whom have a voice in the matter didn't reside in that time in Tehran. Dr. Young argued that he made no practical suggestions especially in the uncertainty of the situation in Persia, as these khans never made „such a strong point of it as to impress me that action should be taken” (63). However, some action need be taken. The khans' demand was from Dr. Young of point of view: (a) Possession of the share certificates. (b) An assurance that the Khans get full return for the oil produced. (c) Receipts to be accepted from each. (d) An arrangement that each Bakhtiyari Khan can will his shares to his heirs.

Dr. Young argued that the Khans were granted these shares collectively and not individually, and the intention was to enlist the combined efforts of the Khans by affording the A.P.O.C. the necessary protection for the conduct of the work. The distribution of the shares amongst irresponsible members of the two families will destroy the collective responsibility of the Khans who are in frequent quarrels. If the A.P.O.C. „split up the shares amongst a score or more of young khans, the dividends in which represent a substantial figure received by each Khan, very much lessened, a couple of hundred pounds, say, for each Khan and it will not satisfy him” (64).

The actual scrip issued in the names of the khans of the Bakhtiyari must be lodged either with Anglo Persian Oil Company or with the British Legation, or with authoritative body by mutual consent, as a guarantee that the khans would be fulfilled their obligations and khans can regarded as shareholders with obligations. The A.P.O.C. would be prepared to carry out the following:

- (a) “Retain any documents drawn up by them as to sub-division of the shares in the names of members of their families, handing the annual dividends to the individual Khans named.
- (b) Retain any wills, registering the names of the heirs to whom the shares will belong, and continuing to pay the dividends to such heirs.
- (c) Advance any loan, at a reasonable rate of interest, to any member of their family to whom shares have been allotted by the senior Khans such

loans, would, no doubt, is based on the market value of the shares, as assessed by our auditors, and the accrued dividends on such shares.

- (d) We shall give the representative Khans a letter that they were the holders of 37.320 shares in the Bakhtiyari Oil Company and First Exploitation Company. The Companies, the scrip of which has been deposited for safe custody and as a guarantee against the Khans obligations with His Majesty's Legation or any bank by mutual consent.
- (e) Copy of the annual balance-sheet would be forwarded to the Khans regularly when issued as an assurance of the return of their holding" (65).

Noel believed that the A.P.O.C. should take the first step on finding a solution to the Bakhtiyari Khan's discontent before the Bolshevik uses it. The authorities of the Oil Company in Persia as well as the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz deny somehow the existence of any crucial problem. The critical view of Noel on certain policies such as scrip for the shares was reported to the board of the company in London as a sign of Khan's provocation by Noel against the Oil Company. Noel was obliged to write to the Director of the company and explain or rather defend of himself.

In his letter, Noel stated, he believe that reports reached to Sir Charles Greenway that Noel had been encouraging the Bakhtiyari Khans to hope: "A revision of dividends paid to them in the past" a royalty instead of a shareholding in the future. "Let me tell you what I have and what I haven't done". Noel wrote: when he arrived in Persia in April 1921, he realises the possibility of trouble with the Bakhtiyari khans over their share holdings. He communicated his view and anxiety to the Resident Director of the Company, Sir Arnold Wilson by a letter and orally to the political advisor of the Company, Dr. Young at the oilfields.

Then he travelled through the Bakhtiyari land neither he discussed oil affairs nor the khans raised the question. The news of one million Pound for the Persian Government did not jet filtered in Bakhtiyari, but as Noel arrived in Tehran, realised that the Khans were in view that their past dividends should be revised and they should come in for a windfall like the Persian Government. He continued to say: "I know that in the past it has been the policy to treat the khans like the children (they are) and that this policy had enjoyed a certain measure of success. In the past, however, British have monopolised the Bakhtiyari ear. Imperial Russia whatever her other faults, in the case of the Bakhtiyaris at least, played the game by not interfering. It seems to me that those

days have now gone. British must certainly expect, that the Bolsheviks will intrigue actively in Bakhtiyari in the near future” (66).

Recently the Bolshevik Russian Legation supported Samsam al-Saltaneh’s candidate for Premiership. It’s much better to let the Bakhtiyari hear the truth from British instead “twisted and coloured version of it from Bolsheviks” “the policy keeping things from them must be modified”. “For example the Khans did attempt to get hold the scrip for their share holdings. They were put off by a number of childish excuse such as the insecurity of the post owing to submarines etc. “It could be exploited by British enemy”.

Though Noel dissuaded the Bakhtiyari Khans from many actions against the Oil Company and did attempt to persuade that the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz protect the legitimate interests of the khans, but it appears his criticism of Anglo-Persian Oil Company policy did not forgive him. Noel did explain the difference between royalty and share to the Khans. That, they paid 6% in the L.1 income tax, but no E.P.P., that they had no claim to mineral rights. That, the 3% of the share was given to them for guarding the property of the Company and facilitating its work. “The principles governing the Persian Government a million had no application whatever to their case“.

Noel discussed the Khans of engaging legal counsel in England and assured them that the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz and the British Legation in Tehran could always protect the legitimate interests of the Khans. Noel stated: he recommended a change of a royalty instead of the shareholding on the ground to provide “a solution to the difficulty of the custody of the scrip”. Noel did not even discuss the matter with the Khans.

He added: “in regard to the future of southern Persia, should a Soviet form of Government to be set up at Tehran, the khans might be able to negotiate for an increase royalty instead 3% shareholding, but they would have to offer the Oil Company very solid “proguid quo“ to induce them to effect such a change”. In conclusion he referred indirectly to the suggestion of Peel that “it is best to leave the Bakhtiyaris alone to work out their own salvation”. This policy would hold as long as nobody else interferes and excites the cupidity of the Khans.

With exception of the first half of the Great War (1914-1918) British had always a clear field in Bakhtiyari up to 1920 and the only outsiders were Dr. Young and the vice-consul Ahvaz, who visited the Khans in Bakhtiyari land. Those days have passed, “in the near future must expect to see a strong Bolshevik propagandist agency at Isfahan in the guise of a Russian Consulate”. “Hysterical temperament” of the Bakhtiyari

tribesmen and tendency “to a high pitch of excitement and their avarice and cupidity” are the soil to the seeds of Bolshevism. “With the approach of Bolshevik menace, we will eventually be forced to take active and constructive steps to supply the cement recession to hold together a Bakhtiyari barrier against Bolshevism, or else watch the barrier collapse as others have done”. (67)

7.7.1. Director Respond

With regard to all correspondences of Noel to the representatives of Anglo-Persian Oil Company in Persia and England (letters, telegrams and memorandums) almost two months later, Sir Charles Greenery responded to Major Noel. As far as the letter of Greenway indicates neither the information’s which Noel gave Dr. Young who cabled to Greenway urging the suppression of the MacLintock report nor his efforts to dissuade the khans from appointing a legal counsel in London nor his efforts to prevent of Bolshevik access to Bakhtiyari and nor his efforts of making no reference to the matter of the MacLintock report and even its existence to the khans, did not worth to mention by Greenway to appreciate the efforts of Noel.

On contrary, Greenway’s statements were rather quarrelsome. He spoke from the position of strength to a British officer, who was so courage as to criticise the policy of the A.P.O.C. in relation to the Bakhtiyari Khans as a minor shareholder in two subsidiaries companies. Noel had suggested the change of policy to save the British interests in a long term. Greenway stated; the efforts to satisfy the cupidity of the Khans were well intended, but the Board of Anglo-Persian Oil Company was very much concern to know “what has been said and done during the past few months“ that the Bakhtiyari Khans believed that they have been treated unfairly and swindled by a company in which British Government hold two thirds of the ordinary shares and the representative of the Government on the Board of the Company “have a legitimate claim for a revision of terms” (68).

These wrong impressions of the Bakhtiyari Khans „would have been immediately checked if the demands and complaints of the Khans would have been replied by Dr. Young and the personalities who were acquainted with the question and on previous occasions always repeated that:

- (a) “as ordinary shareholders in the producing companies they have no right whatever to question the correctness of the company’s accounts other than the right possessed by ordinary shareholders in any public company as laid down by the companies Act of this country“.
- (b) “That the Persian Government and not they are the owners of the mineral rights, and since we have to pay royalty to the former we cannot also pay it to the latter-i-e their recourse- if they have grounds for dissatisfaction - is against the Persian Government and not against the Anglo-Persian Company" (69).

Greenway continued to say: “How far you personally may have been responsible for encouraging the wrong impressions of the Khans. It was of course difficult to judge from London. Then Greenway pointed out that from the letter of 31 March 1921 of Noel to Wilson on returning to Persia he believed strongly that the khans had been very unfairly treated the company and then he repeated this view again in his memorandum. Greenway concluded it is difficult to imagine that Noel could avoid conveying some indication of these views to the Khans”.

Greenway discussed and plied to five of the Noel questions to Wilson:

- (a) “Now here in the world had the owner of oil bearing been bought out at so low a figure as 3%“. Greenway said: the owners of the surface rights “only as are the Bakhtiyari khans, you are entirely wrong because the almost universal rule is“, only the value of the land for agricultural or building purposes, plus compensation for any interference with ways, etc. On which basis the Khans would have been far less amount payable than they receive through 3% holding of shares in the producing companies. “If you mean the owners of the Mineral rights, the A.P.O.C. 16% royalty plus 3% in the producing companies. In which we (Anglo-Persian Oil Company) were forced vi-et-armis to concede to the Khans congenitally, for the purpose of protection before they would allow as to work in their country" (70).
- (b) The second question: E.P.D. & Income tax. “If allowable in the case of the Persian Government are equally so in the case of the Khans“. Greenway replied: it was open to question whether one state had their right to levy taxes to another state you saying „the khans possess

sovereign rights“. “They may at some future time achieve that position“. “Then they are entitled to claim the privilege of exemption from British taxation and be entitled to the 16% royalty and we (Anglo-Persian Oil Company) should be quite ready to pay it to them since to us it is all the same who gets the royalty”.

As a matter of fact, the producing companies never paid E.F.D., but as a whole the companies bound to pay income tax, like any individual shares holders, the khans are in precisely the same position as thousands of other foreigners and “since it was a condition of our agreement with them that they should receive such “shares”- and not a “share of the profits“ as in the case of the Persian Government, they have no ground whatever for claiming a refund from us” (71).

- (c) “The producing companies do not seem to be receiving a fair price from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. As an example might be cited the oil sold by the First Exploitation company to the Bakhtiyari company at 1, 8 and 2 a ton and resold to the A.P.O.C. at 8 to 12 per ton. The khans might raise the question whether the A.P.O.C. as majority shareholders have the right to the dispose of the production without regard to the interests of the minority shareholders. If they went to law might it not be possible that the court would decide that the sale at 1, 8 to 2 - a ton was not a bona fida one...?”

Greenway stated: “Sir Arnold Wilson had already explained the error in to which Noel had fallen in making the above statement, and that the Khans were getting their 3% upon the full price”. Greenway angrily wrote: “When you (Noel) wrote the above words did you understand that you were accusing the Anglo-Persian Company of a deliberate fraud and did you really believe that a company of the standing of the Anglo-Persian Company and administered by board composed of a number of men of the highest reputation in England would be guilty of such fraud? If so, I can only regret that British interests in Persia should in any way be represented by a British officer who for a moment as capable - even in his own mind - of forming such a low opinion of his fellow countrymen”.

Greenway added: “you were aware that the whole of the accounts had been gone into very exhaustively and critically by Mr. Armitage-Smith and M. Maclintock some months previously and that all inaccuracies had then been adjusted“ and „you really did believe that the A.P.O.C. had been guilty and the fraud”.

- (d) “The real cause of the Khans anxiety is the reluctance of the company to part with the scrip”.

Greenway said: This statement is absolutely untrue. The first lot of shares delivered to the Imperial Bank of Persia as security for a loan and the khans signed transfers in favour of the Bank’s nominees, but the scrip still stands registered in the name of the khans.

- (e) “These are financial groups would be prepared to offer as £ 25-30 for a one pound share“. Greenway stated: The outside intrinsic value of these shares is £ 3-4 for them, the financial who attempting to gain improper political influence over the Khans may prepare to offer such amount for a share.

Finally the Director of the Company added “you have fallen were quite unwitting and were due to your inexperience of business questions, but the harm that has been done to the A.P.O.C. And to the British prestige is incalculably great. For a moment that the Khans had grounds for a revision of their terms and of their account the time when so many anti-British influences are at work in Persia. Now your wrong impression have been corrected you will endeavour as far as possible to overcome the harm it will be many years - if ever - their effect upon the minds of the Khans can be entirely eradicated” (72).

In fact, Greenway received a letter from Armitage-Smith dated 25 July 1921 stating only British Minister in Tehran, Norman, Stuart Morgan, Armitage-Smith and Greenway have seen the Noel’s memorandum and he has since explained the actual facts to Major Noel “who is doing his best to keep the Khan quiet” and also is Armitage-Smith (73).

The explanation of Armitage-Smith did not satisfy him. For this reason he replied so hard to Noel. It is probable that the change of political atmosphere in August 1921 affected on such expression of view. Foreign Office also in respond to the dispatch of 27 June 1921 on formation a Bakhtiyari police force, sent a telegram almost two months

later to Norman that the Foreign Secretary desire no encouragement should be given to Major Noel's proposal "regarding the raising of a Bakhtiyari police under British officers and the exercise of control over Bakhtiyari finances" (74).

The same day Foreign Office sent a letter written by George Churchill to Greenway enclosing a dispatch from British Minister in Tehran, an appeal from four senior khans and a memorandum prepared by Noel. In respond, Greenway stated since the date of Norman's dispatch, it has been arranged that the question raised by the Bakhtiyari khans should be left to Dr. Young to deal with "in view of the fact that he has full knowledge on the whole of the matters connected with the khans interests in producing companies "of Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

As regard Major Noel's memorandum and his letter to him, said Greenway that Noel was in complete ignorance of the actual facts and circumstances the time he wrote this memorandum. With regard to the letter of Armitage-Smith, however, Greenway concluded he trusts "that the wrong impressions formed by Major Noel and harmful effects that may have been created by them, will now go no further, but it is much to be regretted that they should ever have been convinced" (75).

Two weeks after the communication of the Director of Anglo-Persian Oil Company with Foreign Office, the following telegram was ciphered to Norman by Lord Curzon: "Major Noel was originally sent to Tehran when the situation appeared imminent and closer relations with Bakhtiyaris were most desirable. If, as appears, there is no further immediate need of his services for this purpose, I think it would be well that he should be placed again at disposal of Government of India, who were so good as to lend him. Unless, you see grave objections, I propose to inform India Office accordingly"(76).

It appears that the gradual British and Soviet Russian understanding on Asian policy and the gradual success of Reza Khan on stabilisation of the army and suppression nomads and insurgence, made it necessary for British to abandon formation of local forces such as Bakhtiyari Police Force. The negative view of the Director of the Oil Company on Major Noel's view accelerated the Foreign Office decision on instructing the British Minister in Tehran to ask the return of Major Noel from Bakhtiyari land.

In his letters, Major Noel complained that due to the wishes of the Board of Anglo-Persian Oil Company he should leave the Bakhtiyari territory. This was denied by Foreign Office. At the end of the October 1921, 45 days after Foreign Office

telegram and the return of Noel from Bakhtiyari land, Trevor stating: A good deal of water has passed under bridge since Noel wrote and started his proposals. Trevor was of opinion that the idea for Bakhtiyari police force under British Officers was not any more within the range of practical possibilities unless Persia breaks up. There appears, however, to be no immediate probability (77).

Further, Bolshevik power appears to be at last on the wane. The Persian Government put out of the question any chance of the introduction of Bakhtiyari military force under British Officers on the near future (78) and the scheme fertilising the Bakhtiyaris against Bolsheviks is not likely pursued further. With regard to the Major Noel reports on discontent of Bakhtiyari tribesmen and Khans, Trevor suggested (this confirmed that these were differences between the Oil Company and Bakhtiyaris) anything can be done to increase the popularity of the A.P.O.C., “ they could ingratiate themselves both with the khans and the tribesmen by assisting both in irrigation schemes boring artesian wells etc.” (79).

Meanwhile Sardar Zafar who had returned to Bakhtiyari land in his arrival he began to interfere with tribal administration and refused to entertain the Bakhtiyari settlement which did not recognise him as Ilkhani, but he failed to impose his will on the khans. He received an ultimatum from tribal governors to leave the Bakhtiyari land within 48 hours or fight. He agreed to go to Isfahan and accept the settlement to which the majority of “Hans had agreed (80). He retreated to Isfahan at the beginning of October 1921 (81).

Peel considered it is essential that the khans should be left to arrange permanent settlement without British interference and the result will be approximation to commission scheme (82). It appears that the Ilkhani and Ilbegi as well as the other Bakhtiyari Khans realised that the local British authorities did not support Sardar Zafar anymore; therefore they stood against him and threatened him if he stays in Bakhtiyari. Some months later Viceroy of India stating: Armitag-Smith wrote privately to Trevor that though he had the highest opinion of Noel’s courage and ability, he did not think he ought to go back to Bakhtiyari (83).

As Trevor was emphatically of the same opinion, Government of India decided, in view of Anglo Persian Oil Company’s attitude to post Major Noel him elsewhere. Loraine, as the new British Minister in Tehran, wrote he is pleased with Noel and his advice in assistance for Bakhtiyari affairs. He added as Noel left London on 3 March 1921 for Persia, while it was possible the evacuation of the Legation from Tehran to

Isfahan, it was the suggestion of Noel who asked that the reports of McIntock not to publish and then it proved to be useful. The other question was the possible Bolshevik propaganda among the Bakhtiyaris and now the opening of the Soviet Russian Consulate in Isfahan proved his view in this respect.

The A.P.O.C.'s Directors were discontent of Noel's view on relation between the Oil Company and Khans and accused him that his actions in Bakhtiyari caused those the problems for the Company (84). Oliphant wrote in his minute to the letter of India Office that Loraine asked the extension of Noel's assignment in Persia and no one had affection on our decision to post him elsewhere. He added Sir Charles Greenway, however, asked through the board of the A.P.O.C. the replacement of Noel at the end of summer and the beginning of autumn.

7.8. Senior Khans in Correspondence

Major Noel left Bakhtiyari land, but the question of Bakhtiyari khans with the Oil Company remained unsolved. In fact, before the arrival of Noel to Tehran at the end of the May 1921, the Senior Khans had written to the Oil Company and raised certain questions and contrary to Dr. Young's statement, the Senior Khans of Bakhtiyari were discontent with the treatment of A.P.O.C. And contrary to the Greenway's view (85), Noel did not encourage the Khans, against the Company. He rather endeavoured to pacify them.

The action of Peel on obtaining the rest of share scripps at the request of the managing agents of the Oil Company, and keeping in deposit with the Company for the duration of concession and with the view to make the Khans "believe that there is something more coming to them" (86). The retention of the Khan's Scripps, however, caused a new and addition question between the Bakhtiyari Khans and the Oil Company.

It is almost certain that the Khans heard in Tehran of the Persian Government having got one million pound of Anglo-Persian Oil Company after the accountants who were reliable to the Oil Company had been gone to the accounts of the Oil Company (87). This act encouraged the Bakhtiyari Khans to raising various question to the Company and then appointing a representative in London, Sydney Armitage-Smith a man who was previously appointed by the Persian Government.

Four Bakhtiyari Khans, Samsam al-Saltaneh, Sardar Zafar, Sardar Fateh and Amir Jang sent a letter on 8 May 1921 to the A.P.O.C. and raised for question (88). In spite of demands made various accusations, the oil shares, capital and interests have not been paid. This has caused some difficulties. Then the Khans asked the share and ... should be paid to shareholders “so that they may be dividend according to the family rules” (89).

- (a) The Bakhtiyari Khans were prepared to undertake through the Persian Government that there would be transaction only with the members of the family who were partners of the shares. The priority right of the sale to the Oil Company would be considered if the Khans enter into transaction with any stranger.
- (b) So far the company have not rendered a complete account to the shareholder Khans so that they may know their “rights and the amount of the shares“. They have received some times certain amounts as dividends through the I.B.P.
- (c) Formerly, the dividends use to be paid by the Bank to the shareholders and the receipts signed by four persons. This caused in convenience. It should be arranged in future that “each Khan give a separate receipt to the Bank and get his dividends“(90).

Finally they requested the company if any shareholders Khan die, his shares and dividends should be under supervision of the other Khans given to his heirs. In fact there was a great difference between the given figure of the Khans in the two subsidiary companies by the authority of the A.P.O.C. and the stating figure by the khans themselves. It is an indication that the Khans, in reality, did not know exactly of their shares in the Oil Company.

On 21 September 1920, the Foreign Office asked some information's on the shares of the Bakhtiyari Khans in the two subsidiary companies. In respond the A.P.O.C. sent the following information's to the under Secretary on the shares of the four senior Bakhtiyari Khans in Bakhtiyari Oil Co Ltd and the First Exploitation Co Ltd. The numbers of shares held by four senior Khans in Bakhtiyari Oil Co Ltd was 21.000 in September 1920. 4665 shares were registered in the names of Sardar Mohtasham and Sardar Jang (Nasser Khan), of Haji Ilkhani family. 4665 shares were registered in the

name of Najaf Qoli Khan Samsam al-Saltaneh and Ali Qoli Khan Sardar Ass'ad of Ilkhani family. Altogether 9330 shares in possess of the Khans.

As far as the information's of the A.P.O.C.'s letter is concerned the rest, 11670 shares were registered in the name of Sydney Rogers and G.W. Kelbe. They were officials of the Imperial Bank of Persia (London Office) and „lodged with and pledged to the Imperial Bank of Persia as security for a loan to the Khans“(91). The number of shared of the four senior khans in the first Exploitation Co Ltd was 16.320 in September 1920. From mentioned shares, 390 shares were registered in the name of Sardar Mohtasham and Sardar Jang and 390 shares were registered in the name of Samsam al Saltaneh and Sardar Ass'ad, altogether they possess 780 shares. The rest, 15.540 shares were registered in the name of Sydney Rogers and G.W. Kelbe and were held by the Imperial Bank of Persia as security for a loan to the Khans.

The dividends due to the four senior khans for each of the four years were as follows:

Year to March 31	Amount	First E.Co. Ltd
1916	1.875.00	1.632.00
1917	2.250.00	2.040.00
1918	2.700.00	2.448.00
1919	3.150.00	2.856.00 (92)

One year later, in September 1921 five Bakhtiyari khans stated, however, different figures on their shares to Armitage Smith as the representative of the Khans in London. Samsam al-Saltaneh, Sardar Mohtasham, Sardar Jang, Sardar Ashja and Amir Jang (for Sardar Ashja) wrote: “our holdings amounting to 16,400 L shares in the First Exploitation Company the scrip for this holding is deposited with the Imperial Bank of Persia in London” (93).

With regard to the relative achievement of Armitage Smith on negotiation with the A.P.O.C., the Senior Khans wrote a letter to Sidney Armitage Smith as their Attorney in London. They wrote: “We, the four signatories or heirs and descendants there of the agreement of 15 November 1905 between the chiefs of the Bakhtiyari tribes and the present representatives of the Bakhtiyari Khans, here by invite you to act on our behalf as our London representative” or to appoint a suitable individuals “to act as agent of the

Bakhtiyari Khans in London”. For this purpose the Khans “enclose a power of attorney granting you or your selected agents full powers to act in our name”:

- (a) The appointment of the attorney was for a period of two years from 1 January 1922 to 1 January 1924.
- (b) The Khans agreed to pay L500 a year and exclusive of the expense he may necessarily incur on their behalf.

The duties of the attorney were advice and assistance in regard to: “The Khans’ rights privileges and obligations as shareholders in the First Exploitation and the attending of the attorney in shareholders meetings and Bakhtiyari Oil Companies“. The Khans interests in the A.P.O.C. and in the concession they hold from the Persian Government for the Ahvaz-Isfahan road. Projects and concessions for the exploitation of mineral and other natural resources of Bakhtiyari country as well as agriculture development and so on by the khans or foreign capital.

Samsam al-Saltaneh

Sardar Mohtasham

Sardar Jang

Amir Jang (on behalf of Sardar Ass’ad) (94)

The scrip for this holding amounting to 16,400 shares in the Bakhtiyari Oil Company and 13,056 shares in the First Exploitation Company, is deposited with the Imperial Bank of Persia in London, should at any time within two years period of the contract it be withdrawn from present place of custody. The Bakhtiyari Khans especially drew Armitage Smith attention to the great importance of Khans’ claim “for exemption from income-tax paid in the past” (95).

Armitage Smith received the letter of the Khans and three enclosures a power of attorney and two letters addressed to the Imperial Bank of Persia in London and Tehran. He responded in two days to the Khans. Armitage Smith wrote, as soon as he return to London, his intention is to revert to the service of British Government and he would “probably not retain liberty of action for more than a few months”. He suggested that he do his best “to obtain the services of a suitable agent “to protect and to promote the interests of the Khans” (96).

Trevor wrote: it is to be hoped that when the khans have an attorney appointed by Armitage Smith, they will not be so suspicious of the Company. Trevor added the khans know Armitage Smith as the man, who was mainly instrumental in obtaining recent some of money for the Persian Government from the A.P.O.C (97).

Almost seventy days later at the end of November 1921 still the differences between Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the Bakhtiyari Khans remained unsolved and undecided. The Bakhtiyari Khans, Amir Mofakham, Sardar Zafar, Sardar Mohtasham, Sardar Iqbal, and Amir Jang sent a telegram to Arnold Wilson through British consul in Ahvaz on 28 November 1921. They stated: previous conversation with Mr. Armitage Smith and Captain Peel it was arranged that on our arrival at Isfahan, the Oil Company's representative should visit Isfahan in connection with the handing over of the oil share scrip and the arranging of a loan.

They asked about the arrival of the A.P.O.C.'s representative or in the event of delay, inform them so that the Khans send a representative to discuss with Wilson or his representative (98). The Bakhtiyari Khans arrived in Isfahan to discuss the family differences and to meet the representative of the A.P.O.C. Instead the representative of the Oil Company in Khuzestan, the British Consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel, responded to the khans' telegram. He stated: the telegram of the khans regarding shares and combined loan received (99).

Peel added: three weeks ago Dr. Young wrote a letter in detail on the subject to the khans. He asked the Khans: after they receive the letter of Dr. Young and finished the family discussions in Isfahan, while the representative of the Company in Tehran does not possess full power to settle the questions, they should send a representative to him in Khuzestan. A week later Arnold Wilson sent a telegram to Isfahan. He explained to the khans that he was ill and in bed as he received the telegram of the Khans, so that he asked "Captain Peel to answer it after discussion with Dr. Young". Wilson added: The Board of the A.P.O.C. in London are in every way ready, active to assist your Excellencies in this and other matters" and Dr. Young and Captain Peel ready to assist the representative of the Khans on his arrival here (Khuzestan) (100).

As regard to the Bakhtiyari Khans, family discussion, British Charge d' Affaires instructed the British Consul to exercise his influence to bring about a satisfactory settlement on family differences. Charge d' Affaires asked him without a partisan attitude he should suggest to Sardar Zafar through the khans, to accept Governorship of Kerman in his own interests and the interests of Bakhtiyari unity (101). The Consul-

General, Isfahan telegraphed to Charge d' Affaires and informed him. Though it seems that Sardar Zafar unwilling to take office under Persian Government at the present, but at British instance and of all other Khans when their family arrangement, have been discussed, he promised to reconsider matter.

Crew was of opinion that "the discontinuation of allowance for guards" in Isfahan and Arak rather put the Bakhtiyari Khans from accepting Governorships. He pointed out to the khans that there was no question of reducing allowance in Kerman (102). Crew also telegraphed to Peel and informed him, Sardar Zafar agreed to go to Kerman if Peel can arrange following. Amir Mojahed appointed the Governor-General Yazd, Sardar Ass'ad to be Ilkhani or Ilbegi, as a guarantee for the protection of Zafar interests during his absence. He remains in Kerman for eighteenth month without the reduction of province Budget. He asked his shares of proceeds of land sold in 1920 to Oil Company.

Zafar said that Morteza Qoli Khan received half as Ilbegi, but he did not distribute it, Facilities for loan from Imperial Bank of Persia or elsewhere up to 5000 T for his travelling expense. Finally British (Peel) protection of his interests in future sale of land to the A.P.O.C. or big contract made while he is away (103). British Charge d' Affaires instructed the Consul in Ahvaz to explain to Sardar Zafar that his appointment to Kerman "is not to be treated as bargain "and "he is at liberty to accept or decline appointment "and British suggestion was solely dictated by „a friendly settlement of internal differences (104).

Crow suggested in these circumstances a little from British will "greatly facilitate adjustment of family differences which have ranked for some years. The Khans attach great importance to Peel's suggestions and assistance". Crow considered it of great importance in Oil Company's interest as well as in interest of tribal unity. Sardar Zafar and Amir Mojahed „should be removed from Bakhtiyari for a time“. He believed the remaining of these two Khans in Bakhtiyari country would be increasing British difficulties and may lead to tribal disturbances.

So, it worthwhile for British Government "to interest themselves to a great extend in Bakhtiyari affairs" (105). Peel suggested, however, British "should refrain from any interference" at this stage. If the Khans left to themselves, they would "be forced to arrive at a workable compromise". Sardar Zafar „should be instructed to discuss his proposals with the other Khans". When, final proposals are put forward by the Khans as a whole, British Government "will do their best to get them put into effect" (106).

Trevor commented after the Sardar Zafar conduct in 1915, cannot be said that he is an ideal candidate for the post of Governor-General.

British consul in Kerman has several occasions protested “when it has previously mooted“. “On the other hand, Sardar Zafar is not to be likely worse than the present governor Sardar Ass’ad“. As it is necessary to get Sardar Zafar out of the Bakhtiyari country for a time, this is the easiest way of doing it (107). The new British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine arrived in Tehran. He kept in contact with Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Jang, the two senior Khans, resident in Tehran since 10 January 1922 and he established good relation with them.

In spite of this fact, the question of the Bakhtiyari Khans resolved neither by the Board of the A.P.O.C. in London nor by the political advisor and managing director in the field in Persia. The differences between the Bakhtiyari Khans and the Oil Company did not reach to any solutions. Towards the end of the March 1922 the Bakhtiyari Khans and Dr. Young had a meeting in Malamir. The Khans pointed out that they intend to withdraw protection and labour from oilfields and to cut their connection with the A.P.O.C., because the “benefits derived inadequate as compared with the responsibility entailed , and that is a “violation of their right to full 3 per cent” (108).

In accordance with 1905 agreement, failed to obtain delivery of their scrip. They demanded: “Relief from income tax in future a grant of £ 40.000 to include the income tax deduced in previous years, a loan of £ 2 per share at 4 per cent the company to retain custody of all their scrip”. Otherwise it is better to cut their connection with the company in order to prevent the suspicious of the Persian Government and the junior Khans, who were pressing for more money.

Some weeks later, on 13 April 1922, Fitzpatrick of British Consul in Ahvaz telegraphic informed the Legation the purport of the meeting. Loraine, who had kept in contact, immediately arranged a meeting with the Bakhtiyari Khans. Though, Loraine was informed that the attitude of the Khans in Malamir was not hostile, but he wanted to prevent the pursuit of the Khan’s intention.

He spoke from the position of strength and said that he had no fear of such threats and they would not influence his conduct to the slightest degree, then he reminded the two Khans of a previous discussion in which the affairs of Bakhtiyaris “were safe in the hands of a specially competent representative who had been selected by Mr. Armitage Smith” and the khans “must await patiently the result of the deliberations in question” (109).

Lorraine continued to say that they were aware that he “had a personal interest in the matter. Therefore the Khans should listen to his advice and remain patient until “their claims could be thoroughly examined”. In fact, Lorraine wanted to be sure that the work would not be interrupted in the oilfields and asked them to repudiate the threat. Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Jang were loud that no threat was implied in the Khans statements in Malamir. Both, Lorraine and Samsam al-Saltaneh sent two separate telegrams to Ilkhani and Ilbegi to withdraw the threat and at the same time Lorraine expressed his views that the (Bakhtiyari) matter was receiving proper consideration.

Lorraine succeeded to postpone the Bakhtiyari demands for the time being, but it was clear to the both, Anglo-Persian Oil Company and Foreign Office authorities and their representatives in Persia, and with regard to the opposition of the A.P.O.C., they should find a solution to the matter. The Company therefore instructed Dr. Young to negotiate with the Khans. As a result the negotiations the formal agreements completed between the local Khans (Ilkhani and Ilbegi) and the company (Dr. Young):

- (a) “A loan of £ 84.000 on security of all shares, present and future, which shares will remain in deposit with the Company”.
- (b) “The Khans will be relieved in future”.
- (c) “The grant of £ 30.000 by the company to the Khans to include past income tax and to meet their present needs”.

The local Khans sent a message through British Consul to Lorraine. They assured him of “their loyalty towards their connection with Great Britain” And their attitude “towards the Persian Government will be regulated to suit the policy and views of this Legation”. In spite of such statement, British Minister and British Consul Ahvaz were of opinion that “although talk of their withdrawal from the oilfields had been dropped it was evident that the imaginary grievances of these chieftains against the company would have remained and would have reacted detrimentally on its work, that the chief purpose of company in the present state of Persian politics clearly was to keep the Khans satisfied and loyal, and this object had been attained” (110).

As the matters with Oil Company settled, Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Jang sent a warm message (on advice of Lorraine) to Armitage Smith and Sir George Barnes for the care in the defence of their interests. To avoid the unnecessary expense, the Khans did not sign the power of attorney for Sir George Barnes.

7.9. Summary

- (1) In 1921, the Bakhtiyari Khans were still active in state politics. The Coup Cabinet was recognised by the Bakhtiyari Khans, who governed on several provinces.
- (2) The Bakhtiyari Khans informed and assured British authorities that they are ready to take responsibility in campaign against the possible Bolshevik aggression.
- (3) At this juncture, various proposals in defence of British interests and against Bolshevik came into discussions including the proposal of British High Commissioner in Baghdad, Sir Percy Cox.
- (4) In spring 1921, based on a memo of George Churchill, Foreign Office sent a political officer to Persia to organise a Bakhtiyari Police Force.
- (5) Major Noel, the British political officer, had served for several years in British consulates and was familiar with the political situation in southern Persia and Bakhtiyari affairs. He came to Bakhtiyari during the war to form a Police Force.
- (6) The southern Consulates in Bushehr and Ahvaz were against formation a Bakhtiyari police force they suggested a southern confederation under their supervision.
- (7) British Oriental Secretary, Smart, also had another proposal in defence of the south against Bolsheviks attack.
- (8) Manor Noel was of opinion that the financial and political conditions in last decade brought a gap between the Bakhtiyari Khans and tribesmen. The khans, however, still had a considerable influence in the tribe. The Khans had also differences with the Oil Company and the political officer realised it.
- (9) As a result of opposition of southern consulates as well as dissatisfaction of the Oil Company, the Foreign Office instructed the British Minister in Tehran no encouragement should be given to the proposal of Bakhtiyari police force at the end of summer 1921.
- (10) The success of the Persian Army in the northern provinces was also one of the strong grounds that no other proposal was followed.
- (11) The Bakhtiyari Khans appointed an attorney in London to take care of their interests.
- (12) Finally, the political agent of the Company in Persia negotiated with the Khans to settle the questions in 1922.

Part III. Towards the Centralisation

VIII: Central Government and the south

8.1. Provincial Administration in Persia

Traditionally, the Persian Sovereign enjoyed of almost unlimited power. The administration of provinces run by the rulers, who were appointed or sent by the Shah with a considerable power or they were hereditary ruler, who had to be confirmed by the Shah. The latter were the chiefs of the great tribes or belonged to the old provincial aristocrat families. The provincial rulers, also, due to the long distances between the capital and the provinces enjoyed of a high degree of power. The degree of their „obedience to the Government varied according to the distance of their provinces from capital and personalities” (1). This process continued with fluctuation throughout the history.

8.1.1. Provincial Administration in 1800-1920

In the 19th century in addition to the hereditary rulers, mainly the Qajar Princes and the members of the Royal family were appointed as the ruler of the provinces and cities. The sons of the Fath Ali Shah 1797-1834, Mohammad Shah, 1834-1848, and Nasser al-Din Shah, 1848-1896, ruled on the important provinces. In the first quarter of the 20th century in addition to the Qajar Princes increased the number of aristocrats, who were sent or appointed as the ruler of the provinces and the cities.

On contrary to the previous decades, at the beginning of the 20th century, in the absence of a strong Central Government, the Princes and the aristocrat rulers were unable to perform their duties. The position of the Central Government weakened in the provinces due to the Constitutional Revolution 1905-1909.

Confrontation between the Constitutional Government and the despotic forces backing by the Russia, occupation of certain regions by the British and Russian forces and their interference in the Persian affairs 1909-1914, Then, the station of belligerent troops in neutral Persia as battlefield during the Great War accelerated the weakness of the Persian Government and Participation of Persians in the war in supporting one of the belligerents, accelerated the weakness of the Persian Government.

By the Anglo-Russian treaty 1907, and secret treaty 1915, the two old colonial powers reached into understanding with each other to divide Persia in two spheres of

influence. They, both, agreed to oppose the arrival of other powers in this region. With Moratorium of 1916 British and Russian intended to legalise their presence and interference on the Persian affairs, without waiting the ratification of Persian Parliament.

During these years, the Persian Government was unable to exercise his authority over many districts and collect the annual taxes especially during the war 1914-1918. Since the Constitutional Revolution many reform plans postponed for the reasons of empty treasury, foreign interference and internal chaos. While the Central Government was unable almost to recruit the army and pay the salaries, the tribal chieftains gained more modern arms and ammunition through foreign Legation (2). In the absence of a strong government, the chiefs of the tribes took opportunity and refused to pay their taxes.

In these upheaval years, the Persian statesmen realised that in addition to the evacuation of foreign forces, only with the formation a uniform and modern army, the Central Government would be able to re-establish gradually his authority throughout the country, then, collecting arrears and annual taxation, suppressing tribal and the other local insurgents.

The nomad tribes could jeopardise the safety of the road, the vicinity villages and the towns particularly during the annual migration. Some of the chiefs of the great tribes were ready to guarantee the safety of the roads, only if the Government would agree with them to form road-guards of their tribesmen and collect road-toll. These chiefs of the tribes, even, ignored the representatives of the Central Government in their regions. They were also in touch directly with the foreign powers. Some of them even came into Secret Agreements with them.

8.2. A modern Army and Provincial Administration

While the Great War still continued, with regard to the rise of Bolsheviks in Russia, Hassan Khan Vothuq al-Dowleh came to power with the support of the British Legation in Tehran in summer 1918. He was the chief of the cabinet for almost two years 1918-1920. The aim of the cabinet was to bring tranquillity by suppressing bandits and strengthening the position of the Persian Government in the country. After some month's negotiations, he signed the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919. Consequently, a

joint Anglo-Persian Military Commission was set forth. This commission reached into conclusion that the nomad tribes and their fighting forces are as the most dangerous internal factor to the safety of the country.

It was aimed to equip the Persian Government with a uniform army with modern arsenal under British advisors and as soon as a uniform army was organised, the military units would pacify the tribes. At the same time, the cabinet negotiated with the tribal chiefs on payment of taxes. British Government did not intend to cut her relation with the tribal chieftains. This was, to some extent, different from the view of the Persian officers whose commanders intended to dispossess the tribal chiefs from power and to crush the nomads in 1921 (3).

After the coup d'état of February 1921 by the Persian Cossack, the question of tribal taxation rose again. The Coup Cabinet chaired by Seyyed Zia al-Din was only about hundred days in power, but Reza Khan, the Commander of Cossacks, then Persian Army and the Minister of War, remained as a permanent and important factor in following cabinets until he captured the throne in 1925.

It was the desire of the majority of Persians, modern or traditional, democrat or non-democrat, in this juncture to have a strong Government without the presence of foreign forces in the country. Reza Khan, the Minister of War, and the other army commanders did not prepare to divide the power of the Central Government with any other groups in Tehran and the provinces.

8.3. Begin of Consolidation in the South

In the year 1921, while the question of rebellion in Khorassan, Gilan and the tribal insurgence in the north-western provinces occupied the Central Government's mind, certain incidents in the south from the first week of the coup d'état drew the attention of the army and the cabinets to the southern tribal chiefs and some of these events discussed in previous chapters. The southern question, however, remained in abeyance until the middle of 1922.

In the middle of 1921, the Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh, appointed Zahir al-Molk as the Governor-General in Khuzestan. As soon as he arrived in Shushtar, he agreed with the British official to ask the Central Government to undertake the British financial payments in relation to the nomad chiefs. He was praised by the British in Khuzestan,

but as they realised that he intends to strength the position of Central Government in northern Khuzestan, changed their view about him. Zahir al-Molk requested the Central Government to send a small force to this region and this caused the opposition of British and Khaz'al to him (4).

The arrival of Sir Percy Loraine, the new British Minister in Tehran at the end of the year 1921, was coincident with the beginning of serious political and military activities of Central Government in the south. Loraine informed his superior in London that two friends of the Persian Prime Minister have been replaced to the Bakhtiyari governors of Arak (Soltan Abad) and Yazd (5). The Persian Government intend to dispatch 12.000 Cossacks to Isfahan and fifty already arrived , two remunerative districts Barberud and Chaplak were controlled by the Bakhtiyari Khans for some time past, it is proposed restoration to the Government of Lorestan (6).

Loraine concluded: these facts indicate that the Central Government's attack systematically on Bakhtiyari influence and the ulterior objection of Persian Government is to send the Cossacks to oilfields. It is interesting to attention to the Loraine suggestion as a new comer with new instruction. He was certain that the Bakhtiyari Khans would seek the advice of the British Legation. He suggested to the authorities of Foreign Office in London to say that British "will not take sides and counted moderation". Curzon approved the proposed attitude of Loraine and instructed him to consolidate his influence over the khans and "to check southward thrust of Cossacks whose presence in oilfields should at all costs be avoided" (7).

In the same telegraph, Foreign Office informed Loraine that Armitage Smith derived the impression while in Bakhtiyari country that the Bakhtiyari Khans would resist to the force of Central Government in their territories. The Khans expected the moral support and arms from British Government. Curzon, however, was not prepared to sanction the question of arms for Bakhtiyaris in that juncture, but he instructed the British Minister to remind the Bakhtiyari Khans of existing the Anglo-Bakhtiyari close relation in order to strengthen his position with them (8). British Minister discussed with the Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran on this matter.

They were favourably impressed with cordial friendliness of Loraine's attitude. The Bakhtiyari Khans said that British Government should not provide funds to the Persian Government which will use them to destroy the Bakhtiyari influence. Loraine responded that Persia is one family and although British had a particular affection for its Bakhtiyari members. It was „every body's interest to be on good terms with family as a

whole“. British Minister hoped “for was one where friends of England would also be friends of Persian Government” and then much trouble would be saved.

Pending Curzon’s instructions, Loraine did not want to go any further in order not the Bakhtiyari Khans “interpret a declaration of neutrality on our (British) part as an invitation to attack Cossacks in Ispahan and if there is to be aggression it had better come from the other sides”(9). Trevor informed British Minister that he agrees with British consul in Ahvaz, Peel that it is highly undesirable to take any steps which would encourage the Persian Government to send Cossacks to the oilfields and everything should be done to discourage this (10).

Meanwhile Loraine received the respond of Foreign Office to his interview with the Bakhtiyari Khans. Curzon approved the language of British Minister (11). In January 1922 the Minister of War sent a body of troops (not 12.000 Cossacks as Loraine had wired) to Isfahan to create a southern division. Reza Khan had already the eastern and western divisions. The Bakhtiyari Khans regarded, wrote Loraine, the extension of Central Government’s authority in Isfahan with much suspicious. They believed that: “it was part of a plan to diminish their authority”. Since the Constitution in 1909, usually the Bakhtiyari Khans were appointed the Governor-General in Isfahan.

They were also accustomed to fill the Governorships in Behbahan, Yazd and Arak (Soltanabad). They had only short while ago lost the Governorships of Yazd and Arak, however, „they still retained the Governorships of Isfahan, the outpost to the Bakhtiyari country and Behbahan“. “Both places were regarded as nature of doorways into “the home of Bakhtiyaris (12). It is a safe guess of Bakhtiyari Khans in March 1922 that the Central Government determined to deminish their power by the annexation of Behbahan and Kohgiluyeh to Fars was propounded by the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh.

8.4. Bakhtiyari Khans and Kohgiluyeh

The Persian Government was always suspicious of the direct relation of the tribal chiefs with the Great Powers. In the south, the Persian Government almost confronted with the British local authorities from time to time when the question of southern tribe’s taxation came into consideration. This time the Cabinet decided to bring to an end the Governorship of Kohgiluyeh and Behbahan by annexation to Fars to cut off the Bakhtiyaris hand from Governorship of this region.

The Bakhtiyari Khans under the pretext of difficulty of tax collection in restrained themselves of paying the provincial tax to the Persian Government. Even British Legation realised that the Bakhtiyari Khans became “exceedingly wealthy by reason of the various government posts which they held“ and the Bakhtiyari Khans profited considerably by their Governorship of Behbahan and Kohgiluyeh, wrote British Minister Loraine “but their greed overcame their wisdom, and when the Central Government requested them to pay the Kohgiluyeh taxes into the Central Treasury, they pretended that their expenses exceeded their income and resigned the Governorship“ (13).

The Bakhtiyari Khans who defended the constitutionalists against despotic forces, then, they governed with their Bakhtiyari force oppressive-ill-treatment. Some of them somehow plundered the public and bribery was very common in their administration. Additionally they sent from time to time their young inexperienced sons on their behalf. The complaints to the Central Government through the influential personality were the last hope of the public. The Central Government could not take a serious measure against them and the Bakhtiyari Khans ignored the Central Government’s warning. The Persian and British sources frequently referred to the mischief of the Bakhtiyari Khans.

Since 1920, Moshir al-Dowleh was familiar with the public discontent and their complaints the Bakhtiyaris, but he could not dismiss them in that time. As Moshir al-Dowleh formed again the cabinet at the beginning of 1922, he dismissed the Bakhtiyari Governors of Yazd and Isfahan. The effort of Central Government to dismiss the Bakhtiyari Khans from governorship was partly due to their ill-treatment on which caused public’s malcontent. On the other hand they did not prepare to pay their taxes either.

Chick, the British consul in Shiraz, heard from Nosrat al-Saltaneh, the Governor-General in Fars that the Persian Government, the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh, suggested him the reincorporating of Kohgiluyeh province in Fars. The Governor-General also heard from the agent of Mo’in al-Islam that he was pushing in Tehran scheme the appointment of Sowlat al-Dowleh as the governor of Behbahan to improve his hold over his Mammasani properties.

Nosrat al-Saltaneh “talked of agreeing if he could have 200 soldiers sent to Behbahan”. Chick endeavoured to dissuade him of the idea by telling that the Governor-General was less able to deal with the Kohgiluyeh tribes than Bakhtiyari Khans and the administration of Fars is weak enough without Kohgiluyeh tribes and he could not

collect revenue in difficult times and “he would made himself responsible for Boir Ahmadi raiders in Fars „and jealousies between Bakhtiyari Khans, Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh as result" (14).

Trevor agreed with Chick’s statesmen. He added formerly when Behbahan was under Fars administration, the Governor-Generals was not able to strain Boir Ahmadi and at the “present conditions matters would be even worse“. Trevor stated may be this proposal is a part of Persian Government’s anti-Bakhtiyari policy” (15). Loraine instructed consul Chick to point out the governor-general that even the Bakhtiyari Khans found Kohgiluyeh and Boir Ahmadi most difficult to control and could not collect no revenue out of them (16).

Meanwhile the Bakhtiyari Khans asked the Governor-General in Isfahan, Sardar Ashja, to inform the British Minister through consul Crow, in Isfahan that the Persian Government demanded the taxes from Kohgiluyeh tribes for the past ten years. The Bakhtiyari Khans said that they could never collect any revenue from Kohgiluyeh except a small sum of their representative in Behbahan. On contrary, they spent considerable sums of money in trying to control the Boir Ahmadi and Kohgiluyeh tribes. Sardar Ashja continued to say if the Persian Government insists on the matter the khans intend to renounce administration of Kohgiluyeh and Boir Ahmadi and to leave it to the Persian Government.

The Khans replied to the Persian Government in this sense, but they wished the British Legation to know they don’t want the renunciation of and “they have been forced to this decision by action of Persian Government” “(17). Sardar Ashja added that “the safety of the road would probably be affected“. Crow believed „the Khans may be counting on this to obtain the intervention of British Legation” (18).

Trevor informed the Government of India of the Persian Government’s proposal to reincorporate Kohgiluyeh in Government of Fars. He added: the Bakhtiyari Khans can at least exercise some measure of control over the Kohgiluyeh tribes in June-July 1918 and the security of Ahvaz-Isfahan road. Whereas Behbahan be administered by the Governor-General in Fars, he could exercise no control over the Kohgiluyeh tribes (19). This anti-Bakhtiyari proposal would react unfavourably on the safety of the Ahvaz-Isfahan road (20).

Accordingly Loraine met the Persian Finance Minister and drew the attention of him to the fact that the Persian Government had not yet sufficient force to secure the Bakhtiyari road and if the Bakhtiyari Khans resigned, the Governorship of Behbahan

the British trade in this road would be in danger. After some discussion, the Finance Minister agreed to drop “temporarily the claim for arrears of taxes“. Now Sardar Jang’s endeavouring to get some sort of guarantee as regards the future (21).

Meanwhile the Central Government had been extending its military formation in the south towards Shiraz, the capital of Fars and the military formation in Isfahan was being gradually increased. In April the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan was also rumoured (22). The news reached the British Minister that Reza Khan has a plan for bringing gradually “the outlying provincial centres under the direct military control of Tehran” (23). He was firmly kept in views contemplated the dispatch of a force to Khuzestan. News of this step reached Khaz’al as well.

8.5. Taxation of Southern Khuzestan

While the Persian Government collected even a few Tumans from any possible sources, Khaz’al was one of the latest chieftains who had not liquidated his arrears and present taxes. Khaz’al “was at moment very unpopular in Tehran” and the Persian Government fixed on the vexed question of the Sheikh’s land revenue. Majles and press supported the Central Government demand (24).

“It was freely that the Sheikh owed huge sums for arrears of revenue, and that he was sheltering himself behind British power in order to avoid payment, that if maintained his refusal to pay, he must be coerced into doing so” and from British Legation point of view “and at that moment any steps taken against him to force payment would have been enthusiastically supported by the pack of demagogues who in the present circumstances represent articulate public opinion in this country” (25).

“Of course, this received every encouragement from Bolsheviks, who had already successfully launched the idea of a federation of southern chieftains, formed under the aegis of His Majesty’s Government to resist the authority of the Central Government and ultimately to render a partition of Persia inevitable“ (26). “I must add that, so far as I could judge, these were some truth in the allegation that the Sheikh was sheltering himself behind us (British) in order to extract the most favourable terms possible from the Persian Government and to make the minimum payment consistent with dire necessary”(27).

Khaz'al had in his possession a telegram from Cox the terms of an agreement, both as regards present and future payments, accepted by Vothuq al-Dowleh, but, it was never ratified by him during his tenure of office and was denounced by his successor. Khaz'al, "as was to be expected, made an urgent appeal to the British authorities in Persia to intervene and protect him from what he judged to be a direct move to his personal position, his considerable local interests and the security of his territories" (28).

On 17 April 1922 British consul in Ahvaz, Fitzpatrick, wired the Political Resident that Khaz'al is much disturbed at hearing that the Persian Government intend to dispatch troops to Khuzestan. Khaz'al pointed out to Fitzpatrick that he has stabilised himself with British support and brought under control the tribes which continually giving troubles when they were under the government administration. Khaz'al continued to say that "the British commercial interests must suffer from dispatch of a small force to "Khuzestan „which lead to unrest and anarchy" (29).

Khaz'al appealed for British intervention under the agreement as "he considered action is a deliberate threat against him]" (30). Fitzpatrick believed: only by sufficient strength can pursue the anti-Bakhtiyari and anti-Khaz'al policy and guarantee the peace on oilfields and other commercial interests otherwise Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans would not be sorry to see the Persian Government discredited by unrest which would follow (31). In his telegram to the Government of India, Trevor stated: Khaz'al is right in thinking the dispatch of Persian troop to southern Arabistan (Khuzestan) is a threat against him. He added: "It is not clear why the Persian Government should want to lock up troops in an orderly peaceful province when these is, elsewhere, so much work for them" (32).

Unrest would cause among Arab tribes by presence of Persian troops and British interests generally and Anglo-Persian Oil Company would suffer. Trevor did not question about the right of a sovereign country on her territory. He reminded, however, to the secret assurances of 1910 and 1914 to Khaz'al. Trevor was not sure "whether dispatch of troops to southern Arabistan would be considered a direct encroachment by Persian Government on jurisdiction on and recognised rights "in assurances.

The present state of local autonomy of Sheikh Khaz'al, wrote Trevor, which British promised to do her best to maintain is menaced by dispatch of troops. "British should nip proposal in the bud". Finally Trevor hoped that the dispatch of troops, at any rate to southern Arabistan and if possible to Arbistan may be prevent (33). Addition to the Khaz'al's position and interests, the other considerations were "the effect of

proposed step on operations of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company". The effect of any action taken by the Legation on British relations with the Persian Government general, and with the Minister of War particularly, Reza Khan had hitherto shown "on the whole a friendly demeanour and a marked inclination to resist the spread of Bolshevik influence and idea" (34).

From British Minister point of view, Reza Khan was surrounded by people, who recounting "extravagant stories about the wickedness and perversity of British policy in Persia" and any too emphatic intervention against the dispatch of a force to Arabistan might well have defeated its own object, and have confirmed the suspicions which haunted the mind of the Minister of War. It was clear that no justification existed for British objecting to the dispatch of Persian troops to any point within the Persian territory and it was not certain that the troops would dispatch to southern Khuzestan.

On 19 April 1922 Loraine sent Oriental Secretary, Havard to see Reza Khan and in the course of conversation point out that the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan where the Anglo-Persian interests of real magnitude were involved, would jeopardise the peace and tranquillity there whereas there were many other districts could be employed. Havard realised that the Minister of War intended to send troops to all parts of Persia and for another three or four months no force would be sent for Khuzestan. The failure of Khaz'al to pay his tax was the most important reasons of Reza Khan to dispatch of troops there (35).

Loraine wired Trevor through Bushehr and Simla and hoped Trevor includes in his Persian Gulf tour, a visit to Mohammareh in order to see and speak to Khaz'al very seriously. Loraine pointed out that the Persian Government are incensed at Khaz'al attitude in withholding payment of his revenue taxes and his obstinate resistance of any proposal for settlement (36).

He must come to a reasonable settlement with the Central Government about his revenue the question of troops can be discussed in Tehran. Loraine requested Trevor to point out to Khaz'al that „his own obstinacy is directly responsible for this move „and British do not intend to embroil themselves in such issue with Persian Government. The purpose of sending troops to Khuzestan was the idea of the Minister of War with the object of collecting taxes. He had the support of public, the cabinet and Majles.

Loraine pointed out that assurances were given in the condition to fulfil of his obligations to the Persian Government. Loraine stated: "a battle between myself and Minister of War would be most inopportune at this moment. He is target of Bolsheviks

and is therefore, if property managed, an asset to us (British)” (37). Trevor wired that his tour is to Maskat and other places at southern of the Persian Gulf and then he asked British consul in Ahvaz, Fitzpatrick, to impress on Khaz’al that he must fulfil his obligations among first of which is payment of revenue. He added if there is no result of Fitzpatrick’s efforts, he would do something personally (38).

Accordingly Loraine informed Foreign Office that the Persian Government intend to send troops to Khuzestan with the object to compel Khaz’al to pay his revenue taxes. He could settle this question some time ago with the Persian Government “on perfectly reasonable terms“, but despite our (British) good advice, has remained obstinate and uncompromising“. He mentioned that he requested the Political Resident to speak to sheikh seriously and informed the Government of India and High Commissioner in Baghdad “owing to responsibility which devolves on Irak [Iraq] is our oil interests are threatened” (39).

From British point of view, Loraine realised how completely undesirable the presence of Persian troops in Khuzestan, if revenue question can be settled, he should be in a stronger position and he possibly could delay and perhaps stop their dispatch. He added: it is undesirable if avoid to acquainting the Minister of War with British obligations towards Khaz’al (40). Curzon instructed Loraine in 31 May 1922 “to refrain from divulging in any conversation with Sardar Sepah (Reza Khan) the nature of assurances which His Majesty’s Government had given to the Sheikh of Mohammareh” (41).

Shortly, afterward Sheikh Khaz’al on the advice of British Minister, he appointed an agent in Tehran to endeavour to settle his account with Ministry of Finance. The agent was former agent of the Ministry of Finance in Khuzestan. Khaz’al gave him “carte blanche” within the limits of certain fixed sum to settle the matter. British Legation was in touch with him through Havard, (the Oriental Secretary). Loraine was of opinion that he “made an honest endeavour to reach an agreement with” the Ministry of Finance, due “to the insatiable greed of” him and “of the officials concerned who expect some of the money transferred to stick to their own hands”. No settlement reached even at the end of September 1922 (42). Loraine in his telegram of 21 April to Political Resident on dispatch of Persian troops to Khuzestan confidentially informed him that “their dispatch in less than two months is unlikely” (43).

8.6. Dissension or Alliance in Southern Persia?

About seven weeks later in June 1922, he wired the following secret information to Political Resident-Bushehr and British consul-Shiraz. He wrote: he learned from a reliable source that the policy of Bolshevik Government in southern Persia is “dissensions” between the Bakhtiyaris and the Qashqa’is “with a view to winning over one of them „and they realised and the Soviet consuls had been directed the Qashqa’is “will be easier to get hold of them” (44).

Loraine intended to defeat the Bolshevik scheme. He considered if the scheme of Bolshevik successfully carried out, could result in strife and disorder in the south of Persia necessary detrimental to the important British interests as the scheme was deliberately directed against British interests (45). He added: maintenance of friendly relations between the two tribes and judicious warning to both tribes is useful (46). Loraine would warn himself the Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran and asked Trevor to instruct Fitzpatrick, British consul in Ahvaz to talk with local Bakhtiyari Khans accordingly. He was of opinion that it might be advantageous to inform Khaz’al “so that he could use his influence with both tribes to counteract such schemes”.

Then, he pointed out: the relation between British consul in Shiraz and the chief of Qashqa’i, Sowlat al-Dowleh is strain and it is rather difficult to make contact through this channel and he added perhaps Political Resident knows another suitable one (47). The day after, Trevor informed Loraine that according to the Shiraz diary of 31 May „the Russian consul and his staff wasted no time in trying to establish friendly relation with “Sowlat al-Dowleh. Trevor added Clegg who was in the S.P.R. as Political Officer on the road and vice-consul in Bushehr, now is the employment of the A.P.O.C. and he leaving Bushehr for Shiraz and Trevor could give Clegg a letter to deliver to the chief of Qashqa’i, Sowlat al-Dowleh and inform him of a verbal message delivered to him by Clegg.

Trevor - a wise precaution in view of Soulet al-Dowleh’s unreliable Character would trust Clegg who is known to him and most of the leading Qashqa’is. Trevor suggested to Loraine the following message to Sowlat al-Dowleh: The information has been received that the Russian wish to sow dissensions between the Qashqa’is and Bakhtiyaris. My advice to him as an old friend is to regard the Russian with suspicious.

He (Sowlat al-Dowleh) knows “what result Bolshevik influence had on position of Persians of rank and property like himself”, further “his best interests lie in keeping

friendly with British, especially in view of the good prospects of finding oil in his country from which much more solid permanent advantages will accrue than from Bolshevik promises and transient presents“ (48).

Lorraine approved both the means of transmission and the substance of the message to Sowlat al-Dowleh and furthermore he informed Colonel Trevor that the authentic information indicate that “the ultimate political aims of the Russians is to create chain of Soviet Republics from Caucasus to Chinese Turkestan including Persia and Afghanistan”. The present policy merely to pave the way for larger aims(49).

Trevor wired to Vice-Consul Ahvaz and informed him of British Minister’s communication and instructed him to inform in his communication with Fitzpatrick, who was on tour in Bakhtiyari land, and asked him by cipher letter to warn principals Khans in above sense or send a copy of Trevor’s telegram (in cipher) to Fitzpatrick. He mentioned that Sheikh Khaz’al should be informed to use his influence with both parties. Then, he added further information which it might be given to the Sheikh (50). The same day he wrote a letter to Sowlat al-Dowleh in accordance to the communication between British Minister and himself.

“It is not necessary for me to introduce Mr. Clegg with whom your Excellency is already well acquainted, but I give him this letter to you to inform you that he will give you a message from me on behalf of H. M. Legation. I hope you will act in accordance with it, and feel convinced that your best interests lie in doing so” (51). Two days later Trevor informed his superior in the Government of India-Simla on Bolshevik aims in south Persia and the steps which were being taken to counteract their schemes. As far as the information of this letter concerned, Trevor asked Clegg if he gets the opportunity of drawing Sowlat al-Dowleh in to conversation, he would further inform him of “the Russian ultimate aims” (52).

A. Fitzpatrick, the British consul in Ahvaz who was in Bakhtiyari tour, arrived in Dehkord (the present city Shahr-e-Kord) of Chahar Mahal where the Bakhtiyari Khans gathered to settle (a) division of the money go that year from Oil Company among the members of Haji Ilkhani family and (b) To settle a quarrel between Amir Mojahed and Sardar Zafar of Ilkhan family. Fitzpatrick who was present at the meeting of the Khans delivered the message of the British Minister and the Political Resident to the present Khans.

The Bakhtiyari Khans declared that they would continue their friendly relation with the British Government and they were ready to co-operate and carry out the British

wishes and suggestions in every way (53). The Bakhtiyari Khans expected the continuation of British support against the possible repressive action of the Central Government. They contemplated British moral support and if necessary arm and ammunition (54).

In his letter to Foreign Office, Loraine speaks of a good deal of talk in Tehran press on formation a southern league comprising of the chiefs of Mohaysen Bani Ka'ab, Sheikh Khaz'al, Qashqa'i, Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Khans of Bakhtiyari, under British auspices in a sense hostile to the Central Government in Tehran and with a view to the ultimate partition of Persia and direct controlling influence over southern portion by Great Britain (55). British Minister, however, pointed out to Foreign Office that „this is not truth whatever in any such report”. He added: “any policy which tended towards a partition of Persia would be most serious mistake from the British point of view” (56).

Loraine continued to say that the reports gained credence even with the Minister of War who was very sensitive to the authority of Central Government throughout of the country through of the army “which is in process of formation under his guidance“. The British Minister succeeded to dissuade Reza Khan of this idea. Loraine accused the reports emanated from the Russian Legation and „their circulation in the press was paid for by Russian propagandists”

This incident and other actions make him, wrote Loraine, suspect that the Russians make efforts to bring Red troops in to northern Persia on suitable occasion. Loraine mentioned the story of Samsam al-Saltaneh as prove to his view. Samsam al Saltaneh told Sir Percy Loraine that the Soviet Legation invited him a few weeks ago. On his arrival to the Legation the Russian accused the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al of conspiring against the Central Government. Then they added “unless a stop was pot to these manoeuvres Red troops would be marched into Persia” (57).

Samsam al-Saltaneh replied, he was not frightened of Russian troops and if the Red Army enters Persia, the Bakhtiyari would return to their own mountains where the Russian could do nothing effective against them. On contrary to Sir Percy Loraine's statement that “the Bolsheviks do not themselves believe the story“, it appears the invitation of Samsam al Saltaneh to the Russian Legation and Bolshevik intimidation indicates that they believed the southern chieftains conspiracy under British auspices. The steps which British Minister took to bring the southern chieftains close to each other and guard against Russian and to persuade Sowlat al-Dowleh that his interests lie in keeping friendly with British. The action of Sir Percy Loraine and the other British

political agents in relation to the southern tribal chieftains occurred when the Central Government intended to station gradually the Persian troops in the southern provinces.

British Legation was aware of the scheme of the Minister of War. It appears that the British Legation intended to show to the Persian Government that Great Britain enjoys of a strong position and influence in southern Persia and the Persian Government should come to terms with the British interests.

8.7. A Military Detachment and so Many Discussions

In the middle of the year 1921, the Cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh appointed a governor-general for Khuzestan and instructed him to strengthen the position of Central Government. The Cabinet approved the whole expenditure which was suggested by the new Governor-General.

At the end of the year 1921, after the disappearance of the South Persia Rifles, the Minister of War dispatched some officers and a few troops to the capital of Fars, Shiraz. Owing to the shortage of fund and owing to the active operations elsewhere, the necessary “attention could not be given to Fars” (58). Little progress, therefore, was made in recruiting as foreseen. The next step on turning the attention of the Central Government towards the southern provinces was the dispatch of a body of troops to Isfahan in January 1922 and the creation a southern division similar to eastern and western division by the Minister of War (59).

The Persian Government extended its military formations towards the south in 1922. The new detachments were formed in Shiraz and the size of military force in Isfahan was gradually increased. Though, the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan was postponed in April 1922, but, it was known that the Central Government and the army commander had no immediate intention, but the organising military formation had been planned in all the distant parts of the provinces (60).

8.8. A Detachment in Bakhtiyari land

On 18 July 1922 in the evening, the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine heard that 500 Government's troops with guns and machine guns left Isfahan for Khuzestan via Bakhtiyari land. Then he realised that the Bakhtiyari Khans resident in Tehran did not know of the movement. From the information subsequently received to the British Legation, Loraine stated: "it seems clear that special pre-cautions had been taken to keep any news of the formation and dispatch of this force from reaching the ears of any British official or any of the Bakhtiyari Khans, moreover, Sardar Ashja, the Bakhtiyari governor-general in Isfahan was in total ignorance of the movement (61).

The day after, in 19 July, 1922, Loraine directed the British Oriental Secretary, Godfrey Havard, to represent to the Prime Minister and the Minister of War and to protest to the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan on which would endanger the important interests of Anglo-Persian Oil Company by the local tribe's disturbance. "More over available troops were urgently needed elsewhere to deal with rebels and brigands".

The Minister of War told the Oriental Secretary that he could not recall the detachment without instruction from Prime Minister. Havard visited therefore Qavam al-Saltaneh. From Loraine and Havard point of view Qavam al-Saltaneh was less reasonable, due to his resistance to the British demand. However, he eventually sent an assurance to Loraine that the "troop movement would be stopped for two months" (62).

The day after, in a telegram to Foreign Office Loraine analysed the situation and explained his view on the possibility of Persian troops stationing in Khuzestan. He stated: from the language of both Ministers, it is certain that the project to be revived. He added: British have no desire the station of Persian regular troops in Khuzestan, but there is no ground on which the British Government can contest. It is the right of Persian Government to send their army to any part of Persian territory (63).

If friendly dissuasion feels, these are several possible forms of opposition to get assurance that Sheikh Khaz'al territory will not be interfered with:

- (a) "Blank veto - which of course we have not the physical means of enforcing.
- (b) A hint to Bakhtiyari to stop passage of troops, which they would certainly take.

- (c) Buy off Minister of War by facilitating advance to Persian Government (for which I know he is any way going to appeal to me very soon" (64).

This is test case of Minister of War's scheme to bring all provinces under direct control of Central Government. The British opposition is at the risk of straining relations with the Minister of War as well as the Persian Government. On 21 July Qavam al-Saltaneh called on Loraine about question of troops for Khuzestan. He stated: "the emphatic nature of language used by British Oriental Secretary look him somewhat by surprise. The Persian Prime Minister stated: he was not aware that the dispatch of a comparatively insignificant body guard, some 250 men to Khuzestan in respond to a previous request by the Governor-General in this province, was one of such deep interest for British.

An escort detachment in order to sustain authority and the Persian involves the cabinet approved the step and the prestige of the Persian Government was seriously desire to "show the flag". The detachment remains in Shushtar, north Khuzestan and would not interfere with the Sheikh Khaz'al's territory (65). Qavam al-Saltaneh wanted to hear the view of British Minister. Loraine said that the Minister of War knew of his ideas when the question raised some months ago and he was surprised that the Prime Minister should not have consulted him. He added, they would inform Sheikh Khaz'al accordingly.

Loraine stated: if Sheikh Khaz'al agreed "that might alter the case but I could not recommend him to do so" (66). The Prime Minister pointed out: "the Government did not know on what pretext they could recall detachment without being attacked in Majles for yielding to foreign pressure" (67). Qavam al-Saltaneh enquired whether British pre-occupation was principally in respect of the interests of Sheikh Khaz'al. Loraine replied his principal anxiety was concerned "with the important British interests represented by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company" (68).

The Persian Government had a considerable stake. He added: he did not question the right of the Persian Government "to send troops where it liked within Persian territory" he pointed out to the inadvisability of the present step. Qavam al-Saltaneh was of opinion that the presence of a Persian Government force in vicinity but outside, the A.P.O.C. only contribute to the safety of operations. The Prime Minister and the Minister of War, both, "were ready to give most formal assurances to" the Sheikh and

British Government that the “troops would not interfere either with Sheikh’s territory or Arab tribes”.

8.9. From Threat to Action

Though, Loraine asked the clear attitude and the instruction of Foreign Office, but he was not kept waiting and the day after sent for two leading Bakhtiyari Khans, Samsam al- Saltaneh and Sardar Jang, and explained the situation to them, the same day as the Persian Prime Minister called on him. “It was agreed that interests of Bakhtiyari, Sheikh of Mohammareh, and our selves (British) were identical and that in order to impress Persian Government both they and Sheikh must support my action and bring pressure to bear and that every peaceful means must be employed to secure abandonment of project. Khans propose force. I (Loraine) said that this must be absolutely the last resort and ought not to be necessary”.

At the suggestion of British Minister the Bakhtiyari Khans asked a telegraphic, the tribal leaders to send an official protest to the Central Government (69); a telegram was sent through Loraine to Khaz’al that they must act together (70). The Khans should obtain through the Bakhtiyari Governor-General of Isfahan daily reports of detachment. The British Minister instructed Political Resident Bushehr, to send the substance of his telegram to the Government of India (71).

He asked the Political Resident also to send his confidential message to Sheikh Khaz’al. He pointed out at first to Khaz’al that "when the following message is read to your Excellency you will understand how constant my solicitude for your Excellency’s honour and fare is". Then he recounted a summary of the Persian Government’s action, the contact of Oriental Secretary with Minister of War and Prime Minister and his suggestion to send troops to Azarbaijan, Gilan and Lorestan to crush the rebels and brigands on many trade routes and not in complete tranquillity resigned Khuzestan.

Then, he spoke of the visit and discussion of the Prime Minister with him and readiness of Qavam al-Saltaneh to give formal assurance to Khaz’al that the Persian troops were merely acted at Shushtar (north Khuzestan) as body guard would not interfere with Khaz’al and his territory. Finally British Minister informed Khaz’al of his discussion with Sardar Jang and Samsam al-Saltaneh the two Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran.

British Minister and the two khans were in agreement that Khaz'al and Bakhtiyaris "must bring pressure on the Persian Government" to abandon the project not to send first by every peaceful means. "It is undesirable, and should not be necessary if we all work together, for the khans to stop the detachment by force though of course they could do so" (72).

British Political Resident instructed the British Vice-Consul Ahvaz, Wallis to give the message of Sir Percy Loraine to Sheikh Khaz'al confidentially. Trevor reminded Wallis if he is unable to translate the message "sufficiently accurately "without using a monshi, "he might take a typed English copy with him to the Khaz'al and get Haji Moshir to translate the message to him" (73). On 23 July 1922, the Minister of War took luncheon with the British Minister at the Legation, and while they were talking afterwards, Reza Khan remarked that the body-guard detachment for Khuzestan was proceeding down the Bakhtiyari road.

Loraine stated that the Prime Minister gave assurance through the British Oriental Secretary that „pending further discussion the troops would remain where they were“. The Minister of War replied that the Prime Minister on his return to Tehran after visiting Loraine two days ago, he wrote to Reza Khan that he conquered all Loraine's objections to the dispatch of the force to Khuzestan and more over he made a similar statement at a meeting of the cabinet. Apparently Qavam al-Saltaneh ignored the view of Loraine.

By the suggestion of Reza Khan a meeting was arranged for the following day to find out the origin of misunderstanding. In response to the Loraine, Qavam al Saltaneh stated: he went with the impression that he had convinced the British Minister "of the innocuous character of the measure" and no assurance was given to the British Oriental Secretary (74).

In fact, a diplomatic representative of a Great Power, Great Britain, with reliance on his country's power taking to task why the Persian cabinet directed the dispatch of a small force into a corner of their country where the British had important interest without consultation with the British Legation. British Minister was of opinion that Qavam al-Saltaneh had "a feeling of hatred for Sardar Sepah and a keen desire to compass his downfall should a favourable opportunity occur".

As the position of Reza Khan was strong, the Prime Minister had to bow to the power of Minister of War in order to resume office. Qavam al-Saltaneh intended to deprive from power by dispatching troops into Bakhtiyari country where the Bakhtiyari

khans and tribesmen resent this intrusion and practically regard as a foreign force. The Bakhtiyaris are friends of the British and the slightest hint "at British instigation will at once be taken and create a such a stir that British Minister role in the matter will pass unnoticed and Reza Khan would believe that the British were behind it and it would be advantageous to Qavam al-Saltaneh" (75).

The biographer of Sir Percy Loraine, Gordon Waterfield, believed: it was probable that Reza Khan endeavoured to make problem for Qavam al-Saltaneh. It was Reza Khan who finally sent Qavam al-Saltaneh to exile, while he was accused a conspiracy against Reza Khan (76). This report was written nearly fifty days after the Shalil incident on which caused many speeches and discussions in the Persian Parliament, a considerable number of articles in the Persian press, British were accused of instigating the incident.

As far as the available British documents are concerned, Sir Percy Loraine pursued a policy in this juncture on which the Foreign Office did not approve and accordingly informed him on time. Practically, he did nothing and ignored the view of Foreign Office. Then, Loraine was partly responsible for the anti-British atmosphere in Persia. He intended to justify his action. As usual the members of the British consulates in southern Persia were in favour of local power fortification in the expense the weakness of Central Government.

Trevor in respond to the Legation put a question to the British Minister: "could not khans make the passage of troops difficult by arranging shortages of supplied at various stages"? He said: "these are no village at many of stages" (77). The same day, Khaz'al was much pleased at receipt of Loraine's message through the Vice-Consul in Ahvaz. He thanked for the great interest taken and to the strong influence exerted on his behalf. Khaz'al said: „he was now as always working for furtherance of the same aims as ourselves (British) in these parts“. Khaz'al was of opinion that the presence of regular troops in Khuzestan would derive him to disclaim his responsibility for law and order in Khuzestan including Dezful and Shushtar.

He continued to say since the departure of British troops, due to his influence the tranquil of Khuzestan continued and he intended to reply to similar lines to Central Government. British vice-consul Ahvaz suggested to Khaz'al to point out to Ministers "should necessary arise for military action he is ready to supply such troops as may be required in the Persian Government instruct him to do so" (78).

In other words it was an indication to Central Government that he is capable of arising troops. Wallis informed the Political Resident that the soars (cavalries) and

police are now maintained by Governor-General and his deputies can well provide for their protection and they have to increase their strength (79).

The following day Wallis informed the Political Resident that Sheikh Khaz'al had not received any assurance telegram from the Central Government up to 25 July 1922. It was more probable that the message was being sent through the Governor-General in Khuzestan (80) and Trevor wired to the Legation accordingly (81). Khaz'al received only a telegram from Governor-General informed him of regular troop's movement now ever. The Governor stopped them "as he knew Sheikh did not favour their presence" (82).

In minutes of Eastern Department to the telegram of British Minister Tehran on the question of Sheikh Khaz'al has been written: This Department first heard from Sir Percy Loraine in April 1922 that the Persian Government intended to send regular troops to Khuzestan in order to compel Sheikh Khaz'al to pay his revenues. From British point of view as Sir Percy Loraine realised undesirability of allowing Persian troops to go to Khuzestan, but at the same time British could not support Khaz'al in an unlawful attempt to evade the settlement of the Persian Government's just claim upon him (83).

"The view taken in this department was that, having obtained for the Sheikh a certain privileged position within the Persian realm, we must not allow him to abuse his privilege". The minutes refer to the position of Khaz'al and British responsibilities due to the letter of 7 December 1902 of Sir Arthur Harding (84) and the Letter of 21 November 1914 of Sir Percy Cox. "So long as you remain faithful to the Shah and act in accordance with our advice we will continued to give you our good offices and support". "H.M.G. will be prepared to afford you the support necessary for obtaining a solution satisfactory both to yourself and to us in the event of jurisdiction and recognised rights. ... vis-à-vis the Persian Government". "We shall do our best to maintain your Excellency in your present state local autonomy".

Sir Percy Loraine was fully aware of the necessity to induce the Sheikh to settle his accounts with the Persian Government took measure accordingly with the result that we heard in May that the sheikh had paid his revenues, but in June it appeared that the "sheikh's alleged discharge is by no means final and that negotiations were still proceeding between the Sheikh and the Persian Government".

Sheikh was showing some disposition in spite of this they seem determined to send troops to his territory. There was an important distinction between Arabistan and

southern Arabistan from British point of view Shushtar and Dezful were within in Arabistan, but cannot be described as southern Arabistan. Eastern department had no reason to object to the dispatch of troops to Shushtar or Dezful which were not within the sheikh jurisdiction (85). In response to the telegrams of British Minister in Tehran, Curzon stated Sheikh Khaz'al "is at any rate disposed to settle Persian Government's legitimate claims against him". "We must certainly carry out obligations in our various undertakings to him particularly that of 14 November 1914" (86).

"You may employ all your efforts to induce Persian Government to abandon intention as regards southern Arabistan though there is little reason to object to dispatch of what is little more than glorified body guard to Dizful or Shushtar". Captain Peel who was at that time in London shared the same view (87). At the same time, Foreign Office stated: "Any unwarranted interference on their part with sheikh may render it necessary for His Majesty's Government to reconsider present attitude and adopt such measures and may be necessary to support him". But they asked British Minister "must on no account commit us to embarrassing obligations towards Bakhtiyaris, which is to be apprehended should force be used even if only in last resort" (88).

It appears when the instruction of Curzon reached British Minister, he realised that the position of Foreign Office was difference in relation to dispatching of small detachment to north Khuzestan. Loraine modified his view and corrected his action towards Sheikh Khaz'al by sending a telegram in the name of Fitzpatrick to Sheikh Khaz'al through Wallis, the Vice-Consul in Ahvaz.

He wrote: "I have discussed your case with Sir Percy Loraine and he has authorised me to assure you of his continued friendship and regard for you" It is a matter of great regret to him that "the Persian Government refuses to take his friendly advice regarding the dispatch of troops to Arabistan. Though not of course disputing their right to station troops where ever they please within Persian territories he is much vexed at the underhand way of doing so in the resent instance" (89).

Then, he repeated as before that the British Legation is fully alive to the importance of safe guarding the interest of Sheikh Khaz'al and the Persian Government is willing to give him assurances will in no way interfere with him and his tribe and the present detachment will not recruit and they will remain in Shushtar as body guard to the Governor-General. He asked Khaz'al if he was given the above assurances by the Persian Government, Sir Percy Loraine hopes to learn his view on that situation and he (Fitzpatrick) hoped that Khaz'al's land revenue soon be settled satisfactory (90).

8.10. Shalil Incident in Bakhtiyari

The military detachment, destined by the Persian Government to act a body-guard for the Governor-General in Khuzestan, on its departure from Isfahan was 274 all ranks, 1 guns, 3 machine guns. On 30 July 1922 at about noon the detachment on the Bakhtiyari route arrived at Shalil caravanserai. The commander officer and a few of officers had their wives with them. The commander officer sent out partrots in the afternoon and evening, “these men taking up positions on the hill-tops around caravanserai for sentry duty” (91).

He also dispatched about sixty men to the top of the Morwarid hill “with instructions that they were to remain at the borj (tower) there and await the main party arriving on the following morning“. “These men got to nearly the first peak of the Muwai (Morwarid) hill shortly after sunset, when they were attacked by band of Kohgilus and scattered in all direction“. “Some were killed, some wounded and some fled”. The Kohgilus were several hundred “surrounded the caravanserai on the hill-tops, firing as they approached” (92).

Dr. Young, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company’s Political Advisor, who reached Shalil on the 5th August pointed out in his report to Fitzpatrick “You know Shelil, the hollow in which it lies and its difficult situation for defence”. „Firing went on by both sides all night. In the morning of 31 July 1922 two machine guns were brought into action, but after an hour’s firing both gunners were killed. At about 9-10 a m the commanding officers surrendered.

“The Kohgiluye tribesmen looted the men of all they possessed, including all rifles and ammunition, transport animals and all general equipment, removing even the clothes. The men were stripped of everything except the shirts and the women were also stripped of all their belongings” (93). Then a number of Aurak tribe of Bakhtiyari came out to the assistance of the troops and chased Kohgiluye tribesmen, but they were not enough to overpower the raiders. The numbers of casualties were 115 killed and like number wounded and missing (94).

Dr. Young left the oil field on the 30 July, on his way to the north, reached Nghun (31 July) and at the evening to Chigakar where the Bakhtiyari Khans resided. He heard that the Persian troops were attacked by the Kohgiluye in Shalil and sending a messenger to Isfahan. He left Malamir on 2 August and heard a party of 400 troops was looted at Shalil three days ago when he reached Pol-e-Shalu, he met the two men who

were in Charge of caravanserais on Bakhtiyari road and came down especially for Dehdiz for welcome(Esteqbal).

Dr. Young noted that he heard before the incident detachment Hossein Aqa Khan, was very indiscreet in his speech all along the Bakhtiyari road and the head men, Kadkhoda spoke ill of him. "He talked high, assumed great airs and abused the Khans freely in front of the tribesmen where ever he stopped" and said "his language was unbecoming and his behaviour bad for an officer in his position".

He announced that he would send a party to hold the bridge and collect tolls for the supply of funds for his troops. He told the tribesmen that "this country belonged to the Persian Government and they were free to act without the authority of their chiefs. He told the head of Bakhtiyari guard at Shalil who offered to be of service, that his services were not wanted and the troops could take after themselves."

Finally, Dr. Young was very impressed with the facts that of the attack on the troops in broad day light in robbing even food and personal clothing. Whereas, the complete safety of the road for all caravans for the past two months prior to this incident and its safety immediately after it (95). The latest report was that the Kohgiluye tribesmen afterwards burned and raided Shalil caravanserai killing its Bakhtiyari defenders. A party of 60 cavalry and 2 machine guns left Isfahan to evacuate wounded and stand by unarmed referring survivors. The remnant returned to Isfahan after being hospitably entertained in Chaghakhor by Bakhtiyari Khans.

On 3 August British Legation received a report of British General-Consul in Isfahan emanating from the Bakhtiyari Khans. Further information from Crow on 8 August confirmed the main features of previous report. The Bakhtiyari Khans resided in Tehran informed Loraine that the Bakhtiyari Ilkhani sent a full detail of the incident to the Persian Government Lally with the British information. Bakhtiyari Ilkhani organised a party who pursued the Kohgiluye tribesmen and recovered part of the equipment of detachment after a sharp fighting. The Ilkhani pointed out to the Persian Government that he warned last 6 months regarding the Kohgiluye he was astonished that they were not given any warning of passage detachment in order clear the road.

The Persian Government neither acknowledged nor answered the Ilkhani's report and Reza Khan gave no indication of his future course of action. The Bakhtiyari would offer to subdue the Kohgiluye tribes if their governor of this province confirms (96). The viceroy transmitted the information of the Bakhtiyari Ilkhani and Ilbegi through Fitzpatrick and Trevor dated 5 August to the Secretary of India by the telegram dated 7

August and added the Kohgiluyeh tribesmen ambushed probably and attacked in Laghamgir pass, near Sorkhun. The British Minister sent his report ten days after accident he justified his delay due to awaiting the confirmation and details before telegraphing (97). British Military Attaché sent also his report to Office the same as British Minister (98).

It was the Board of Anglo-Persian Oil Company in London who at first informed the Foreign Office of Shalil incident. Although Dr. Young anticipated no difficulty regarding completion on his journey, but the Board of Anglo Persian Oil Company was anxious that the Bakhtiari Khans agreed to continue responsibility for Kohgiluyeh on conditions that the Central Government to present two guns to Bakhtiyaris, all arrears revenue to be wiped out and the future revenue to be balanced each year with expenditure (99). “To be in the Kohgiluyeh country brings the troublesome what too close to the (oil) fields to be pleasure and it believes us to watch the position closely” (100).

The manager of the Company considered that “it is to be regretted that the advice of British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine was not listened by the Persian Prime Minister, Qavam al- Saltaneh. He thought that “the exercise of discretion and for bearence on the part of the Minister of War which Sir Percy Loraine will doubtless counsel, will remove the possibility of complications at the (oil) fields itself”(101). The Oil Company requested the Foreign Office the exchange of any further information on this matter.

After the first report on Shalil reached Loraine, in continuation of his efforts to show the difficulty of the situation in the south to the Central Government, he asked the British Political Resident as if he could mobilise Sheikh Khaz'al and the Bakhtiari Khans to Deprecate stay of troops in Ahvaz. He added any further intervention on his part at that juncture would hardly be dignified having had practically scene with Prime Minister and the Minister of War about question of sending troops to Khuzestan at all and they assured him that the detachment go to Governor-General's Headquarters in Shushtar (102).

Loraine was inclined to suspect that the Bakhtiari Khans might have a hand in instigation the attack, with regard to the allusion to the possible of force by Samsam al-Saltaneh. On 21 July 1922, Loraine continued to say that the Bakhtiari Khans set his mind immediately at ease. As it will be seen in following pages, the Bakhtiari Khans did instigate the attack at the request of Loraine with regard to his telegram of the 9

August, it was only after the incident that he endeavoured to improve that the Bakhtiyari did nothing as he alluded.

Then, he made it “perfectly plain to the Khans that British could accept no responsibility in the matter” and he pointed out to his superior that no evidence supports “the theory that the Kohgiluyeh were egged on by the Bakhtiyari” (103). This statement, however, did not assist the head of the British diplomatic mission from the view of the cabinet, Parliament, press and public on British involvement and responsibility in Shalil incident. Loraine endeavoured to justify his action, he reported that the Prime Minister „prompted some of the anti-British press articles in connection with the attack on the Arabistan force, because one Persian acquaintance of him told this and then concluded “the political morality has sunk in this country” (104).

With regard to the reference of Loraine to a report on Qavam al-Saltaneh, this paper is not available to the reader. There is, however, a reference to it, the subtitle Sheikh of Mohammareh, there are two reports submitted 23 August 1922. The second report, as Sir Percy Loraine on 22 August. Further report respecting the defeat of the Persian troops, these telegrams are available. The first telegram, the title, sender and the date is blackened. There is, however, a short minute of Mallet he has written. “It is noteworthy that Kavam-es-Sultaneh refers is the Bakhtiyari as the aggressors and not the Kuhgelus and it seems is suspect the British of being on the bottom of it”.

8.11. A Loose Confederation in the South?

A week later, in a secret telegram British Minister reported to Foreign Office that as a result of military centralising tendencies of the Minister of War, Reza Khan, the important southern chieftains are driving into loose federation. Bakhtiyari Khans concluded a close agreement with Sheikh Khaz'al in the spring of 1922 and they are now in the best term with him. The Khans of Bakhtiyari was negotiating with Qavam al-Molk, the chief of Khamseh, “for a friendly understanding“. They intended to include the chief of Qashqa'i great tribe, Sowlat al-Dowleh, in this series of agreements.

The relations of Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh were of their periodical reconciliation's the reactions of Sheikh Khaz'al with both of them are already good. Sheikh Khaz'al also had close agreement with Vali of Posht-e-Kuh “to which Bakhtiyari will very likely become party“. British Minister was of opinion that process

was „a perfect natural one and it was a measure of mutual protection of semi-independent positions of tribal chiefs against the encroachment of Central Government and it did not require British facilitation (105).

Sir Percy Loraine asked the British consuls in the south to take up attitude that „friendships between British friends are always welcome to us. At the same times he warned them, however, to commit British to any responsibility for these agreements. Loraine also asked the British consul in Shiraz, Chick, to patch up his relations with Sowlat al-Dowleh without loss of dignity (106).

Mallet in the Eastern Department wrote in his minutes that real prime move in the loose federation was Sheikh Khaz'al who wished to put as many barriers as possible between himself and the Persian Government and the first front of these policies was the Kohgiluyeh attack upon regular troops on Bakhtiyari road (107). The policy adopted by Sir Percy Loraine towards southern tribal chieftains, arrangement approved in Foreign Office by not openly helping the tribes to antagonise the Persian Government. Mallet pointed out that the chiefs are mainly friendly to British and largely depended to the A.P.O.C. for their wealth. These were different views on Sowlat al Dowleh.

As Mallet wrote:“these seem to be little reason to continue to remember his past” (108). Oliphant wrote: “I agreed except that I have doubts about the expediency of the action vis-à-vis of Sowlat al-Dowleh who has always proved hostile to us (British) (in the confrontation). Four days later, Curzon stated in his telegram to the British Minister in Tehran “I approve your attitude” (109). The documents indicate that Mallet was rightly that Sheikh Khaz'al as the most important member of this alliance.

On 19 August 1922 or about three weeks after the incident in Shalil close to Morwarid hill and near to the pass, Fitzpatrick, British Consul in Ahvaz who was in Isfahan reported the view of the Bakhtiyari Khans as follow : the Persian Government suspected that the attack on the troops by Kohgiluyeh tribesmen were engineered by the Bakhtiyaris. The Persian Government does not reveal but has determined to tackle them at the earliest opportunity, the recent negotiation with Sowlat al-Dowleh and the affairs of Arak were in this direction.

The retirement of Sardar Ashja of the Isfahan Governorship on medical grounds, „should be succeeded by another Bakhtiyari, it would indicate that Reza Khan's plans are not yet ready“, but should be from outside, it will be assign that Bakhtiyaris are to be ousted from all governorships with the possible exception of Samsam al-Saltaneh, the khans would retire in Chahar Mahal.

The Isfahan districts would become unsafe from Bakhtiyari robber gangs, before the Persian Government would dare to attack the khans in their own country. They were of opinion in their alliance with Sheikh Khaz'al they have a powerful ally in the south. Fitzpatrick wrote: "public feeling in Isfahan among the bulk of merchants and the power classes setting against us" (British) (110).

The wounded warriors from Shalil were visited in the military hospital daily and given presents of money and flowers and violent speeches made by visitors (merchants and Seyyed of Isfahan) accusing the British of having instigated the Kohgiluyeh attack and of being the enemies of Persia. A Persian newspaper in Isfahan subsidized by Russian as well as the Russian consulate inspired the visits and Bolshevik propaganda. For better class the audience preaching is anti-British and for labourers is pure communism (111). After the receiving of Fitzpatrick's report on which he recorded in Isfahan of the attitude the population and local Khans, Loraine concluded that the Bolshevik endeavour to exploit the incident in an anti-British scheme.

With regard to further reports of Loraine respecting the Shalil incident, minute of Mallet, the Persian Prime Minister, Qavam al Saltaneh, was of opinion of British involvement in the Shalil incident. The second report indicates that the Persian press accused the Bakhtiyaris involvement in the Shalil incident. They asked the punishment of Bakhtiyaris. The Persian Government also suspected that the Bakhtiyari tribesmen participated in this event.

The survivors stated that assailants were Bakhtiyari. Meanwhile the officer commanding detachment and his subordinate officers imprisoned in Isfahan and would be "court-curtailed". Reza Khan would take "no action pending investigations", in order to identify the assailants. The Minister of War, was said, contemplated to send a force to Khuzestan, but sufficient large to defend itself. The Persian troops operating in Barberoud district burnt Bakhtiyari owned crops and villages and took "as hostage prominent local man who went for a friendly interview".

Despite the promise of Prime Minister, these troops did not recall and 2,000 incensed Chahar Lang Bakhtiyari to be pursuing them and the Bakhtiyari Khans told that they cannot restrain them. From British point of view the matter seemed brewing up for a general row between Bakhtiyari and the Central Government. Loraine intended to use his influence in a pacifying and moderating sense. A detachment of 250 men was moved from Arak to Isfahan. 1,200 in Tehran was warned to be ready to proceed to Isfahan (112).

It was interesting to Mallet of Eastern Department that Qavam al-Molk refers was not Kohgiluyeh, but Bakhtiari and British in the first report. With regard to the second report, Mallet was of opinion that Reza Khan stands for asserting the authority of Central Government. He has been successful in the north of Persia, but his task in the south is much harder. From British point of view it would be embarrassing if the quarrel develops into a series conflict.

A fresh detachment to Khuzestan, the Bakhtiari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al will have something to say. Sir Percy Loraine „is quite to right to attempt to exert a moderating influence and not to take sides in the quarrel. Under Secretary Oliphant expressed his view as follows: “The Bakhtiari may have lead into Sir Percy Loraine’s remarks than was meant. In any case he was at once informed of our views has certainly not been meeting to take any drastic action. But in the present temper of the Persian politicians, they may be expected to attribute all responsibilities to us these is nothing to be done at present” (113).

The A.P.O.C. in London informed Foreign Office through Oliphant of a telegram dispatched by Fairely from Tehran the following message: “publication details recent attack on Government troops in Bakhtiari country raised storm indign win against British who accused of complicity press clamouring summary execution Bakhtiari Khans and the dispatch of a large force to punish tribes. All Khans removed from Government positions except Isfahan which expected to be removed in a short time situation requires careful handing British Minister Tehran still at Lar” (114).

Three days afterwards, the representative of the Oil Company in London sent another letter to Foreign Office and address to Oliphant “with reference to our conversation the other day on the subject of feeling created in Tehran” respecting the Shalil incident and after on. He thought it well to cable Fairely: “Do not take any action unless Dr. M.Y. Young strongly advises same.

“Our views shared by Foreign Office, is do nothing as to deny complicity would be undignified and might only intensify controversy“. Fairely replied: “the whole question left without commenting part and no action taken whatever” Dr. Young arrived. He shares your view. It is not yet certain whether another force will be sent to Khuzestan in near future (115).

8.12. Public, Press and Shalil Incident

The same day Sir Percy Loraine sent a telegram on anti-British statement in the Persian newspapers respecting the attack on regular troops to Khuzestan. Loraine referred to a particularly offensive article in a newspaper, he regarded as habitually hostile, stating the disaster to Persian force “is direct outcome of policy of British Government who provoking Simko and other tribes in the southern Persia, rebellion and of aiming at partition of Persia”.

Sir Percy Loraine addressed “a very stiff note to Prime Minister demanding maximum punishment and public apology by offering newspaper or failing latter dementia by Persian Government. I warned his highness that patience of his Majesty’s Government has limits and that unless at once given full satisfaction I must recommend that papers be laid before the Houses of Parliament to show their inability to protect friendly government from base calumny in suit” (116). Then Loraine asked do you approve?

It has written in the minute of the Foreign Office that the press attack is along the lines of Bolshevik in Persia. W. Rothstein was always saying that Britain was aiming at partition of Persia. This attack is obviously inspired by the Russian Legation. The allegation of our complicity with Simko, this is by no means the first time that they have been made. It is probably known in Tehran that Sir Percy Loraine was in conversation with the Khans about the dispatch of government troops to Khuzestan and it is not unnatural behaving that we had a hand in the ambush.

Sir Percy Loraine proposal note does not go too far though I am not sure whether the threat today papers before the Houses of Parliament will have been delivered as Sir Percy Loraine said “I warned” and then reply giving approval (117). Loraine continued his campaign against the newspapers with the approval of Foreign Office. He informed his superiors that no to already sent, proved effective. Prime Minister replied in writing that offending newspaper was suppressed, expressing deep regret and promised to expedite passage of press law. Two other papers were subsidised by Bolsheviks, offend. Loraine stated: Article in latter was so abominable that he could not let the matter rest and he was requested sever measure (118).

The following day he met Qavam al-Saltaneh. Loraine asked this sort of thing an article in Bolshevik subsidised newspaper must stop. He promised to supress newspaper at once. Loraine went on to ask the Persian Government should communiqué in semi-

official newspaper expressing strongest disapproval of these articles (119). Finally Qavam al-Saltaneh suppressed about nine newspapers including two Bolsheviks subsidised one. The council of Ministers, however, did not agree to the Loraine's request and Qavam al-Saltaneh asked him to drop for a government's communiqué. Foreign Office approved the Loraine's suggestion (120).

The month of August 1922 was not at ease in Anglo-Persian relations. British realised that the centralisation policy of the Persian Government and army to bring the remote areas and the semi-independent tribal chieftains under the authority of the Government had the support of the Cabinet, Majles press and the public.

At least, the success in the north indicated that this process would continue. In the course of time, British Government had established various means to protect British interests in the south against the other Great Powers or the Central Government. If the main interest of British would be secured in a long term policy, British should come into terms with the centralisation policy of the Persian Government. Loraine had to frequently explain to London as well as the British consulates in the south where the political officers and officials from the Persian Gulf school of British India resided.

8.13. Towards a Conciliatory Policy

The Persian Government particularly Reza Khan who intended to achieve to higher political position followed a conciliatory, but steadily and emphatically on centralisation policy. The last week of August was the start of understanding between the British Legation and the Persian Cabinet on press question and 30 of August were the turning point of this policy. The question of British tribal policy in the south and Central Government, Loraine realised that the Central Government suspected of Bakhtiyari Khans and Khaz'al. The short term policy of the army commander and the Government became necessary to ascertain.

At the end of August he met Reza Khan. Loraine stated on fully grave risk to the British and Persian interest, of any armed collision even in approximates vicinity of the oil fields. Reza Khan gave him definite assurance that "no action of this would endanger Anglo-Persian Oil Company's interests" and operations (121) and he did not contemplate any violent measures in the immediate future (122). He did allude to a plan to execute when all the preparations so complete as to ensure its success and permanent results.

Reza Khan asked Loraine “whether it would be much more convenient for us (British) to deal with one central authority rather than a pack of grasping local chiefs”. Loraine: “replied certainly yes, provided central regime was durable and solid” (123). “We (British) should be foolish to throw over arrangements which, if not altogether satisfactory, had stood the test of time and viassutues, it exchange for any alternative but a certainly we understood and sympathised with his position: He must do the same for ours” (124).

Loraine pointed out to Foreign Office that the defeat of Simko strengthened the position of the Persian Government and the Minister of War to bring outlying provinces under the direct of military control and British must reckon seriously with steady development of advance policy. He was of opinion that the Minister of War has become superior to changes of Persian Government and the prestige of the army was growing (125). Meanwhile the Governor-General in Khuzestan who did not submit to the wishes of Sheikh Khaz’al and subsequently, from British point of view “was at the bottom of the major part of the mischief” or sending troops to Khuzestan.

Very soon, after the Shalil incident the adherents of Sheikh Khaz’al in Shushtar terrorised the situation for Zahir al-Molk and surrounded his house. His servant was killed. He had to resign and return to Tehran only with assistance of Khaz’al (126). He was replaced by, the governor-general in the Gulf Port and transferred to Shushtar. As a friendly gesture to the British and Khaz’al, Loraine directed the British-Consul-General in Isfahan to watch carefully over preparations for the formation of an expeditionary force in his district and report regularly to Tehran (127).

Loraine acquainted the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz’al with the assurances given to him by the Minister of War and urged them to dispel the suspicious of Persian like a „defiant attitude towards the Central Government by cultivating a good relation with the Minister of War to deprive him of any pretext for a hostile action (128). With regard to the development of political events during the year 1922, particularly after the Shalil incident his meeting with the Minister of War and finally Khaz’al desire to purchase rifles and ammunition, Loraine reformulated the orientation of British policy towards the support of centralisation policy of the Persian Government, if the British interests in Persia would be durable safeguarded.

8.14. Sheikh Khaz'al Arms Purchasing

On 31 August 1922, Loraine received a telegram from Curzon who informed Loraine that Sheikh Khaz'al desire to purchase 10.000 rifles and 250.000 rounds of small arm ammunition. He asked the view of Loraine on this matter and the effect of such transaction on Anglo-Persian relation. In spite of the fact that Sheikh Khaz'al received the assurance of the Central Government, he requested his old friends, Sir Arnold Wilson, the Resident Director of the A.P.O.C. to purchase new arm and ammunition.

Loraine replied: Sheikh Khaz'al had been supplied 5.000 rifles recently through the agency of the Government of India and he "stands in no particular need of rifles and ammunition" (129). The shipment of so large a consignment of fire arms to a Persian Gulf port would confirm the suspicion of Persian Government that Sheikh Khaz'al, the Bakhtiyari khans, at British instigation and under "British auspices are conspiring together to set at defiance the authority of the Central Government" - British aims at an ultimate partition of Persia.

Loraine continued to say "the Persian are unable to understand, mainly owing to their in ordinate variety, in the fact Great Britain, in order to protect and safeguard her important and legitimate interests in this country, has been compelled by the weakness of the Central Government and the absence of a single executive authority capable of imposing its will throughout the provinces such local arrangements and under tacking as have been necessary to carry on work, that the justification for these local arrangements is to be found in the fact that British trade and enterprise has been enable to carry on for long term of years, chiefly for sporadic local rebellions, including the convulsions brought about by the First World War.

The policy underlying these local arrangements has never been directed against the Central Government. "The Persian politician is, unfortunately, incapable of seeing the matter in this light, if the outlying parts of the Empire are not completely subservient to Tehran, it is because of the persistent policy of disintegration pursued by the British" (130). Sir Percy Loraine was right if this agreement would have been concluded with the knowledge and the approval of Persian Government and not secretly especially in the decades of Anglo-Russian Agreement 1907 and 1915.

Loraine was of opinion that British obligation towards Sheikh Khaz'al is dependent on fulfilment of his obligations towards the Central Government. In spite of

his loyalty towards British in the past and during the war, “the fulfilment of British undertakings towards the Sheikh Khaz’al might well bring us into an actual, if unrecognised, state of hostility with the Persian Government” (131). Anything which, might encourage him to provoke a conflict to be avoided. The possession of a large store of arms and ammunition might act such encouragement. Bakhtiyari Khans sent a special messenger to Sheikh Kha’zal recently, purpose of concerning common measures of defence against a possible attack by the Persian Government after the Shalil incident.

The date of messenger’s arrival at the Sheikh’s residence was approximately contemporary with the dispatch of Sheikh’s message to Sir Arnold Wilson. Therefore, sheikh intends to arm the Bakhtiyari tribes. The news which reached him (British Minister) in Tehran on 3 September, that the Bakhtiyari Khans are discussing among themselves the possibility of acquiring arms and ammunition through the agency of Sheikh Khaz’al. As the rifles were of British original would add fuel to the Persian suspicions. If it desired to fulfil the obligations to the Sheikh Khaz’al to the extend of supplying him with arms and ammunition “an appropriate reserve of rifles and ammunition might be created at a convenient spot, such as Basra, under supervision of those British military authorities in Irak who assumed responsibility for protection of the Khuzestan oil fields” and the means for supporting the sheikh would exist (132).

From Loraine view point the correct course at that time was to give counsels of moderation both to the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz’al as well as the Persian Government and British should telling Khaz’al that British and Khaz’al interests „are best served by maintaining good relations with the Central Government”. Loraine added: “although British representatives in the south of Persia and important British economic interests are very naturally anxious if anything appears to threaten the serenity of the local factors. I think, be perpetually borne in mind that Tehran is the ultimate criterion of our relations with Persia, and that the cohesion of the Persian Empire as a whole is far more vitally important to British interests generally and in the long run than the local supremacy of any one of our particular protégé”.

Loraine examined the other aspect of this question. He wrote: „since the crushing of Simko rebellion the Minister of War, Reza Khan’s plan of gradually bringing the whole country under the direct control of Persian national army has a distinct chance of success. The task will be completed within the next twelve or eighteen months. Reza Khan, Sardar Sepah, in spite of several set back and many question such as a depleted

treasury, is actually succeeding in the task which the British military advisers would in other circumstances (in Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919) have assumed” (133).

The spirit of the troop seems good and the prestige of the army, and Reza Khan’s own reputation as chief and organiser have been enormously enhanced by the successful campaigns in Khorassan, Gilan, Azarbaijan and Lorestan. One could hardly imagine a country less disposed than Persia to the growth of military spirit which fortified by the fact that the army is a purely Persian force, unaided by foreign advisers or instructions. The whole fabric, of course, centres round Reza Khan, and if his personality was suddenly removed, it would probably collapse.

There are many rocks in the path towards the military hegemony to which he aspires, but to judge from his performances and from the historical subservience of the Persian Character to any dominating personality, there is no particular reason why these rocks should not be evaded or removed and the military hegemony become an accomplished fact“. “It may be that Reza Khan will be unable his task without a stand-up struggle with some of more important tribes, and especially the Bakhtiyari, but I am inclined to think that, barring unforeseen circumstances, the Persian army would emerge victorious from the struggle” (134).

Loraine discussed the tribal question with Reza Khan who realised the best policy is, rather than antagonise those medieval organisations, gradually bring them into the army. Loraine considered that “at all events, I see no inherent reason why the bold and adventurous plan of Reza Khan should not succeed. He suggested, therefore, we must take it seriously to account, for in many respects it would radically alter the position” and “to suit which our policy has necessarily been framed”. It would be much more convenient to the British from every point of view to deal with a strong central authority „provided we were reasonably satisfied as regards its chances of stability.

Such a state of affairs would necessarily involve a loosening of our relations with local chieftains and we should lay ourselves open to the accusation, when these were brought under the thumb of Tehran, of having sacrificed our old friends” (135). In conclusion he suggested: “We must go very carefully for the present, and be as strictly non-partisan as possible, we must not abandon our existing friendships, but must attempt the delicate task of preparing the ground so as not to fall between two stools should any such radical changes as I have suggested come about in the Persian situation, and we must gradually shape our course of action more definitely as circumstances develop” (136). It is interesting to mention that in this report the words Sheikh Khaz’al

and Sheikh of Mohammareh as well as Khuzestan and Arabistan has been used alike. It appears that these were something new in British official report of those days.

According to his view, Loraine sent a message through British consul in Ahvaz, without waiting the approval of Foreign Office. He informed Khaz'al that he and Dr. Young explained the risk of armed conflict near the oil fields to the Minister of War and he promised to do nothing. Then he added that this is a general suspicion in Tehran that Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans are conspiring together to resist authority of Central Government and asked him to take steps to remove this idea from the minds of the Persian Government.

A good understanding with the Minister of War is perfectly possible and advantageous. He found Reza Khan trustworthy, but a little touchy about his authority and the Persian army. Sardar Jang is doing his best to prove to the cabinet and Reza Khan "no more loyal servants than the Bakhtiyaris". He and Loraine agreed that this is the best course for Khaz'al as well (137).

As regard the Bakhtiyari Khans and tribesmen were alarmed and ever since the arrival of Loraine they were convinced that sooner or later the Minister of War merit breaking their power as one of the principal obstacles to his dictatorial domination. The disaster of Shalil incident gave him a pretext and the public support assured him of his operation in future.

The Bakhtiyari Khans turned to the British Legation for advice and assistance. British Minister told them to take moderate attitude. Sardar Jang proceeded on the lines with Prime Minister and Reza Khan. He was being delegated by the Persian Government in company with a commissioner appointee by the Government to investigate the whole incident. British Minister advised him "not to stay away too long, as his presence is much needed in Tehran, so long there is any doubt in regard to the Government's intention" (138).

Sir Percy Loraine, British Minister, asked him to represent the views of the British Minister to the leading local Khans on the whole subject and suggested him that he should bring back with him two of the local Khans, with authority to speak on behalf of the tribes and conclude some arrangement with the Persian Government the limits of Bakhtiyari khans responsible for the maintenance of peace and order to minimise the risk of skirmishing between the Government force and the Bakhtiyaris "which has of later been unpleasantly frequent in the Burb Ural and Feredan districts" (139). Reza Khan is a man with a will.

Finally Loraine pointed out that „nothing is less palatable to the Persian Government in the present conditions than advice from a British source. “The Persian Government have a guilty conscience in regard to us (British), if, indeed, the possession of a conscience at all can correctly be attributed to them, they are secretive in regard to their plans because they know, whatever, they may prefer to believe, that our (British) influence in this country is not broken and that we still possess plenty of means for thwarting their plans if we regard them as unwise or prejudicial; lastly, they are in terror of being accused by the Madjliss and the press of being subservient to foreign influence and obedient to foreign instructions” (140).

Loraine realised that he was responsible to the wave of anti-British after the Shalil incident and he wanted to justify his action and steady efforts on protection of British interests. He wrote: he could not pretend the situation in Persia is satisfactory, but having regard to difficult and tangled circumstances, “to the utter unreliability of the Persian Government with which he had to deal and to the limited means at his disposal. Loraine wrote: “I have done what was possible to uphold essential British interests and to exercise a moderating influence on the trend of events” (141).

The dispatch of Loraine on British tribal policy and Khaz'al position received in London on 29 September 1922. In the minute has written: we should reserve some arms and ammunitions in Basreh or other port “for use in possible eventualities”. Oliphant wrote: since the date when this dispatch was drafted we had a telegram report from Sir Percy Loraine that Reza Khan's star is no longer in ascendant, the view therefore expressed in paragraph 10, 11, 12 may this soon prove to be out of date, but their general scenes is and contesbly accurate a part from the question of arms for Sheikh.

The minute of Curzon was sent to Tehran: “Though circumstances altered in some respects since above was written, I concur entirely in general lines of policy towards Sheikh, and southern tribal chiefs as far as formulated by you and you may pursue it in reliance upon my support” (142). Loraine informed the British Political Resident that “It may assist you to know that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has expressed his entire concurrence in general policy towards the Sheikh of Mohammareh and southern chiefs as formulated by me and promised his support” (143).

8.15. Summary

- (1) As a result of economy and political crisis in the first decades of 20th century and foreign powers intervention, the military and political power of Persian Government weakened.
- (2) After the termination of Great War, the Persian Government prepared to organise a uniform army. The Persian Officers of Cossack Coup in 1921 formed a uniform army of available modern forces. The military detachments stationed throughout the country and authority of Central Government re-established first in the northern provinces.
- (3) In the south, the Persian Government began to consolidate his position in the second half of the year 1921 by appointing an experienced Governor-General in Khuzestan after the evacuation of British forces.
- (4) At the end of the same year, the S.P.R. disbanded and the Minister of War sends Military Commanders to Fars and Isfahan. They increased the number of local forces and finally organised the southern Division.
- (5) Bakhtiyari Khans lost their position as Governor-General in several provinces in 1922 and also they lost certain districts in Bakhtiyari. Persian Government intended to destroy the political influence of the Bakhtiyari Khans
- (6) The Persian Government began to collect arrear and annual taxations from any possible sources. The chiefs of the tribes were among those, who had not paid their taxes for several years due to the weakness of Central Government.
- (7) The Persian Government intended to send military detachment to Khuzestan similar to Fars and Isfahan to re-establish the authority of Government. Foreign Office, British Legation in Tehran, the southern consulates as well as Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans were of opinion that it is highly undesirable to send Cossack to the oil-field.
- (8) Persian Government dispatched a detachment to Khuzestan through Bakhtiyari Land in July 1922. They were attacked by tribesmen in Morvarid pass near Shalil. Many soldiers and officers were killed, wounded and disappeared.
- (9) The Shalil incident indicated that with regard to the oil industry, the question of Khuzestan needs long negotiations and long preparation. British Government also realised that in spite of many casualties the Persian Government intended to send Persian force to Khuzestan.

- (10) The Persian Government endeavoured to persuade the British Legation to deal with one central authority rather than several local chieftains.
- (11) The British Minister in Tehran was of opinion that with a durable and solid central regime would be better safe guarded British interests.
- (12) After Shalil incident, with the support of the southern British consulates and the Resident Director of the Oil Company, Sheikh Khaz'al request again to purchase arms and ammunitions and Bakhtiyari Khans decided to reinforce their military equipment through Khaz'al.
- (13) British Legation in Tehran for the following reasons rejected the southern suggestion:
 - (a) Khaz'al had been recently supplied 5.000 rifles and ammunition.
 - (b) The shipment of such amount rifles would add fuel to Persian suspicious.
- (14) The Persian army has a distinct chance of success and would emerge finally victorious of tribal struggles and Tehran is the ultimate criterion of British relation with Persia.

IX: The Minister of War in the South

9.1. The Affairs of Bakhtiyari

Reza Khan pursued his centralisation and militarisation policy in the country to consolidate his position. After the Shalil incident, he intended to acquire the British support, but it was necessary for him to assure the British authorities that his policy would not jeopardise the British interests in the south. As a reconciliatory signal of his friendly attitude to the British interests and prestige, he responded positively to some of the British demands, among them the dispatch of the troops to Khuzestan in harmony with the British.

British Minister realised that the success of Persian Government in centralisation in the north provinces would continue in the south. It would be in the short and long interests of British to come to terms with the Persian Government. British Minister endeavoured to pacify the Bakhtiyari Khans, who were still uneasy in August and early September. With regard to the attitude of Minister of War towards themselves, “the intentions of Sardar Sepah were not clear” and “he evidently did not regard the Shalil incident as liquidated”(1), particularly as some troops proceeded to the districts Burburud.

The Bakhtiyari Khans were rightly anxious on their future. Reza Khan intended, indeed, to break up the power of all tribal chieftains throughout the country, particularly the southern tribes and foremost the Bakhtiyaris by disarmament and resettlement of the tribes and divesting of the ruling families from power. An army analysis indicates they believe that with ten thousand regular force armies enable to perform military operations.

From the army point of view, especially after the Shalil incident, the suppress of Bakhtiyaris, a tribe with its ruling family involve in national politic as Minister and Governor-General and the close connection with British Consulates, was psychologically important in tribal policy. This was done by provoking the other tribes against the Bakhtiyari, instigating the Chahar Lang branch against the ruling Khans of Haft Lang, aggravating the family feud and between the tribesmen and the ruling family and encroachment to the vicinity districts to the Bakhtiyari.

Dr. Young, the political advisor of the Oil Company, sent a telegram from the Bakhtiyari Khans to British Consul in Ahvaz, Fitzpatrick who resided at that time in Isfahan. The Khans informed that the Government troops operating in Burburud destroyed crops and villages of Bakhtiyari and captured and held as hostage. The sons of Haji Shokr-allah Chahar Lang are greatly incensed and collected 2,000 men and went after the Government troops to forcing them to give up the prisoners and this was risk of collision with the tribesmen.

The Khans professed that they are unable to control the tribesmen and asked the government to recall the troops. Prime Minister sent a telegram to the Khans promising to do so, but so far on 18 August these were no sign of their instructions reached the troops (2). Apparently, the Minister of War did not regard the Shalil incident as liquidated and his intentions were not clear.

9.1.1. Investigation Mission

Sardar Jang undertook negotiation with Persian Government and the Minister of War on behalf of the Bakhtiyari Khans. On these points he was entrusted with a mission to investigate the Shalil incident with a representative of Minister of War and a suitable instruction would be issued in regard to the military action at Burburud. Sardar Jang consulted the British Minister in regard to his acceptance of the mission inquiry. Sir Percy Loraine approved it to work cordially with the military officer in order to secure a joint report (3).

On 18 September 1922, the British Minister received a message from Ilkhani and Ilbegi through Fitzpatrick, who was in Bakhtiyari country that according to the Counsel of British Minister willing to be on friendly terms with the Minister of War and loyal to the Persian Government. Owing to their apprehensions of the intentions of Reza Khan Sardar Sepah, suggested that British Minister should obtain a written promise from the Persian Government that no hostile action against the Bakhtiyaris was contemplated.

At the same time the Bakhtiyaris reacted to the military action of the army in Burburud. The British Consul-General in Isfahan, Francis Crow, informed the British Minister Sir Percy Loraine on 19 September that two minor Khans with a force of Bakhtiyari tribesmen attacked Choghur (Chogha Khor), a village in the Faridan district and destroyed it. This village contains the Government stores. Crow urged the Khans through Sardar Ashja, the Governor-General in Isfahan to withdraw their force in order

not to inviting trouble. British Minister approved the action of Crow and warned Sardar Jang in Tehran of this unwisdom of the conflict (4).

The following day, 20 September 1922, Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Jang sent a telegram to Sardar Ashja and told him that the Government wished him to resign and they urged him to do so. British Minister was aware from confidential sources that Minister of War previously warned the Bakhtiyari Khans, the Governor-General in Isfahan that "he was believed to be working against the Government". Sardar Ashja, whose health was so bad that he would compell to abandon his Governorship in any case, offered his resignation.

He was replaced by Amir Eqtedar a hence man of Minister of War, who had been Military Governor of Tehran during the preceding year. On 25 September 1922, Sir Percy Loraine responded through Fitzpatrick that he "was ever mindful of their interests" and told them Sardar Jang who would leave for Isfahan the following day would explain the view of British Minister. He reminded the Khans not giving Reza Khan any pretext for picking a quarrel with them even to seek a definite agreement with the Persian Government for the maintenance of order in the area of Bakhtiyari, when Sardar Jang return to Tehran (5).

On arrival in Isfahan, Sardar Jang who heard flow of troops southward from Tehran, sent a message to British Minister that he was waiting the definite instruction of Reza Khan and the appointment of his representative to settle the Shalil incident its merits. If Minister of War intended to use force the incident as a pretext for invasion with the help of Sowlat al-Dowleh, his mission was unlikely to succeed. Sir Percy Loraine replied on 4 October due to the passage of the Shah from Bushehr via Shiraz, Isfahan to Tehran, The Minister of War intended to guard the throughout the road with troops. Reza Khan would accompany the Shah, and there is no intention of attacking the Bakhtiyari. The visit of Havard, Oriental Secretary, of the Reza Khan on 9 October 1922, confirmed the view of British Minister. As a result of Havard and Loraine's visits, Loraine was impressed that "Reza Khan realised that without a friendly understanding with British, these would be no sensible policy for Persia. Reza Khan waited the report of commission of inquiry (consisted by). He assured Loraine that the army would not attack the Bakhtiyaris and he had nothing "If result satisfactory incident will be closed" against Sheikh Khaz'al (6).

Reza Khan accepted the suggestion of Loraine to invite to the Bakhtiyari Khans to meet him in Isfahan in November on his way to Bushehr where he was to meet the

Shah on his return to Persia from Europe (7). Reza Khan went on to show his confidence on British Legation by stating that he was disgusted with the present Government and incapacity of Prime Minister Qavam al-Saltaneh. He added: "if the Shah delayed his departure from Europe", he intended to change the Government. Reza Khan appended for a financial loan.

Loraine replied: now "he could expect me to recommend help for a Government which would not recognise its debt and allowed me to be called liar by the newspaper". Reza Khan said: "nothing could be done with this Madjless. We must both of us be patient for another six months and then he must see to it that a proper Madjless was elected" (8). Loraine came into conclusion that the losing of outside governorship was a sore point with the Bakhtiyari Khans. British Minister, therefore, suggested "the appointment of another Bakhtiyari governor to Isfahan would be the best sign he could give of his friendly attitude forwards the Bakhtiyari" (9).

Reza Khan replied when the Shah passed through Isfahan, he would recommend one of the khans to the Shah for the vacant post the Governor of Isfahan. On 25 October, Major Javad Khan, the representative of Minister of War who accompanied Sardar Jang returned to Isfahan. He appeared satisfied with the result of this mission. He said the assailants were Kohgiluyeh accompanied for few Bakhtiyaris from the same district. The seized property was restored or its value paid (10).

Dr. Young who for many years as the Political Advisor to the A.P.O.C. and acted as intermediary of the Oil Company with the Bakhtiyari Khans suggested in the second week of November 1922 to the British Minister through Ahvaz consulate that it would be most opportune moment for a meeting between Reza Khan and the Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari on his way to the south for a better understanding, "as the Minister of War is sure to hear especially much against the khans when he passes through Isfahan" (11).

If Loraine concurs the proposal, "he could send the Khans a hint" Political Resident confirmed the above suggestion (12). Loraine approved the above suggestion and pointed out to Young through Wallis that he himself urged consistently on Reza Khan and on the Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran. Loraine added, he has informed Crow the matter and instructed him to inform Sardar Jang of this and Crow did so through Sardar Ashja. Loraine asked Dr. Young to giving proposed hint to Khans.

The Minister of War left Tehran for Isfahan on the 11th November and three days later in a meeting, Qavam al-Saltaneh confirmed the view of British Minister that "the

Bakhtiyari question was practically settled” (13). He concurred the suggestion of British Minister that publicity should be given to “the final reconciliation in order to silence mischief makers” (14). Trevor hoped that they “projected meeting” will take place and when Ahmad Shah passes through Isfahan all misunderstanding and suspicions “which are such a potential danger to our interests in the oil fields will be finally removed” (15).

Loraine informed the British Vice-Consul in Ahvaz of political situation in Tehran after the Shalil incident and the opposition of Males to the Minister of War’s interference in the affairs of other Ministries. British Minister stated: “Relations between the Minister of War and myself are excellent”. He instructed the British Vice-Consul to inform Governor-General, Moshir al-Dowleh and Sheikh Khaz’al privately and confidentially that they can rely on his co-operation in relation with Minister of War. “We expressed a friendly sentiment towards Khaz’al”(16).

Loraine added that Reza Khan had smoothed over his differences with the Males which threatened to be serious, “by promising to curtail his interference in the matters not pertaining to his own administration”. Then asked Wallis to advise the pro-British Governor-General in Khuzestan, Moshar al-Dowleh who endeavoured to show his respect to Reza Khan by direct telegraph to the Minister of War without waiting for reply, by saying if Reza Khan keeps his promise not to interfere to the other office, these should be no need for much personal contact between the Governor-General and him (17).

Finally Loraine stated, that he expected Mo’ayyed al-Dowleh will endeavour to cause difficulties for Moshar al-Dowleh, when he arrive in Tehran, but Moshar al-Dowleh can rely on Loraine’s co-operation “in overcoming them“. Moshar al-Dowleh was grateful to the Loraine intention and promised to follow his advice in doing his best to keep on friendly terms with Reza Khan. Sheikh Khaz’al declared in respond: “he would do his best to cultivate friendly relations with Minister of War and with all those who are your friends“, and would be reciprocated by Reza Khan to a great extent than had been the case up to the present (18).

9.2. The Minister of War in Isfahan

On the evening of 16 November three Bakhtiyari Khans, Sardar Jang, Amir Mojahed and Shahab al-Saltaneh went to Isfahan on behalf of the Ilkhani and Ilbegi to

see Reza Khan, the Minister of War. After the meeting with Reza Khan, Sardar Jang told the British Consul-General in Isfahan that the talk with the Minister of War passed pleasantly and the three Khans of Bakhtiyari showed him all respect and Reza Khan expressed a friendly feeling towards the Khans. The meeting was indeed short when he was about to leave Isfahan for Qomsheh (a town on the Shiraz-Isfahan road). Sardar Jang added the Khans did not trust the Minister of War.

They believed that he was doing all he can to minimise influence and lessen the prestige of the Bakhtiyari Khans. Sardar Jang set aside his feeling and tried to make friends with Reza Khan because “it was entirely out of deference to the advice of British Minister” (19). Sardar Jang said that Reza Khan had not time to discuss outstanding questions before leaving, but he promises the Khans to go into the various matters and consider their views on his return. Sardar Jang “thought the Minister of War meant them no good”, but he promised to inform the British consul his views when “pending matters had been fully discussed and some definite decisions taken” (20).

The Bakhtiyari Khans were annoyed by the action of Reza Khan on arranging Chahar Lang section from the Bakhtiyari and make soldiers and many had already joined the army and also the army recruiting soldiers in Bakhtiyari villages of Burburud and the loss of governorship of Isfahan and Kohgiluyeh with a suitable budget. Communications to the press on the Shalil incident Colonel Heidar Qoli Khan caused much ill-feeling on the Bakhtiyaris. Apparently he put on Bakhtiyaris the blame for all acts of brigands in the neighbourhood. The Bakhtiyari Khans realised that the Minister of War’s personal escort consisted a certain number of many tribes, but no Bakhtiyari soldier.

The appointment of Amir Eqtedar as the Governor-General in Isfahan was the last straw. Sardar Jang said that he did a great deal in Bakhtiyari in setting the Shalil affairs to the entire satisfaction. He, however, told the consul that the British Legation “had no done nothing“. Crow replied the Bakhtiyari affairs occupied a large share of British Minister’s attention and the interests of Bakhtiyari had not neglected by the British Minister in his representations to the Minister of War. Sardar Jang expected and replied that the Persian Ministers “no longer paid need to the British representations”. He declared that British “ought to check and restrain him”. Crow believed him as long too much.

Finally Crow concluded: "I am inclined to regard Sirdar Jang's admissions as rather disappointing a poor response to the suggestions contained in your telegram to me of October which I interpreted to him personally with care, but it is evident that the hearts of the Bakhtiyari Khans are very full just at present and that they suffer from wounded vanity no less than the Minister for War, who whatever else he may have done, has certainly succeeded in making the khans feels uneasy and alarmed for their own immediate future" (22).

Sir Percy Loraine was disagreeably impressed with view of Sardar Jang who did not recognise the efforts of him to facilitate a settlement of the matter and representation to the Persian Government and to the Minister of War. Before the arrival of Ahmad Shah and the Minister of War from Shiraz to Qomsheh, where the leading Bakhtiyari Khans went to meet the Shah, British Minister, therefore, sent further message to Sardar Jang through British consul Isfahan expressing his astonishment, that "a time when he ought to be endeavouring to prove to the Persian Government the loyalty and fidelity of the Bakhtiyari he should follow like the Governments of Kohgiluyeh and Isfahan to rankle in his mind" (23).

He expressed his gratification that Shalil incident settled to satisfaction of the Minister of War, when he and Shah arrived in Isfahan he would succeed in convincing them both that the Government had no more loyal servants than the Bakhtiyari. Whether His Majesty was prepared to do restore to them the governorship of Isfahan, depend on the attitude of the Khans. "For my part", said the British Minister, "I was willing to help them in future as I had in the past, if a favourable result were to be reached, it was necessary for the khans to co-operate themselves".

Sardar Jang responded to the British Minister on 12 December: The Ilkhani and Ilbegi were loyal in their efforts to help Sardar Jang in his mission. They showed great kindness to military representatives, gave their word of honour to the Minister of War through them and send him with Shahab al-Saltaneh and Amir Mojahed to greet the Minister of War in Isfahan and explaining the readiness of Ilkhani and Ilbegi to carry out orders he gave. They are prepared to render loyal service and pay their taxes and the Ilkhani and Ilbegi sent a telegram to the Minister of War undertaking to recover military losses from Kohgiluyeh and restore them to Persian Government and Sardar Jang thanked the British Minister for kind advice (24).

9.3. En Route to the Province of Fars

Reza Khan left Isfahan and arrived in the province of Fars. On tribal affairs and military organisation certain steps had been previously taken placed in this province. After the success of the Persian Government in the northern provinces and the formation of Army Divisions in 1921, then the Central Government and the Minister of War began to concentrate their attention to the south, where the great tribes and chieftains resided. As a result of Shalil incident in summer 1922, the Persian Government only postponed temporarily the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan, but the centralisation policy of the Government in Fars and Bakhtiyari Land as well as Lorestan and Posht-kuh did not abandon.

In Fars, despite the Sowlat al-Dowleh's success in regaining the defacto governorship of Qashqa'i tribe in 1920, he reached to no definite solution with his brothers. Consul Chick, Qavam al-Molk instigated his internal opponents in the tribe against him. They, all, enjoyed the support of the Governor-General, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh. Sowlat al-Dowleh, however, was supported by the public and constitutionalists.

The permanent struggle between the two rival chieftains of Qashqa'i and Khamseh and the participation of the others caused a tense situation in Fars and many complaints to the Central Government. The Minister of War interfered in the affairs of Fars by sending a mission of two Colonels from Tehran to collaborate with the General Officer Commanding in Fars to reconcile between the two rival chiefs and by sending troops to Shiraz to form southern brigades. Colonel Sa'id al-Dowleh and Colonel Salar Nezam were specially deputed by Reza Khan, the Minister of War, to mediate between Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh. The two officers were assisted by the General Officer Commanding of southern Army.

The two Colonels first visited Sowlat al-Dowleh at the end of June 1922 and then proceeded to Shiraz to see Qavam al-Molk. Apparently, Sowlat al-Dowleh, as he disclosed to a friend, at first did not take the mission serious. Qavam al-Molk, however, did prepare to negotiate and moved out of Shiraz to Dehbid "on 25 July 1922 as to render negotiations simpler and quicker" (25).

The three officers went three weeks on road to and pro between the two parties and worked hard continually. Their efforts were successful. On 12 August 1922 a meeting took place between Sowlat al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Molk in the south of

Abadeh and “considerable force present on both sides” (26). The enmity between Sowlat al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Molk was deep and in the case of the Qavam al-Molk was hereditary and many of these reconciliations have patched (27). At this meeting Sowlat al-Dowleh promised to prevent his tribesmen from raiding (28) and since that time this was a diminution in raids and an out ward show of politeness (29).

The poor policy of Governor-General, Prince Nosrat al-Dowleh, gave an opportunity to the Minister of War to undermine the authority of governor and the civil administration by direct order to the local military commander on independent action in internal provincial affairs without on solution and knowledge of civil administration authorities. One instance “the negotiation between Soulatud-Douleh and Qavam ul-Mulk ordered by the Minister of War, were entirely behind the back of the Governor-General”.

From the summer 1921, “a military regime was set up, not as an arm of the civil administration, but independent of it” (30). The support of the Shah, the Crown Prince and the Prime Minister brought little help to the Governor-General. In October 1922, therefore, on the news of the intention of the Minister of War to visit Fars, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh, the Governor-General, resigned, and persisted in his resignation.

Despite the desire of the royal court and the Prime Minister, he did not accept to remain in his office and left Shiraz on November the first (31). The intervention of the Army Commanders in the affairs of Fars continued and even expanded on arrival of the new governor-general Prince Sarem al-Dowleh to Fars in December 1922.

9.3.1. En Route to Bushehr

Reza Khan left Isfahan for Shiraz. He stayed there only for a few days and then, pursued his journey to Bushehr where he would welcome Ahmad Shah who returned from Europe. Reza Khan was accompanied by the General Officers and number of Cossacks. He left Shiraz with thirty-three cars. On 26 November 1922, he reached Bushehr, with some broke down. Sowlat al-Dowleh entertained the Minister of War and his companies a night at Pol-e-Abgineh, near Shiraz, and then accompanied him to Bushehr (33).

In addition to many local tribal chieftains, their sons or representatives, the Resident Director of the Oil Company, Sir Arnold Wilson, Sheikh Abd al- Hamid, the senior-son of Sheikh Khaz'al, Haji Rais, the advisor of Khaz'al and Gaston, the Belgian

Director of Posts for southern Persia came by British ship Lawrence “placed at Wilson’s disposal by the Political Resident. Reza Khan arrived at Bushehr on 27 November 1922” (34). The news reached Bushehr Residency at the beginning November that the Shah would arrive from Europe about the end of month and the Minister of War would come to Bushehr to meet him. “Great efforts made to make the road passable“.

9.3.2. The Visit of Bushehr

On unexpected arrival of the Minister of War on 26 November, at the out skirt of the port inspecting “the saluting battery and the barracks”(35). He was greatly dissatisfaction with these as the guns are falling into pieces and the barracks are a remarkable tumble-down serat, which until a few days before the visit of Reza Khan did not repair for years. The fault has with the Persian Government, who had no troops in Bushehr for years and starred the allotments (36).

The day after, on 27 November, the Political Resident, Colonel Trevor called on the Minister of War. He at once raised the question of the British (Indian) troops in Bushier. Colonel Trevor replied he believed that the British Government would be ready to take them away as soon as they were satisfied as to the security of Bushier. Reza Khan said that a garrison had now established and would protect the place.

Trevor said it was correct that the garrison had only recently been posted to Bushehr and still quite small. Then Trevor made it conditional if as a Minister of War’s visit it strengthened and showed itself capable of maintaining order, he thought, the British Government would be sure to consider question of the removal of the Indian troops favourably. The same day, in the afternoon the Minister of War issued a proclamation saying that during the war, owing to the weakness of the Persian Government, it had become necessary for the British Government to place troops to protect the frontiers, but that now the war was over and peace restored and the Persian army reorganised the British troops would be withdrawn (37).

On November 28 Wilson visited the Minister of War. Reza Khan received Wilson very cordially and assured him that the Kashkuli Agreement would be ratified and Wilson might regard the Agreement for practical purposes as practified already. At the same time the Minister of War wanted to know the probable royalty of the Persian Government for the last financial year. Wilson replied that it was to be declared next

month, and there was good reason, said Wilson, “to hope that, it would be less than last year” (38).

Reza Khan stated: he looked forward to the day when royalties would increase to L2.000.000 or L3.000.000 per year and hoped that this figure reach in 5 or 6 years’ time and the company press on development work in Persia as fast as possible and he assured Wilson that “he, at all events, would do nothing to prevent us from pressing forward our work with the almost dispatch” (39).

On general politics Reza Khan told Sir Arnold Wilson that he was busier with the situation in the north now the time to turn the attention to the south. The Minister of War said that he would like to see the Persian troops to every port and “put down smuggling and strengthened of Central Government”. Reza Khan “made it quite clear that he actively resented the claims to autonomy of various chiefs of the Persian Gulf littoral”. He announced that he intends to obtain shortly a Cabinet decision placing all tribal chiefs and leaders directly under the Minister of War so that they should be adequately controlled.

The Resident Director stated: the A.P.O.C. concerned themselves with local politics only so far as much matters affected their daily work and wished that the Central Government policy on local affairs would not disturb local situation which would interfere with the company’s work of development. Wilson continued to say: the labour was coming forwards in satisfactory quantities, much of it being drawn from central Persia. This fact itself indicated that the state of the country was more satisfactory than might appear.

Minister of War hoped that in all Anglo-Persian Oil Company relation with local chiefs, the company would do nothing injurious to the legal a position and prestige of the Central Government (40). The same day, 25 November 1922, Reza Khan received the chieftains of the neighbourhood. On the 29 November, Ahmad Shah arrived in Varsova in Bushehr. After official ceremony he was then received by the local notables and the Khans of all vicinity districts and a considerable crowd cheered and gave a warm welcome.

On 29 November, Wilson was received in audience by Ahmad Shah and he thanked the Resident Director of the Company for coming from Mohammareh to meet him and asked him in his visit to Tehran. The Political Resident and his secretaries and the Senior Naval Officer were received by the Shah the following day on 30 November 1922. On return to the town the British Political Resident and his accompanies, the

Under Secretary of Resident noticed a car containing some Cossacks and Allah Karam Khan, the son of Heidar Khan, the chief of Hayat Davudi, a Lor speaking tribe in a district close the coast of the Persian Gulf.

Allah Karam Khan was struck on the mouth by one of the Cossacks. On arrival at the Residency it was as certain that he was arrested by the order of Reza Khan. Because his father has been friendly with the British, said Political Resident (41). Allah Karam Khan was employed by Anglo-Persian Oil Company as the head of Anglo Persian Oil Company and in Genaveh. As Allah Karam Khan was employed by the Anglo Persian Oil Company, it was decided that Wilson would intervene in his behalf.

Furthermore: Heidar Khan Hayat Davudi like his father wrote Wilson was staunch friends of British Government for last 50 years. Heidar Khan in particular, alone amongst all chiefs in this area when every other chief in arm against British, he remained an attitude helpful neutrality throughout the war (42). Sometime later, Loraine stated: Heidar Khan a man who “not only had close friendly relation with British authorities also rendered notables assistance to the allied cause during the War”.

Wilson regarded the incident as “most unfortunate“. Apparently prior to an interview of Allah Karam Khan with the Minister of War , the Minister War after making some opprobrious remarks regarding Allah Karam Khan’s relation with foreigners by his order. Allah Karam Khan was arrested and jailed on the ground or pretext of lack of politeness in his behaviour. Wilson was of view, the arrest of Allah Karam Khan was wholly to the intrigues of the former supporters of the Germans in Dashti and Dashestan - notably Ghazanfar al- Saltaneh and Mirza Ali Kazeruni, and Minister of War received a number of anonymous and other letters of a violently anti-British type urging action against Haidar Khan as a friend of the British and traitor, etc.

Reza Khan acted on these without reference to the governor of Bushehr, Yamin al-Mamalek, “whose attitude towards the Company’s interests was throughout most helpful” (43). On the 1 December, Reza Khan returned the Resident’s call. Wilson on behalf of Political Resident discussed the matter with Reza Khan who did not know, wrote Wilson, the nature of relations of Heidar Khan and Allah Karam Khan with the British Government. In spite of the Wilson’s effort as well as Reza Khan did not release him. British position in Heidar Khan’s territory would suffer seriously (44).

Reza Khan only agreed he would not be taken to Tehran, as he had at first intended and he would release if his father would come to Bushehr under a guarantee from Political Resident. At this stage considerable further conversation took placed.

Trevor was of opinion, Heidar Khan would not come in to Bushehr and he told Wilson that he would never give any assurance to Heidar Khan, "having regard to the behaviour of the Persian authorities in this and other cases".

Finally, Reza Khan modified his decision that he would release Allah Karam Khan if he writes a letter and under taking that he considered himself a Persian subject and obedient to Persian authorities. The letter of Sowlat al-Dowleh on the evening 31 November and on 1 December by various ways by Trevor and Wilson was without result (45). On 2 December Ahmad Shah left Bushehr and Minister of War was next in a second limousine between forty to fifty cars. The Acting Governor, Yamin al-Mamalek, went to Boraz-jan with the Shah.

On his return informed the Political Resident that the Minister of War finally gave written orders to hold a commission with the officer commanding troops, the revenue agent, into Heidar Khan Affairs: a) the necessity for a reassessment of revenue, b) the state of security of Hayat Davudi, c) the question of Khark Island. The acting governor declared he would do his best to make commission a formality (46).

In continuation of his letter in 8 December, Trevor wrote, the Minister of War assured Wilson he would do nothing to impede the operation. The intention of Reza Khan to place all tribes directly under his control after the cabinet decision and with regard to his bitter hostility to a pro-British Khan, the control on these line cause a most disturbing effect on the general situation in the south and it a react adversely on the company's operations.

Heidar Khan stated he as an old man would resist to the dispatch of troops to his territory to dishonour and dispossess of his ancestral property. The Khans of Lirawi would join Heidar Khan and probably Boir Ahmadi and he capable of raising some 1.500 men. Trevor concluded that the whole of the district between Bushehr and Behbahan and the coast of Qashqa'i country would be in a state of disorder and the "Company's operations would have to be suspended" and "most of the capital already sunk in Bidkarz area, no labour would be forth coming for a long time would be lost" (47).

He continued to say that, in the case of Sheikh Khaz'al the disaster our results will be greater than Heidar Khan's. He wrote: British may rest assure that Sowlat al-Dowleh will do his almost to encourage and assist the company in all their operations in Qashqa'i territory. For the reason that he is quite as acute enough realise the enormous financial benefits which will secure to him. Trevor added: He has done his best to make

friends with the Minister of War. It is most probable that Reza Khan will not attempt to undermine his authority, at all events for the present (48).

Sowlat al-Dowleh who accompanied the Minister of War to Bushehr, he also met the British Political Resident and the Resident Director of the Oil Company. Sowlat al-Dowleh called and declared he “was exerting Allah Khan”, apparently, without success. Arnold Wilson called on Sardar Ashayer, on 28 and 30 November 1922, and Sowlat al-Dowleh called on Arnold Wilson on 29 November. The attitude of Sowlat al-Dowleh, considered Wilson as entirely friendly. He urged the Company to extend its investigation to Farrashband and promised every assistance and discussed road, pipelines with intelligence (49).

The advisor of Khaz'al, Haj Rais, however, told Wilson that in conversation with Sowlat al-Dowleh, he expressed not entirely satisfied with company's which under would underline his position with the Kashkuli and the tribes as general. Wilson believed if and when works of the company in some other area in the Sowlat's territory, it will be largely disappear. Wilson believed through the reports of the close relation of Sardar Ashayer with Minister of War and strengthening of his position during the past few months. Wilson said: “Whilst at present the attitude of Sowlat al-Dowleh of lives no cause for anxiety, he is still anti-British heart, his activities should be closely watched and every care should be taken in British dealings with the Kashkuli in gives him no avoidable excuse for picking a quarrel with us (50).

The Minister of War, who had arrived in Shiraz on his way to Bushehr on November 20, 1922 and stayed there “in isolation for most part“ then he proceeded to Bushehr with his political advisor, Amir Lashkar, the General Officer Commanding the south, Said al-Dowleh, son of Sepah Salar, Qavam al-Molk and other officers. After the landing in Bushehr, Ahmad Shah stayed some days in this commercial port. The local chiefs and prominent as well as the Persian Officials was received by the Shah. Then, he left Bushehr on December the second. Between forty and fifty cars accompanied him for Borazjan on his way to Shiraz. Reza Khan was in the second car after the Shah.

9.4. The Shah and the Minister of War in Shiraz

Ahmad Shah stayed some days in Shiraz. The journey of Shah “was a remarkable success, and the warmth of welcome spontaneous, effecting a detonate in faction strife

in the town". On 10 December, the Shah and the Minister of War left the city for Tehran.

The presence of the Minister of War in November and then in December in Shiraz, "produced several marked effects on the situation" (51). He strengthened the position of military in Fars. Reza Khan issued a manifesto while stayed in Shiraz. He warned the tribes that he would send a large force from Northern provinces to Fars to quell the tribesmen, unless "raiding sensed on the high road".

The impression created by the Minister of War and his behaviour towards all class from magnates of Fars downwards was marked. He certainly inspired fear for his own future in Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh not to mention the petty chiefs on the main road (52). The road-guard system was taken under the control of the Minister of War at the end of the March 1922, owing to the reduction in number, the unpaid wages for months and the poor management. At the end of the year 1922, a real attempt was made to improve the discipline. There was also a change to "much better discipline" and drill under the new energetic commander.

After the departure of the Shah, by the order of the Minister of War break up two roads inside the Bagh-e-Shah gate leading to the palaces, at first a road and another entrance to the palace garden from the Masjed-e-Vakil square. "The large palace garden and the hall of audience and the octagonal building, which was the first mausoleum of Karim Khan Zand, have also been annexed by Military Command, and the governor-general's quarters was limited to two country yards in the Arg proper, with one entrance on the Artillery square" (53).

Chick heard that the intention of Reza Khan is to be the creation of a strong fortified position, or citadel, and the extension of the present drill square and surrounding buildings and space. This place sufficed the S.P.R. and was amply large enough for the Persian force. An area from which all but the military will be barred access. A reliable informant told Chick that the Minister of War intends to send an additional force of 800 men from north and 1.000 men to be enlisted from the peasantry. It was discussed with the land lords of Fars who raised objection to the shortage of labour and suggested that nomad tribesmen are more appropriately for enlisting (54).

It was predicted that the General Headquarters of the southern Division would be transferred from Isfahan to Shiraz. The result of military action was alarming on the part of Qavam al-Molk and "uneasiness among the inhabitants of all classes" and the

feeling against Reza Khan. "The deprivation of the historic garden and larger part of the palace premises is but another sign of the relegation of the Governor-General and civil administration to a subordinate role, and must diminish the letter's authority in the eyes of the province" (55).

Chick, however, added much military organisation built up by Reza Khan may earn British administration "he had in fact come to be regarded as an national hero in Democrat circles in Shiraz" (56) and certain arrogance, send British consul, in his demeanour towards the civil administration while in Shiraz, and the orbitory military measures, now in progress of execution are being condemned by representatives of all classes. Chick considered the second visit of Minister of War to the south, from British point of view should be uneasy as the recent tour had several unsatisfactory results. He believed that the Minister of War had very vague and unreal ideas of the condition and past history of this part of Persia.

Minister of War must have been commissioned by anti-British politician in Tehran for his proceeding to accord entirely with the ends. The varied evidence made the consul Chick to believe that there was a certain understanding between the Minister of War and the views of Anglophobe politicians and he is against all who were in relations with the British.

Chick referred to a discussion of Minister of War and British Minister some months ago that Reza Khan stated: "he was playing with Soulet-ud-Dowleh (Sowlat al-Dowleh) till he was strong enough to deal with the latter". Chick added: "what could be more ill-advised and British influence generally in congruous and unnecessary than to take a nomad chief, the limits of whose southern migration do not approach within 100 miles of the sea and who had been once before in his life at Bushehr to introduce to his excellency the maritime coast chiefs and dispense with the presence of their own provincial governor". The step was taken to deprive the influence of pro-British Khans of Hayat-Davudi.

The anti-British who fought with British forces and South Persia Rifles were encouraged. The anti-British Khans were recommended. "The ultimate aim was that British influence in that region should cease to exist". The British Consul continued to say: a military movement is being developed in the south. The peaceful agricultural districts of the coast are to be regarded as „tribes" directly subject to the Minister of War. The new governor-general in Fars, Prince Sarem al-Dowleh, already found

“military interference is one of his greatest difficulties, just as his predecessor was party driven to resignation because he would not submit to it” (57).

Finally he concluded: “Whatever the Minister for War’s future plans for the south may be, here at Shiraz, even if Qavam al-Molk has his tribal and eastern Governments of Fars taken from him and were reduced to importance, this consulate would not be directly affected. But further measures in the region below the coast range, though the particular concern of the Political Resident, would shake the special position of all British consulates in the south, including Shiraz”.

He hoped: “in the Reza Khan’s second visit to the south, British Minister would find it possible to be present at the same time. The Minister of War, who acting independently of the rest of the Cabinet could not make evasions in answer to representations”(58).

9.5. British Consulates and Reza Khan

Trevor endorsed the view of Consul Chick to harm done to the British interests by the visit of the Minister of War and his general anti-British trend acting while in Shiraz, Bushehr and on the road. Reza Khan lost no opportunity of encouraging all the anti-British Khans and discouraging those friendly to British. He honoured either personally the principal anti-British Khans when they survive or in the persons of these sons when deceased.

From British Resident point of view Reza Khan “did this under the delusion that the anti-British Khans were patriots resisting encroachments by the foreigners“. It is true that Sir Arnold Wilson, the Resident Director of Anglo-Persian Oil Company thought a second visit of the south, would give the Minister of War a chance of learning conditions here, that was before the arrest of Allah Karam Khan Hajat Davudi, „and shown anti-British bias”.

Trevor did not think that Sir A. Wilson would then regard such a visit with favour and he “certainly would not do so” and shared consul Chick’s fears as to the danger of a second visit as long as Reza Khan “is in a position to act in such a head strong manner without reference to the Prime Minister or the Cabinet” (59). The interference by military in ordinary civil matters was carried a long way at Bushehr during the visit and shortly after.

The police Department was taken over by the military, the old tofangchis (riflemen) on the posts outside the town were abolished, and orders were given direct by the military authorities to the officer commanding and by subordinate in Borazjan to turn out local khans. Trevor concluded: "The local finances will not be able to pay the expenses of administration and the cost of the troop set, with very little revenue comes in, and then there will be difficulties" (60).

A week later, he sent another letter on the subject of recent visit of Reza Khan to the south to the Government of India. He mentioned of a point which he omitted in previous letters: Trevor stated "it is extremely probable that if Reza Khan visits the south again, he would go to Khuzestan and if he does so in the same anti-British mood as he was on his last visit, he would lay himself out to undermine the Sheikh's autonomous position and would revive the idea of sending troops to Khuzestan". If any considerable numbers of Persian troops come to Khuzestan and stationed the south part of the province, disturbances will arise with the Arabs and interfere with the work of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

Though it can hardly be prevent the Persian troops to come to Khuzestan, but from British point of view the dispatch of troops was to be deprecated. The assurances dated 21 November 1914 given to Sheikh Khaz'al, supporting in the event of any encroachment by the Persian Government to jurisdiction and recognised rights of Khaz'al.

In the event of Minister for War proceeding to Khuzestan and adopting the line in Fars, Certainly Khaz'al would apply for British assistance as he did in April 1922. British Resident suggested of helping the Sheikh Khaz'al "to retain his present autonomous position should be considered" and a decision arrived at to give effect to British assurances (61).

9.6. The High Commissioner of Baghdad

Sir Percy Cox, the British Commissioner in Baghdad sent a letter to the Secretary of Colonies. He stated British Minister who enumerated various considerations by which the British representatives in the south inclined to support the interests of the tribal leaders with whom they were associated and then discussed the successful military operations under the Minister of War and "the exigencies of British policy

considered by the light there of“ (62). Cox observed that Loraine did not include the British obligation which was given in some cases notably of Sheikh Khaz‘al.

This aspect of British policy in southern Persia and the Persian Gulf was overlooked by Tehran or London and Cox did not support it. He asked Lord Duke to recall those pledges to the memory of British Government. He pointed out the British relations with Sheikh Khaz‘al “is a factor which affects the interest in Iraq and of Great Britain in Iraq and the Persian Gulf” (63). Loraine responded bluntly to the dispatch of Cox that “the High Commissioner’s suggestion is quite unfounded and on the contrary, the obligations of British Government have been and are very present in my mind”

Then he quoted an extract from his dispatch of 4 September 1911. He took the opportunity to state: “When the engagements towards the Sheikh Khaz‘al were taken, Persia did not have any army worth mentioning and today has a formidable force directed by a masterful energetic personality.” The Persian Government regards Sheikh Khaz‘al as an ordinary Persian subject like other tribal chieftains and they are not aware of British obligations towards him. The policy of Persian Government today is not to let the tribal authorities live in a state of semi-independence and practically complete autonomy, but to bring under the directed control of the central Government.

The policy of British Government is to encourage the establishment of order and stability in Persia through the Central Government and “are pledged to respect absolutely the independence and integrity of Persia” (64). Finally Loraine drew the attention of Foreign secretary the trends of events may prove to be incompatible with British engagement towards Sheikh Khaz‘al and when the fulfilment of those engagements will necessitate the use of British arm force to resist the operation of Persian troops on the “Sheikh’s territory”. Such an occasion would place British Government “in a serious and embarrassing dilemma” and recommendations of British Minister “in avoiding its occurrence, however, its occurrence is outside the region of possibility” (65).

9.7. The Return of Ahmad Shah to Tehran

On his way to Isfahan and then Tehran, the Bakhtiyari Ilkhani and Ilbegi and some other Khans gathered in Qomsheh to meet the Shah. Finally the caravan of passengers reached in Tehran on 17 December 1922. The day of his arrival, in a brief formal audience, the Shah received the diplomatic representatives at Bagh-e-Shah.

British Minister was among the present diplomats. Ten days later, 27 December, Ahmad Shah received him in a private audience (66).

Sir Percy Loraine also met the Minister of War. The British Minister rejected strongly the impression of British Consular officers in the south that Reza Khan was anti-British. He also added the commendation of Sardar Zafar to the British consul in Isfahan “must be taken with a pinch of salt” a man who painted a picture of disaster to British interests if Bakhtiyari interests were not supported by British. Loraine pointed out that “It is not our (British) business to fight the Bakhtiyari battles, but to look after British interests” (67).

Loraine asked the southern consuls to realise the motive and intentions of the Minister for War as a whole beneficial to the British interests. Then he repeated some passage of his letter dated 4 September 1922 on the Persian Government’s centralisation policy and British understanding to this policy and the approval of British Foreign Secretary.

British Minister informed the southern consulates that the explanations of Reza Khan on Allah Karam Khan to him of his action were satisfactory and he undertook to release Allah Karam, to give him rank in the army and to present him with robe of honour (68). This put a definite end to the incident. In fact Loraine obtained the unconditional release of Allah Karam Khan, even Reza Khan promises to give him the rank of captain in the army if he brings in a contingent of 100 tribesmen as recruits and a lesser rank if he cannot and he duties as head of local road guards paid by Anglo Persian Oil Company.

Then British Minister added: The aim of Minister for War is gradually to bring all tribal organisations in Persia under the military financial and administrative control of the central Government. The great southern tribes as well as Bakhtiyari are the most obstacle and the most likely sources of resistance to this policy. The execution of the policy should Characterise playing of inter-tribal rivalries and jealousies' one against the other. It was certain that the tribal chieftains feel themselves threatened by this policy both in the semi-independent position and authority. Loraine foresaw these chieftains would turn to the British consultants and representatives for support owing to the past relations, evens and traditions in which the representatives received in many cases from the tribal chieftains.

The outcome of sympathy and mutual understanding and of a certain community of interests, are naturally disposed to give their support, which form local point of view

is quite justifiable. Purely local considerations, however, often obscure the larger issue and hence, no doubt, arises the impressions that Reza Khan's motives are anti-British (69). "I do not share this view" said British Minister. The object of Minister for War is to consolidate Persia into one united whole under the direct control of the Tehran Government. The process is one similar to "all countries pass the proportions as the State develops and the Central Government increases in strength and organisations". This will be facilitated by the constructions of railways, improvement of communications and the reorganisation of administrations which is being undertaken by the American advisers. In fact "the task which Sardar Sepah is seeking carry out, though with conspicuously inferior resources is practically the same as that which would have developed on the British advisers had the Anglo-Persian convention of 1919 been ratified and applied" (70).

If it be British policy to support tribal chieftains in resistance to the central Government, Minister of War will certainly become anti-British in which he is not so at present. Reza Khan "is a nationalist, though of a more level headed and less chauvinistic type than the Tehran politicians. Beside that all prominent Persians find themselves in present circumstances of maintaining an outwardly even balance between British and Russians." This "impartiality has been used by some a cloak for both Anglophobia and xenophobia."

From Sir Percy Loraine point of view „it is the fact that Sardar Sepah is one comparatively stable element in the general situation and his disappearance be the prelude to the spread of certain influences which are hostile to the British Empire and to encroachments of and undesirable nature capable of raising the whole Persian question of a fresh in and acute form (71).

British Minister pointed out that he warned Reza Khan that he does not interfere in domestic Persian affairs, but he was able "to give him better information and more disinterested advice than he can get elsewhere about local conditions and personalities, especially in the south that he cannot remain altogether indifferent. If things are being seriously mismanaged, and shall certainly foul of him of anglophil-persians are persecuted merely because they are anglophile" (72).

In less than a month Loraine sent a dispatch to Foreign Office, enclosing the memorandum of Wilson and Two dispatches of Colonel Trevor. He considered that it was unfortunate that the visit of Reza Khan produced in the minds of the local British authorities an impression of anti-British tendencies. From Loraine viewpoint Reza

Khan was an important factor in the Persian politic who endeavoured to assert the authority of the Government “as the more remote regions of Empire” and Loraine who continued his cultivated relations with Reza Khan and of his scheme with the approval of Foreign office, was not convinced that Reza Khan was inspired by Anglophobe ideas during his tour to the south. The unconditional release of Allah-Karam as well as the Bakhtiyari condition, whereas the Bakhtiyari Khans fell out once more among themselves.

The Ilkhani and Ilbegi resigned and Reza Khan could take advantage and with ease splitting the Khans into two factions. Sir Percy Loraine was of opinion that the view of Sir Arnold Wilson, the President Director of the Company, was correct that Reza Khan was surrounded by “a set of notorious mischief makers“ and he ease to some extend influenced by their talk. Minister of War, however, assured him that this action was in no sense intended by him as an ant-British stroke and he(the Minister of War) regrets it that his action produced an impression of Anglophobia as Loraine pointed out” (73).

On contrary to the view of Shiraz and Bushehr consuls, British Minister was of opinion that the second visit of Reza Khan to the south “will be to our (British) advantage.“ The Plan coextending the authority of the Central Government succeeded. British representatives must be prepared to adapt” for prospective changes which, if effective and durable may well be a beneficial one for British interests. “A stable, centralised and orderly Persian can never be a danger to British or Indian interests; a weak and divided Persian swaged by every breath of wind from the north, whether form Petrograd or Moscow is a standing menace” (74).

The report of Chick did not receive positively in the eastern Department. George Churchill wrote in his minutes: “consul Chick who expressed his view quite freely, but rather acrimoniously and he took a very local view of matter” (75). Sir Percy Loraine has since addressed an authentic dispatch to consular offices in Isfahan. Shiraz and Bushehr expressed their view and general policy in very clear terms. Reza Khan must treat on many people in his attempt to gain control all over the country in which effect we should assist him by means in our power.

I think we can trust Sir P. Loraine to handle this situation into his usual skill. Another member of the Eastern Department wrote: “I am under the impression that Mr. Chick has been too long at Shiraz” (76). The instructions of the British Minister to the British consular offices at Bushehr, Shiraz and Ahvaz on 10 January 1923 met with the

approval of Lord Curzon. Loraine learned from the dispatch of Foreign Office of 21 February 1923.

9.8. Ahmad Shah and Bakhtiyari Khans

As it was mentioned on his way to Tehran, Ahmad Shah received the Ilkhani, Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari and some other Khans in Qomsheh. The audience passed quietly. As far as the available sources indicate, the Bakhtiyari Khans had schemed to kidnap the Minister of War. Sardar Zafar told the British Consul in Ahvaz that they abandoned their scheme in honour to the presence of the Shah.

It is not clear, however, that the real fact was the presence of the Shah or other obstacles prevented the performance of the kidnapping. In fact, since the Shalil incident in the summer 1922, in the name of the Government, Reza Khan was bent on diminishing the influence of the Bakhtiyari Khans. First of all he deprived the Bakhtiyari khans from Governorship. Then orders were issued that the retainers of the khans „should no longer bear arms to shear the Bakhtiyari Khans of their prestige (77).

Reza Khan who had an old compassion ate friendship with Sardar Ass'ad III, and through him his brother Amir Jang and his uncle Sardar Mohtasham broke up the unity of the khans. Reza Khan gave the governorship of Khorassan to Sardar Ass'ad III and Sardar Mohtasham as Ilkhani and Amir Jang as Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari. The new governors of Bakhtiyari had “since the greatest difficulty in holding the tribe together and preserving their administration“.

On 3 January 1923 Sardar Jang informed British Consul-General in Isfahan that the khans proposed to borrow 10.000T from the Imperial Bank of Persia and pay to the General Offices Commanding in Isfahan for distribution to the sufferers from the Shalil incident and their families. The same sums of money were put at the disposal of the Minister of War. This would be accepted by the Persian Government and “the incident finally liquidated”.

Almost a week later, the internal family quarrels of the Bakhtiyari Khans broke out again. On 11 January, Loraine sent a message through Crow to the Ilkhani Amir Mofakham and Ilbegi, Sardar Zafar, that Sardar Mohtasham and Amir Mojahed and the other khans complained that you have threatened to bring the Government troops against them if they do not obey your orders. Then asked the Khans to remain vital and cease quarrelling among themselves.

These “weaken the position of Bakhtiari Khan anything else British friendship is single and cannot divided up among the Khans” (78). The matters were getting worse instead of better. The Khans continued a regular campaign to bring about the full of the Ilkhani, Amir Mofakham and Ilbegi, Sardar Zafar. The principal malcontents were Sardar Mohtasham and Amir Mojahed. On 2 February Loraine requested to write to the Government the Bakhtiyari tribes as well as to the two formers. He asked them to put aside their difference in the circumstances, but Ilkhani and Ilbegi had resigned and proceeded to Tehran and the Bakhtiyari Khans were unable to agree on successors and the tribe remained without governors for three and a half months (79).

9.9. Bakhtiyari Khans and Compensation

Meanwhile Sardar Jang who had returned to Tehran the second week of January reported to the British Minister of War his mission. It appeared that the whole matter would be settled by a payment of about 20.000T while the incident occurred on the Bakhtiyari territory. In early February 1923, in a gathering in the house of Samsam al-Saltaneh in Tehran, Loraine asked the Bakhtiyari Khans to remain united and work with Reza Khan, but the dissension’s between them widened and in another meeting in the middle of February Loraine pointed out the absence of any appointed Governors in Bakhtiyari threatened British interests as nobody officially responsible for the guarding of the oilfields or for the security of the roads, he should be obliged to talk to the Persian Government.

The Khans promised to settle their differences in two weeks and appointed a governor for the tribe. Until the middle of May no settlement was reached among themselves (80). The question of Shalil incident did not reach to a satisfactory solution. However, the months between September 1922 and April 1923 passed relatively with less attention to this subject. The prospect of a settlement with the Minister of War became day by day more remote and disagreement among the Khans was felt in Sardar Jang negotiations with Reza Khan. Instead of a payment of 20.000T, some 480.000T were demanded.

Loraine questioned Reza Khan about ending of the dispute with Bakhtiyari Khans and he added the Bakhtiyari Khans were not responsible. Reza Khan replied that he had enough documentary evidence of the Khan’s complicity to hang the lot and they must pay 480.000T as compensation for Shalil incident. Reza Khan continued to say that he

had refrained from strong measures against them due to the suggestion of British Minister in autumn 1922 and to avoid internal conflicts. If the document has been published the public opinion would drive him to arm action (81).

Though the chief of General Staff was sent to Isfahan to report on local situation, but no troops' movements took place. The Bakhtiyari Khans told Loraine that they cannot pay when the Persian Government chooses to send soldiers. The Eastern Department of Foreign Office and Curzon personally believed that it was Loraine who told the khans on 22 July the use of the force as the last resort and the Bakhtiyari Khan did it. Accordingly Churchill wrote: "We cannot now go back upon them and consider them as Sir P. Loraine says if they are really guilty, to have forfeited any claim to our support." Churchill added thought it would not be desirable for us to weaken the position of Reza Khan, whose military power is an extremely important factor in Persian politics.

Today, on the other hand it would not do to abandon the Bakhtiari Khans altogether. He suggested Loraine should be instructed to ask the Khans to take moderate attitude and "use his great influence with Reza Khan to dissuade him from going to these extreme limits with the Bakhtiari Khans who are our friends" (82). In another minute was written: "I agree that the situation is unsatisfactory. It is always difficult to ride two horses simultaneously and this is the position of Sir P. Loraine whose original language to the Bakhtiari appeared at that time somewhat unfortunate and we must remind him of his language to the Khans that their action is in any way due to incitement by H.M. Legation" (83).

The gist of the minutes was telegraphed at Loraine that whole question appears fraught with danger. The original policy of use of force by Bakhtiyari Khans was not entirely excluded by you and then asked him to take care not to expose British to any possible consultation of breach of faith. Curzon instructed him to follow the content of the dispatch of 21 September 1922 and dissuade Reza Khan from going to extreme limits with the Khans, (84) "who alter all are our friends." Loraine responded his reason for indifference to the Bahkhtiyari Khans was tactical. The disunity of the Khans caused the situation by ignoring the Legation advice. The Bakhtiyari Khans seemed to think that an omnipotent British Minister can get them out of it. They left the Bakhtiyari for guarding oilfields and roads.

Loraine said to Sardar Jang that his moral support was conditional on Khans if they united and find solution to their differences. The Shah and Prime Minister were

well disposed towards Bakhtiyari and were interested (85). In response to Loraine, Ahmad Shah said: "I will give full support" The pressure on Bakhtiyari Khans was necessary to make them understand and their own folly", wrote Loraine. He did not wish "to risk estrangement with Minister of War "which would react unfavourably on British interests in many directions. Loraine wrote: "Your attitude is approved" (86).

Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Prime Minister telegraphed to Sardar Jang as the Representative of Bakhtiyari Khan and informed him that he received his letter of 27 March and the wire the Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari. Zargham al-Saltaneh like Sardar Jang regarded the incident as extremely regrettable and grave and added, it naturally falls upon the khans of Bakhtiyari as a duty to do everything possible to retrieve its results.

The Prime Minister wrote: It is expected from Sardar Jang, who had shown his loyalty to the Persian Government to take effective measures with the idea and his prospective journey to that region. For the Government it was necessary to know of this project therefore his letter was read in the cabinet and "it was decided that a representative of the Ministry of should accompany you in this mission" for a joint local investigation and asked him to inform of the Ministry of at the day of his departure (87).

Loraine talked to Ahmad Shah, Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs on this matter. Shah told the Minister of War that "he objects strongly to his faithful tribes being messed about" and he cannot approve any measures except on collective advice of the cabinet. Then, he asked the British Minister to persuade the Minister of War, but neither speaks severely nor threateningly. Reza Khan told Loraine that money was what he wanted and the movement of the army was not against the Bakhtiyaris, for to deal with robber bands.

Apparently Reza Khan was of the opinion that several Bakhtiyari Khans are abroad. Loraine stated that he knew more about Bakhtiyari finances than he does and they could not pay the sum demanded. Reza Khan said that they sell up some of their properties and he would not oppose appointment of tribal governors. Reza Khan said to Loraine that 40,000T is the minimum. The impression of Loraine was that Ahmad Shah had promised his Minister to press for this sum. Finally Loraine suggested that unless the A.P.O.C. lends a loan, the Khans could not borrow even 40,000T (88).

In fact, about eight months after the incident of Shalil the British Minister informed the Foreign Office of Sardar Jang confessed that the Bakhtiyari Khans did

invite Kohgiluyeh tribes to obstruct passage of Government detachment last August. Loraine wrote: "The Minister of War is right and the Bakhtiari Khans were responsible for Shalil and have let British down badly." Loraine pointed out that all his actions up to April 1923 were based on the genuine belief that the Bakhtiari Khans were innocent of any complicity in the Shalil incident. This belief was shaken by the statements of the Minister of War of 1 April and completely destroyed by the confession of Sardar Jang of 24 April.

Then he repeated his view that the Minister of War would take strong measures unless the khans pay 200,000 to 300,000T. "They have no such amount of money unless Anglo-Persian Oil Company is willing to guarantee privately a loan by Imperial Bank of Persia" (89). He would endeavour to get khans out of it as cheap as possible on contrary to his suggestion last July on use of force as last resort and the telegraph of Samsam al-Saltaneh and Sardar Jang to the khans in Bakhtiari country accordingly.

At the same time the news of certain Persian troops' movements, the probability the desperately troops from Kermanshah via Posht-Kuh and Lorestan to Khuzestan as ultimate objective caused anxiety of Loraine. He wrote: "I am not easy about intentions of Minister of War. If tribes resist, success of such an operation is very doubtful".

Then, Loraine prepared a draft note to rank warning to Prime Minister on "any policy of armed aggression against loyal tribes" and added: "although British Government have so far viewed with friendly sympathy efforts of Persians Government to set her house in order material interests involved are too great to admit of their remaining indifferent to course of events and that if policy of aggression be adopted: a) Their sympathy will be wholly withdrawn from those responsible for it. b) They must reserve the right to take necessary steps to protect their own interests (90). Lord Curzon approved proposed note (91).

British Military Attaché in Tehran, Lieutenant Colonel Saunders, who was in Baghdad for a visit, in his return to Tehran passed a column of Persian troops about 800 strong between Hamadan and Kermanshah. Then he learned that the column reached Kermanshah. British Legation could not find out the object of these troops (92). This matter was coincident with the confession of Bakhtiari on inciting the Kohgiluyeh tribes against the Persian troops on Bakhtiari road.

Colonel Saunders had a talk with the Minister of War five days after Loraine sent the draft of his warning to Foreign Office for approval. Saunders informed Loraine that Minister of War told him the aim of the column was to operate against Sardar Rashid

who was giving trouble in north-west of Kermanshah. Reza Khan added the rumour that the column is about to move from Kermanshah to Khuzestan was entirely without foundation.

At the same time British Military Attaché learned that unless the Bakhtiyari Khans pay money the demands and restore arms and ammunition issued to them by Persian Government at various times. The army will attack them and the Minister of War was certain of success. Reza Khan stated Bakhtiyari Khan received a certain amount of support from the British Legations.

It caused stillened the unconsiliatory attitude of the Khans. He even agreed should the khans “be unable to pay at once the whole sum demanded, he is willing to take a portion now, and to give the reminder later by instalments.” Reza Khan wished to avoid taking any steps which were not approved of British Legation, but it was essential for him to have these terms carried out.

The Minister of War said that the neighbouring tribes, the Chaharlang of Bakhtiyari, the Qashqa’i, the Khamseh of Qavam al-Molk as well as Kohgiluye tribes are in close touch with him and would carry out any instructions he may give them. He desired, however, to carry operations with regular disciplined troops without murder and pilferage from which tribal irregulars cannot be restrained (93).

Reza Khan ordered the General Officer Commanding Isfahan decision to send a detachment of troops to operate against a large band of robbers south-west of Qomisheh who were threatening the Isfahan-Shiraz road and Reza Khan was of opinion through the news that the Bakhtiyaris are encouraging these robbers and they are collecting an arm lashkar in Falard 120 km north-west of Abadeh.

Colonel Saunders concluded after the conversations that Reza Khan regards the Bakhtiyari problem “as being his brightest case which is being watched by all the other tribes who are well aware of his determination to crush the power of tribal chiefs as opposed to the Central Government to disarm the civil population and to absorb the men of fighting age into the national army” (94). In such circumstances the Bakhtiyari Khans failed after all to agree among themselves to choose the Ilkhani and Ilbegi and they requested the Central Government to nominate the tribal Governors.

British Minister was of opinion that Khuzestan was ulterior objective, and the same tactics will be pursued with Sheikh Khaz’al as with Bakhtiyari. British Minister found it necessary to know how far British Government was prepared to go in this matter and by what means. Put veto on operation? He was of opinion that dispatch of

British troops in Persia „even to guard oilfields would raise whole question a fresh and we should have to reckon with Russia (95).

He added: the situation is bluntly, if the Bakhtiyari Khans refuse to pay, Reza Khan will act and British have no means of stopping him and if the khans agree to pay compensation, they have to find money. Reza Khan would prefer to avoid a fight with the Bakhtiyari khans or a breach with British Government. At the same time neither Shah nor Prime Minister seem incompetent to control him. “If we let down Khans we avert danger to British interests, but those interests will have to finance Khans. If we back up khans risks are incalculable and may fartranscend value of a monetary accommodation now. Also we should be backing a losing horse for Khans have lost their morale, are disintegrated by their family quarrels and some of them have joined camp with Minister of War” (96).

9.9.1. Mediation of the Legation

As the British Military Attaché met the Minister of War, during the conversation, the Minister of War asked the Military Attaché to request the British Minister to inform the Bakhtiyari Khans that he is determined to begin active operations against the Khans and should the terms not be compelled with. If, they cannot “pay at once the whole sum demanded, he is willing to take position now, and to be given the remainder later by instalment” (97).

British Minister came into direct correspondence with Minister of War. Sir Percy Loraine wrote he receives the message of Reza Khan through Colonel Sounders, but he is unable to convey such message to the Bakhtiyari Khans without knowing precisely demand of him. He added the large sums which Minister of War mentioned to him, it is beyond the capacity of Khans and asked him to tell the minimum sum he accept as fair compensation. In fact Reza Khan used the influence of British Legation against Bakhtiyari Khans as the British used Bakhtiyari Khans against Central Government.

Then Loraine referred to the Colonel Sounders that the Minister of War is under impression that “British Mission is behind the Bakhtiyaris“. Loraine replied that he gave counsels of extreme moderation to the Khans they must pay reasonable compensation for the Shalil incident, on desiring to see a fair and peaceful settlement between the Government and Khans of Bakhtiyari. Finally the British Minister stated: „I am certain that a resort to force would be dangerous and probably disastrous. If the

use of force threatened the safety of the oilfields, Shall be compelled to intervene directly for the protection of British interests”(98).

The same day the Minister of War responded to the British Minister. He stated: you do not doubt that an irreparable damage has been done to the honour of the army and no compensation can be sufficient. Then he added: with regard to the British Minister denial as to the protection of Bakhtiyaris, but unfortunately the Bakhtiyaris abuse their friendship with the officials of the Legation and delay the payment of the accepted compensation.

With regard to the danger and disaster of use the force and the direct intervention of British Minister, Reza Khan pointed out that “forcible measure would be taken until the protection of the borders of the oilfields “has already considered and arrangements have been made (99). The day after British Minister reported that the Khans have received telegram saying the Imperial troops have entered Chahar Mahal and occupied several of houses there. Women and children had to flee hostile. The tribesmen are becoming excited. British Minister urged Ahmad Shah to exert his authority to secure the withdrawal of troops. Sardar Jang demanded the Minister of War his conditions on which these operations will be stopped and dispute with government settled so as to have definite basis for discussion (100). The same day, he replied to the letter of Reza Khan.

Lorraine replied to Reza Khan that he is glad that no steps will be taken to threaten the safety of the oilfields, but with regard to the Bakhtiyari question the letter of the Minister of War left him with the impression that the Minister of War prefer a settlement by force to a settlement by agreement And he rejects the use of any the British Minister, s influence in the sense of mediation between the two sides (101).

In his reply, Reza Khan stated: in spite of the fact that the public and the papers in Tehran and provinces have excited and all of them consider that the employment of force is essential, “I alone have kept in view the safety and order of the country have agreed to accept cash payment” and he wished that the Khans make use of this favourable moment and friendly mediation of British Minister (102).

On 4 May 1923 two Bakhtiyari Khans, Samsam al Saltaneh and Sardar Jang met Sir Percy Lorraine They had a conversation with him. The day after Lorraine wrote a letter to them and urged the Khans to make a serious and successful attempt to a direct agreement with the Minister of War on reparation for Shalil incident otherwise the efforts of him cannot be usefully continued. Lorraine pointed out: “I have never had and

could say anything to encourage directly or indirectly the Khawanin or the tribes to resist the Imperial troops by force, and that should they do so, I should entirely disapprove of it, while the responsibility for the consequences would rest entirely with the Khawanin themselves”.

Loraine added that it is the desire and interest of British Government that the Bakhtiyari khans should be on good terms with the Central Government. As regard to the position of the Khans he wrote the strength of the Bakhtiyari and their power to do good and help the state lie in the union of the Khans (103).

It is of course a question why the British Minister wrote this letter to the Bakhtiyari Khans in this juncture and denied that he incited the Bakhtiyaries in the last summer. In fact, in his conversation with Samsam al Saltaneh and Sardar Jang, Loraine realised that the khans sent a telegram to the tribal governors, Ilkhani and Ilbegi, last summer after the discussion with him accordingly just as they promised the British Minister to stop the Persian troops going to Khuzestan and “that all means must be used for that purpose”.

He also realised that this telegram is in possession of the Minister of War Loraine, however, believed: after his personal injunction not to allow a conflict with troops and then its categorical repetition through Havard. He, therefore, told the khans that “responsibility of having acted against my warning must rest exclusively with themselves”.

As far as the telegrams of Loraine indicate the two Khans understand the action of the British Minister and the British Legation differently. Loraine wrote to his superior in London: “criminal folly of khans is thus fully revealed and belief in British complicity in Shalil becomes comprehensible“, “such are people whom we have to protect” (104). Indeed, Loraine justified his mistake by accusing the two Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran. He had a more negative view on Bakhtiyari Khans and tribal chiefs as a whole than the Foreign Office.

The same day, Loraine reported of his activities on Bakhtiyari problem and his warning on safety of oilfields as well as the efforts of Ahmad Shah who did his best to stand up well to the Minister of War. Reza Khan told the Shah if the Khans do not pay his figure he can and will compel them. Reza Khan was willing to settle the matter on a cash basis. Shah told the Khans that he cannot keep Reza Khan many days longer or risk accusation of supporting them against Government and army. Shah, therefore, asked them to pay compensation (105).

Loraine suggested to Foreign Office that two courses only remain for British: (a) “tell Bakhtiari that money will be advanced to them”, that means provision by Anglo Persian Oil Company of L50,000 to L60,000 with scant chance of repayment; (b) “tell them money cannot be found”. This is very risky (106). The same day he sent another telegram on this subject to his superior in Foreign Office that the question of Bakhtiyari is grave in itself.

With the development of the Persian Military power and the “establishment of virtual dictatorship by Minister of War “ the basis of the whole situation has changed and British had to decide to support or oppose extenuation of Central Government’s authority throughout the country and by what means. For dignity of British Government and British interests in Persia, we cannot remain neutral. To support the Minister of War means: lapse of British local friendships and would strengthen the bulwark against Russia. Support might enable British “to control Reza Khan to some extent and perhaps tie him to definite assurances regarding Sheikh’s position” (107).

To oppose him means (a) British local friends are successively tackled by Central Government under visible force (b) Gradual collapse of British position and influence (c) “Thwarting the one chance that has appeared for decades of stability of Persia under Persian control” (d) Playing into the hands of Russia. The same day Loraine sent also a personal and unnumbered to Foreign Secretary. He was authorised to address direct to Lord Curzon in difficult situation. Loraine stated: path he was to follow was not clear. He repeated his view that as regard to Persia the whole situation needs to be reviewed. He reconsidered with a view to formulate a policy to meet new circumstances.

Loraine was of opinion that owing to number and complexity of problems, the personal consultation with Foreign Secretary is necessary. An exchange of views would take too long by dispatch and enormous cost by telegraph. “In personal conversation grounds could be covered rapidly“. Loraine suggested to Foreign Secretary if he agrees, he could leave Tehran temporarily. He could travel via Baghdad, Beirut to England in about three weeks and return to Tehran in September. He added that this would much more impression on Persian (108).

Foreign and political department of the Government of India reached to the same conclusion as the British Minister in Tehran regarding to the Bakhtiyari question. Bray wired: matters have gone so far that the Government of India “can only suggest Anglo-Persian Oil Company in its own interests the financial assistance to the Khans for

amount as first instalment of the Minister for War's demand. This would strengthen the hands of British Minister as mediator.

Bray added in case of Sheikh Khaz'al, he should send a representative to Tehran in order to settle up "outstanding arrears of revenue. Until he observes his obligations towards Persian Government, it would be difficult to give him even diplomatic support" (109). The interpretation of Bray of the situation in Persia was that the Persian Army under Minister of War has gone great transformation and if financial reorganisation with the assistant of American advisers makes good, there is a chance of some stability in Persia.

The safeguarding of British great interests in Khuzestan can be best secured by gradually cutting down our direct dealings with Khans and Sheikh and dealing more and more direct with the Central Government (110). After some discussion between the representatives of Foreign Office and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, it was prepared a loan made by the Imperial Bank of Persia, but Foreign Office informed the British Minister that „on no account must the name of Oil Company be divulged to Reza Khan or appears openly in the transactional all. The Imperial Bank will merely be the channel of remitting the money and will be the instructed to hold it to your order for payment to Persian Government direct and not through Khans" (111).

This was similar to certain former Loans to Khans which were made by British Government. Addition to the political aspect of this decision, there was a financial difference between the loan from the A.P.O.C. with an interest rate at 5 per cent and the Loan from Imperial Bank of Persia with 9 per cent interest. Mr Fairley, the representative of the Oil Company in Tehran sent the following cable to Britannic House in London that the British Minister presented a firm note to the Persian Government protesting against dispatch of troops to Bakhtiyari country. He was of opinion that the note will deflect the Minister of War from present policy.

Fairley who had no knowledge of the Foreign Office and Oil Company's decision and the instruction of Foreign Office to Sir Percy Loraine, pointed out that the Bakhtiyari Khans are looking for British Legation extricate them and British Minister wish to instruct the Khans settle the bill of the Minister of War, but he cannot do so unless in opposition to promise financial arrangement. He added it would be impossible to foresee what would be the result the adventure. Then he suggested a loan for Khans, but arrange settlement first, the "reverse might possibly give impression that Company can be easily bled which is highly undesirable" (112).

Foreign Office authorised British Minister to promise a loan to the Bakhtiyari Khans, but at the same time Lord Curzon directed Lancelot Oliphant to acquaint the secretary of India viscount Peel with the report of British Minister in Tehran on activity of Persian Minister of War in direction of Bakhtiyari country and his conviction that “Reza Khan’s ulterior objective is the province of Arabistan and the Sheikh of Mohammareh” (113).

Lord Curzon asked the A.P.O.C. to assist the Bakhtiyari Khans with a loan, now it is hope some arrangement may be reached with the Minister of War. If negotiations result in a settlement with Bakhtiyari Khans, it is possible that Reza Khan then proceeds in the direction of Khuzestan. If and when Sheikh Khaz’al is seriously threatened by the Persian troops, suggesting a gun boat or two should be in readiness “to proceed at short notice to Mohammareh and up to Karun as far as Ahvaz, in order to show the flag at these ports in supporting of the Sheikh” (114).

In Tehran, British Minister presented a firm note to the Persian Government. He also told the Bakhtiyari Khans that money be advance to them, the Bakhtiyari Khans were prepared to offer 100.000T to Minister of War which corresponds with the money which Anglo-Persian Oil Company was prepare to send them. Sir Percy Loraine did not think Reza Khan will accept this sum as sufficient. He informed Foreign Office that owing to dissension among the Bakhtiyari Khans, this was slightly risk of serious fighting. “Faction amongst khans from which tribal Governors will be chosen has bowed to Minister of War“. They even promised him to give armed assistance at their own expense against Lors and open Kharramabad road to Khuzestan.

If Reza Khan and the Bakhtiyari Khans do not agree on a sum, he may move troops into Bakhtiyari country and probably collision of tribes. However the principal Bakhtiyari Khans are all now in Tehran and “will collapse or be divided by intrigue. Reza Khan is also able to arrest the Khans. But it appears he is more likely to proceed by a forced sale of Khan’s properties in Tehran and Chahar Mahal.”. “In that case khans will adopt an attitude of resent of resignation and public protest and are not above trying to incriminate Legation“. “As far as I can see Khans will be humiliated and their power broken, whatever the decision” (115).

In his letter to Reza Khan, Loraine again endeavoured to mediate between the Bakhtiyari khans and the Minister of War. Even after the disclosure of Bakhtiyari Khan’s participation on Shalil incident, he wrote they admitted to pay compensation and Loraine advised them to come to direct agreement with Reza Khan. While, this

offer was not accepted by Reza Khan, they prepared to increase their former offer considerably.

Loraine told the Minister of War that the Khans cannot pay more than a certain amount and submissive to the authority of Government. If the Government proceeding the use of force and seize the house, property or estates of the Bakhtiyari Khans without the condemnation of the Khans by the court of law, in order to compel them to pay the compensation, the Government break the laws. The other persons cannot be expected the laws (116).

George Churchill wrote a lengthy minute to the Persian tribal policy and British relations. He wrote: Sir Percy Loraine dispatched towards the end of the year 1922 reporting the activity of Reza Khan and his hostile intentions towards the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al certainly prepared Foreign Office for the present crisis.

On 12 October the general line of policy towards the sheikh and the southern tribal chiefs as formulated in British Minister's dispatch of 4 September. The policy "was one of friendly mediation between Reza Khan and our portages" and "he would urge counsel of moderation on the Persian Government. He calculated, that a long era collision is postponed the less likely it is to occur to this policy was approved" (117).

He could pursue it in reliance upon the support of the Secretary of State. George Churchill referred to a minute by Secretary of State, Lord Curzon who asked why we should support the Bakhtiyaris at all and whether the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's interests would suffer if the Bakhtiyaris were severely dealt with by Reza Khan (118).

George Churchill was of opinion that the Bakhtiyari Khans are certainly a very important factor for the preservation of the Oil Company's interests at well where the winter quarter of the tribe situated and the Oil Company wished the maintenance of their present excellent relations with the Bakhtiyari Khans and the regard the Khans as an essential factor for the preservation of order at the fields and for this reason the company readily consented to advance L20.000 to the khans in their present difficulties with the Minister of War.

British policy in this matter has been already adopted: " (a) support of the Bakhtiyaris by financial means through the A.P.O.C. as undertaken recently, (b) support of the Sheikh of Mohammareh, even though such support may eventually lead to the dispatch of a gunboat to Mohammareh" (119).

On 1 May 1923, British Minister addressed a note to the Persian Government approved by Lord Curzon, although British Government have so far viewed with

friendly sympathy the effort of the Persian Government to set her house in order, the British interests involved are too great, “if policy of aggression be adopted their sympathy will be wholly withdrawn from those responsible for it and they must reserve the right of protect their own legitimate interests”.

George Churchill pointed out that Sir Percy Loraine raises now a fund a mental questions of policy and suggests that British Government should now decide whether they are going to support or oppose the extension of authority of Central Government and he states five reasons show the disadvantages of opposing Reza Khan’s adventures against our southern friends.

George. Churchill disagreed with him and stated: these do not, “however to be any alternative to the policy already adopted” (120). He continued to say: if Reza Khan cannot be made to see the folly of his present course, it is possible for British to exert pressure upon him by withholding that financial assistance without which he will be utterly incapable of maintaining his army, “which according to the latest figures in our possession, costs the enormous sum for Persia of L 1.800.000 a year”.

The American Financial Adviser has borrowed the whole of the current year's oil royalties to meet Reza Khan’s requirements for three months and he is bound to borrow again. “If our floating advances are placed on a satisfactory footing, we will consider the question of facilities for a further advance, we might entirely shut down these financial loans and Reza Khan would find himself in an impossible position”.

It is now a question who organised the incident in Shalil? As far as the available sources indicates, and it was mentioned before this, while the British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine did not succeeded to dissuade, the Persian Prime Minister, Qavam al-Saltaneh of sending the detachment as the body guard to Khuzestan through the Bakhtiyari land, he invited the two Bakhtiyari Khans resident in Tehran Samsam al Saltaneh and Sardar Jang.

They reached into conclusion that the interest of British, the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz’al is identical and they should prevent of the Persian detachment to Khuzestan and use force as the last resort. Immediately the two Bakhtiyari Khans sent a telegram to the Ilkhani and Ilbegi Amir Mofakham and Sardar Safar in Bakhtiyari land and informed them of British Minister’s desire (121).

Foreign Office did not approve the use of the force and instructed Loraine accordingly the available sources do not indicate that Loraine did so. From Foreign Office point of view the dispatch of guard for the governor-general in Khuzestan was

only the indication of glorious flay of Central Government in this province. After the incident, Loraine endeavoured to prove to Foreign Office that he told the Khans to omit the use of force and therefore only the Bakhtiyari Khans are responsible, but neither Foreign Office nor the khans accepted Loraine explanations. Meanwhile the Minister of War had a copy of the Khan's telegram, but he did not disclose it for several months.

Sardar Fateh and Amir Mojahed took action, killed and robbed the troops. The Ilkhani and Ilbegi and the other Khans promoted by the letter of the Governor-General in Khuzestan to take action, though not that which was mentioned (122). The Persian sources such as Safar Name-ye Khuzestan recognise Amir Mojahed responsible for the attack in Shalil (123).

Yusef Khan Amir Mojahed was the youngest son of Hossein Qoli Khan Ilkhani. He was fifteen years old as his father was killed. Through the marriage between the family of Sheikh Khaz'al and the family of Amir Mojahed, he and Khaz'al became relative. Amir Mojahed organised the necessary force for Khaz'al who paid for it. Some years later, both, Amir Mojahed and Sardar Fateh arrested after the Bakhtiyari insurgence and executed by the court of army.

Reza Khan harboured a deep resentment against the Bakhtiyari Khans in general, however, Sardar Ass'ad, the Governor-General in Khorassan in 1923 and his brother Amir Jang were completely exonerated from all complicity in the Shalil incident. Reza Khan will deal stiffly with some of the other Khans when he sees his opportunity.

9.10. Annual Taxation of Bakhtiyaris

No sooner was the crisis on Shalil incident safely passed than a fresh one arose. The American Financial Adviser demanded the Bakhtiyari Khans for the payment arrears of revenue amounting to 2.300.000T. "After further examination this figure was reduced to 1.500.000T. It was demanded 100.000T in cash and the remainders in instatement's spread over a term of year". Sardar Jang asked British assistance.

Loraine advised him to produce the various Farmans and other documents as well as "a statement of revenue which the khans admitted to be due from them to the Persian Government" (124) for a discussion at round table) to prepare a considered statement of their obligations and claims. Loraine urged the American Adviser, Dr. Millispaugh "to conciliatory and not reject without careful examination the counter, claims of the Bakhtiyari in respect of services rendered to the Government at their own expense and

abatements granted for their armed assistance in the Constitutional Wars” (125). The Bakhtiyari Khans, however, made little or no efforts to prepare their case.

While the British consul in Ahvaz, Captain Peel who was on his annual visit to Tehran. Loraine requested him to assist the Khans for a definite step was taken to prepare the statement. He also had a number of interviews with Dr. Millspaugh, “who was handling the case and pointed out that the claim was in many respects incorrect and the khans’ ability to pay was in very strictly limited” (126).

In meanwhile, as the Bakhtiyari Khans did not reply officially to the Financial Adviser’s letter giving cover to the original demand. Millspaugh went to Minister of War and asked his assistance as he did in the case of Sepah Salar Azam. The agents of the Finance Department supported by the military force, seized all the estates, privately owned by the Bakhtiyari Khans (127) outside Tehran, Chahar Mahal and Khuzestan. This action brought the Bakhtiyari Khans to sense. After some time and a number of discussions between themselves, they eventually wrote to Dr. Millspaugh and nominating Sardar Jang, the Bakhtiyari representative in the late Majles and Amir Jang to deal with the question and discussion with him and the Financial Department.

Finally a settlement was reached at the end of August 1923, after numerous conferences (128). American Adviser agreed to accept 500.000T, excluding the revenue of Aquili 50.000T was to be paid in cash at once, and the balance in instalments of 30.000T a year. British Legation maintained actively its role of pacify mediator throughout negotiations (129).

The cumulative effect of these events was weakened the authority of the Bakhtiyari Khans in their own country. The disintegration of Bakhtiyari,“ the crumbling of one of the principal obstacles to the reduction of the provinces and especially of the tribal organizations to a state of completing submission to the central authority” (130). Sardar Zafar expressed his view that the compensation of 150.000T for the Shalil incident and the payment of 570.000T as the arrears' taxes were the result of discord between the Bakhtiyari Khans (131).

Since 20 April 1923 Loraine did not seek to see the Minister of War personally for more than a month. He came into correspondence with him through the letters or Oriental Secretary to mark his disapproval of the prolonged dispute on Bakhtiyari compensation and one least likely to weaken his position for an eventual general discussion of the relation of the Minister of War ’s policy of centralisation to the British interests (132).

The final settlement reached in the middle of May 1923. The Minister of War agreed that the Bakhtiyari Khan pay 150.000T as compensation to the Shalil incident (133). Nichols, of Joint Managing Director of the A.P.O.C. informed Oliphant in Foreign Office that the representative of the Oil Company in Tehran, Fairely sent the following message the day before that on the 23rd May, 1923 loan agreement was signed and L30.000 paid to the Minister of War in full settlement of all his claims against the Bakhtiyari Khans and original Document deposited in Bank the same day cabled that the appointment of Sardar Mohtasham Ilkhani and Amir Jang Ilbegi was confirmed.

He added Amir Mojahed would be accompanied by troops on forth coming visit to the Sheikh Khaz'al (134). From the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's viewpoint it was satisfactory that the differences between the Minister of War and the Bakhtiyari Khans were settled at least temporarily. He added if Reza Khan insists still to dispatch regular troops to or through the Bakhtiyari land. "They will not have the pretext of collecting the amount of Riza's claim on the spot"(135).

Amir Mojahed informed Loraine that Reza Khan intends to send him shortly on a mission to Khuzestan to convey oral and written assurances to Sheikh Khaz'al and expressing the desire of the Minister of War on maintaining friendly relations with him. Reza Khan intended to dispatch about 200 troops via Bakhtiyari road and to extend all his influence in Khuzestan, but proceeding cautiously to avoid conflict. Loraine suggested to Foreign Office to ascertain (whether Sheikh Khaz'al sees a working arrangement with the Minister of War the views of Sheikh Khaz'al towards the Central Government (136).

This news caused the British Foreign Secretary some anxiety. He stated: "it is not apparent why friendly assurances to Sheikh Khaz'al should require the support of 200 troops, can possibly be described as co-operation". "Reza Khan seems bent upon pursuing the policy Curzon consistently deprecated and he pointed out that Reza Khan ought to by now know must meet with disapproval" of British Government. Then, Curzon asked "of what nature are the written assurances" and instructed him "keep a careful watch upon these proceeding" (137).

9. 11. Summary

- (1) The one sided tribal policy of Governor-General in Fars did not bring tranquility to the province. This policy gave an opportunity to the Minister of War to undermine the authority of civil administration by direct order to the local Military Commander on provincial affairs.
- (2) In the middle of the year 1922, the Minister of War paid his attention to the southern tribes seriously by sending a detachment to Khuzestan and instructing three officers in Tehran and Shiraz to mediate between the chiefs of the Qashqa'is and Khamseh.
- (3) After almost two months of efforts, in August 1922, the two chieftains of great tribes of Fars reconciled in the condition that no aggression should take place on their territory. Certainly the increasing power of the army and the neutrality of the officers were important factors in this action in which reduced the tribal conflicts and the tension in the province of Fars.
- (4) In his journey to the south, the Minister of War showed his muscles to southern chieftains. In the port Bushehr, he ordered to arrest the son of a pro-British tribal chief of Hayat Davudi and set up a commission to investigate the wealth and the estates of this family.
- (5) Reza Khan ordered to expand the small army garrison of the port Bushehr. With the presence of Persian troops in Bushehr, he asked the British political Resident the evacuation of the British force from Persia.
- (6) In Shiraz, Reza Khan strengthened the position of military Commanders in Fars. Since March 1922, the road guard system and their discipline improved in Fars.
- (7) Reza Khan intended to expand the General Headquarters and increase the size of the force in Fars by sending troops from the north and enlisting from the province. The military officers increased their interference in civil administration.
- (8) Reza Khan warned the tribes that he would send a large force to Fars unless raiding stopped on the high road. He inspired fear in tribal chieftains, great or petty, for their future.
- (9) The southern Consulates and the High Commissioner in Baghdad were of opinion that the establishment of army in the south undermined British influence and interests in the south and the Persian Gulf. This view was rejected by the British Legation in Tehran and in Foreign Office.

- (10) Persian Government and Reza Khan smoothly set up a joint investigation commission for the Shalil incident.
- (11) The Bakhtiyari Governor-General in Isfahan compelled to resign and a military officer was appointed.
- (12) The Chahar Lang branch of Bakhtiyari, who were in inferior political position strengthened in one way or another against the leadership of Bakhtiyari Khans
- (13) Nine months after the Shalil incident it was known officially that the Bakhtiyari Khans were responsible for the raid on Persian detachment. The Minister of War charged the Bakhtiyari Khans to pay a large amount of money as compensation. British Minister mediated between the Khans and the minister of and after some months finally they reached to understanding on lower amount.
- (14) The Bakhtiyari Khans also confronted with the financial department on annual and arrears taxation, something that they did not pay for several years. They were compelled to negotiate and pay it otherwise the estates would confiscate by the army.

X: The South and Security

10.1. Views on Security Question

Gradually the Persian Government succeeded in re-establishing her position even in the remote districts, and stationing the Persian troops in the provinces of Fars, Isfahan and the Persian Gulf coast in 1922. This caused a great anxiety to the southern chieftains including Sheikh Khaz'al.

10.1.1. British Officers in the Persian Gulf

The British Political Resident in Bushehr, Colonel Trevor, his predecessors and the present Resident Director of the A.P.O.C. in Khuzestan, Sir Arnold Wilson, and the British High Commissioner in Baghdad, Sir Percy Cox, were disagree with the view and the proposal of British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine, who supported the centralisation policy of Reza Khan. Loraine regarded the southern tribal chieftains with less enthusiasm in this juncture.

The Political Residents in the Persian Gulf expressed his view individually to Foreign Office, the Government of India and Colonial Office in autumn 1922 and winter 1923 and showed sympathy to Sheikh Khaz'al and supported his request on purchasing of arms. With regard to the view of Sir Percy Loraine and the approval of British Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon, Foreign Office did not agree with the request of Sheikh Khaz'al on purchasing arms through Wilson, Resident Director of Anglo-Persian Oil Company in August 1922.

This time, Sir Percy Cox, in his return to England, prepared to convey the message of Sheikh Khaz'al to Foreign Office and requested to purchase 5.000 rifles and not 10.000. Additionally Cox explained to Under Secretary of Foreign Office that Khaz'al mentioned to him orally and then sent a telegram within last ten days on this subject. Apparently, Sheikh Khaz'al considered so long as the British authorities such as Sir Percy Cox, Sir Arnold Wilson and Colonel Trevor whom he knows for years, and as long as they are the officials around his territory, he need have no anxiety and he can rely on their influence. He feared after the departure of these men, „these might arise a number of officials who knew not Joseph. He, therefore, considered it is convenient to

request for 5.000 rifles in bond at Basreh or elsewhere which he could obtain after communication with British consul-general in Bushehr.

Sir Percy Cox emphasized that if Sheikh Khaz'al was less pro-British at the outbreak of the Great, things might have gone badly for British in connection with oil-fields. On the other hand, Reza Khan possessed various qualities not found in other Persian and after him no other Persian will have his attributes, said Cox. He was also of opinion that the Minister of War was an enemy of Sheikh Khaz'al. Though Cox was convinced, but he questioned whether after Reza Khan, if a subsequent Persian Government is strong, "it may go badly with the Bakhtiyaris and Sheikh of Mohammareh who have always been pro-British" (1).

In other words on the eve of spring 1923, Sir Percy Cox endeavoured to convince the Foreign Office the approval of supplying and delivery arms to Khaz'al in order to equip with arm more and more the chief of the tribes as preparation against less friendly Government in Tehran. Oliphant read the passages of Sir Percy Loraine's dispatches that a strong government in Tehran was not without advantage and the southern must not be too greatly influenced by local and his opposition to supplying Sheikh with additional arms, read the approval of Lord Curzon.

Then, Cox suggested there need be no difficulty about storage the arms in Basreh and "they could be released at the request of the Consul-General in Basreh". Oliphant considered that the opinion of Sir Percy Cox based on experience and merits great consideration and sent a draft telegram to the British Minister in Tehran accordingly.

Three weeks later, on 9 April 1923, Cox wrote to the Secretary of Colonies and commented on certain instructions of Loraine to British consular officers in Bushehr, Shiraz and Ahvaz in which the existence of definite pledges given by the British Government to Khaz'al was not considered in the instructions and he hoped that the Secretary of Colonies would recall those pledges to the memory of British Government (2). Though, Loraine defended his proposal on British tribal policy and Sheikh Khaz'al particularly, but the situation was tense.

10.1.2. British Foreign Secretary

The question of Bakhtiyari compensation remained in those days, in spring 1923 until the middle May 1923 unsolved and the Minister of War showed an uncompromised attitude for some weeks. He threatened the Bakhtiyari Khans and even

took some military measures in Chahar Mahal and elsewhere. British Minister endeavoured to explain to the Foreign Office the stabilization of centralisation policy of the Persian Government and its inevitable consequence, the breakup of tribal chieftain's power, and then he suggested the support of latter against the former. Loraine even came to conclusion to return to London to explain orally the intensively rapid changes in political and military situation.

This was rejected by the Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon. Loraine could not persuade the Foreign Office in this juncture to support Persian Government on the ultimate aim of centralisation policy against the tribal chieftains in the south (3). Curzon who was the viceroy of India 1898-1905, and initiated the policy of close relation with the southern tribal chieftains through the British Residency in Bushehr, psychologically and mentally had more trends to the analysis of the Persian Gulf School's officers than what the British Legation in Tehran suggested. Besides that the final success and the continuation of centralisation policy still was in doubt especially if Reza Khan would disappear from political scene. Curzon formulated this view in his instruction: He also pointed out that the relation between Reza Khan and the Bakhtiari Khans was tense and mediation of British Legation was somehow unsuccessful.

Curzon regarded the situation as described by Loraine the most unsatisfactory and nothing new or surprising development rendering it necessary that Loraine should return home. He went on to say: "events might happen in your absence which with your aids we are endeavouring to pursue". "We have given many recent evidences of our friendly regard. For instance closing of the British post offices whereas, we might have raised considerable difficulties. The removal of British troops from south Persia and the surrender of the Duzdap (Dozdab) railway are now under consideration (4).

Reza Khan, however, appears to be unable to appreciate this attitude. He prepares to create a sort of military dictatorship for himself and provoke a collision with important British interests. British Government has no desire to espouse the cause of the Bakhtiari, "but we cannot regard their subjugation without concern viewing the importance of our oil interests in their country" (5).

The case of Sheikh Khaz'al is much stronger. British bound to him by special obligations and "we have no intention to ignore it", Reza Khan "cannot prosecute his centralising policy to a point where it runs directly counter to British interests". He added: Reza Khan is dependent upon us, he cannot pay for his army or achieve his aims without financial assistance which no one but ourselves is in position to furnish in other

words “for the springs of financial support which lie in London and nowhere else, will be dried up”.

“I am becoming sadly tired of Persian suspicions, Persian intrigues and Persian machinations. Persia is not the hub of the universe, at any rate to ourselves”. Finally, Curzon wrote: a friendly but serious warning may put matters on sounder base and save us from the alternative of formulating a new policy, the need for which at the present juncture I cannot see. Curzon asked Loraine to give his ideas on the suggestions (6).

10.1.3. British Minister in Tehran

In continuation of his telegram of 5 May 1923, Loraine again endeavoured to persuade his superiors in London to a new British tribal policy and referred to the chronically achievement of centralisation policy of Reza Khan. Loraine was of opinion that the support of centralisation policy of Reza Khan and the success of the Army secures the British interests in a long term.

While Loraine was responding to the Foreign Secretary, the situation had changed in Tehran and Reza Khan informed Colonel Saunders that the Bakhtiyari Khans offered 150,000T as compensation and the Minister of War agreed to accept it.

Additionally he postponed the disarmament of Bakhtiyaris until dealing with the Loris first in order not to let the Loris advantage of Bakhtiyari disarmament (7). The situation was much promising to Loraine in Anglo-Persian relation. He sent his dispatch to London: With regard to the success of Persian army in crushing the rebellions including the insurgence of nomad tribes in the north of the country and army consolidated its position against Russian influence there suffered a severe setback, in the south and south-west less had been done, but simultaneously there had been no threat to the authority of the Central Government here, nevertheless determined attempt was made to pursue and punish robbers who jeopardised the safety of travellers and merchandise on the roads and Persian army had a considerable number of casualties during the year 1922 in endeavouring to round up these brigands.

In British Minister’s opinion “the result of these changes has been so far uniformly beneficial to British interests “and it has been entirely the work of Reza Khan “with a chronically empty treasury with an impotent civil administration, in the leer of Russian displeasure” (8). Persian Government desire no credit for what has been

achieved. The power of Reza Khan grew up steady since the arrival of Sir Percy Loraine to Persia as Minister to the British Legation in Tehran.

Loraine considered that Reza Khan had been pulling the country together in spite of the Shah, the Government, Majles and Mullahs. There is an ingredient of personal ambition in Reza Khan's act and policy, and he believed that it is unjust "to attribute this to him as his sole motive". This is a very genuine element of patriotism underlying the actions of Reza Khan who desire to raise up Persia out of present state of degradation to establish law and order and to earn the respect of her neighbours.

Loraine continued to say that Reza Khan has the power to close the Majles and even to overthrow the Qajar dynasty to become Prime Minister Rule as a dictator and diminish the difficulties which beset his path, but he does not. On the other hand British Minister was critical of efficiency of the Persian Governments and the Prime Ministers, Mostowfi al-Mamalek, Moshir al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Saltaneh as well as Majles.

The successive Persian Governments have reached the conclusion that necessity demands and improvement in Anglo-Persian relations, but they prefer to await when they will be able to express their desire for a rapprochement rather than take steps themselves to bring it about, with the accompanying risk of being criticised by the gutter press, abused by Anglophobe politicians or taken by the Bolshevik representative. They know what their country needs, they have not even the common daring to seek and ensue it to contrast their acts and their attitude with these of Reza Khan.

10.2. First Steps on Friendly Relations

He has never shown indifference to established British interests, he has at all events lied to us. It is owing to his initiative that Persian Government are committed by a cabinet decision to resist by force any armed aggression by Russian or Turk. It is who opposed the passage of Turkish troops through Persia, at our request. It is he again at our request, which disarmed Euz Demir and his forces, when they were driven over the Persian border by our columns operating against Rawanduz (9).

"Thus whereas Reza Khan's policy and action have so far suited our interests, the attitude of the Persian Government has been uniformly unsatisfactory". The differential tariffs in the north and the south the navigation rights on Lake Urmia, the attitude of the press, the export of rupees, the levy of improper exaction's on the

roads (10). The question which does rise is the possible effect on British interests of the extension of Reza Khan's centralisation policy to the south.

Persia will be independent and orderly when the whole country brought order a single authority of national Government. The civilian population is disarmed and physical power rests in the hand of the state who must assume the responsibility for protection of foreigners and their enterprises and not local chieftains. British Minister indeed pointed out to Foreign Office that the declared policy of supporting the integrity and independence of Persia by British Government cannot view with alarm and displeasure the execution of the designed policy they rather ought to regard with sympathy especially as its success eliminates Russian danger, "which increases in direct ratio to the weakness of Persia" (11).

The task which is being undertaken by the Minister of War and the Persian Army is practically the same as that contemplated in the Anglo-Persian Agreement, with the difference that as regards the army it is being carried out without foreign assistance. If Reza Khan sends troops to Khuzestan for asserting the authority of Central Government of securing arrears of land-taxes and their punctual payment in future, British have no ground to quarrel. It creates, however, a new element force in the region in which ties endanger and perhaps wreck the operations of Anglo-Persian Oil Company. British can either stir up the local tribes to oppose the passage of the Imperial troops or to guard ourselves the oil fields and Sheikh Khaz'al territory, a very unpleasant alternative and the consequences are not easy to foresee.

The only things British need be anxious about are the safety of oil-fields and the position of Sheikh Khaz'al. If British support Reza Khan Policy and it succeed, we shall gain political influence in Tehran and the mentioned advantages, if we wreck it, we shall destroy a fair chance of orderly and stable Persia and British may have to assume again responsibilities and which British would gladly shed. British Minister stated: "I still incline, to the opinion that sooner or later we (British) shall have to decide whether to oppose the policy of centralisation, implying the necessity of resisting it be force in the last resort or to support it and endeavour to guide it into safe channels, I am myself strongly in favour of the latter course" (12).

British Minister was about to see the Prime Minister and the Minister of War. He intended as British Foreign Secretary desired to say: If British cardinal interests are preserved, British Government are willing to help and regard the centralising process

with a benevolent eye, in return to get the best guarantees that we can that British interests will be fully safeguard and Sheikh Khaz'al not interfered with (13).

Sir Percy Loraine did his best to convince the Foreign Office on supporting the Minister of War, Reza Khan, and his centralisation and militarisation policy against tribal chieftains as well as his political rivals in the cabinets, court, parliament and press in return for safeguarding the cardinal British interests.

It was different from the view of southern British Consulate, the High Commissioner in Baghdad, Cox and the Resident Director of the Anglo Persian Oil Company, Wilson who supporting the policy of supplying the southern tribes with arms and ammunition.

10.2.1. A More Clear Definition

On the other hand, Loraine in his meetings with the Prime Minister, Mostowfi al-Mamalek and the Minister of War, Reza Khan, made a more clear definition of British interests, but it was, however, unclear the British relation with Khaz'al. It was said that he was not under British protection, but British had an especial relation with him. The two Ministers stated of the Government intention to send the Persian detachment to the north Khuzestan and they prepared to protect of British interests in the course of centralisation.

The British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine, spoke to the Prime Minister and Minister of War on Anglo-Persian relation separately on 22 May 1923. The Prime Minister assured him that he desire a better relation with Great Britain and to avoid any clash of interests (14). Due to the Bakhtiari difficulty, British Minister had not any personal intercourse for six weeks with Reza Khan. The question settled a more "reasonable basis" than he expected. They saw each other at the "yicevimento" given by the newly arrived Italian Minister. From the remarks of Reza Khan, Loraine interpreted that "according to the evidence which had been in his possession for some time, there was more than a strong presumption that I (Loraine) had incited the Bakhtiari to attack the Persian Government troops last summer", but the attitude of Loraine in the later stages of the dispute between the Minister of War and the Bakhtiari Khans, he left confidence in friendly disposition of Loraine (15).

The following day they met in the British Legation. The liquidation of the Bakhtiari affairs made an excellent atmosphere for discussion (16). In this discussion,

in fact, Loraine repeated the contradiction policy of Lord Curzon that British did not dispute the right of the Persian Government to send troops to any part of Persia, but British saw no necessary and danger for the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan. The centralisation policy was not in itself objectionable, but not to push to a point where it would clash with British interests.

10.2.2. Tranquillity in Khuzestan

British principal interests in the south were: First to protect the A.P.O.C. from all hindrance and danger which affecting its operation (17). Anything might disturb the tranquillity of Khuzestan. The second question was Sheikh Khaz'al who had been constant friendly to the British interests and rendered valuable services during the war and he continued to say "we (British) owed him a great debt of gratitude". "In 1920 the Persian Government had asked His Majesty's Minister what was the relations between the British Government and Sheikh of Mohammareh".

"The reply given was that the sheikh was not under British protection, but that His Majesty's Government did have special relations with him, that statement was true today, except that, owing to the events of the war, the special relations had become even closer and more cordial than they had been in the Past". Loraine added, however" the primary condition of these relations was that the Sheikh of Mohammareh should fulfil his proper obligations towards the Persian Government and begged the Minister of War to remember this important point".

Sir Percy Loraine reminded the Minister of War that in virtue of Imperial Farmans, Sheikh Khaz'al enjoys an especial position and jurisdiction in the eyes of the Persian Government. Furthermore, the territory of Khaz'al was quiet and it had been done by the efforts of Sheikh Khaz'al many years ago to bring the turbulent Arab tribes under his singular control. The harmonious relations brought about between Khaz'al and his tribes and the Bakhtiyari Khans and their tribes which achieved through British good offices and mediation.

At last so long as peace prevailed between Arabs and the Bakhtiyari, The Lor tribes in region of Shushtar and Dezful could be kept fairly quiet. British relations with Sheikh Khaz'al were of a closer nature than those with the Bakhtiyari Khans. However, British had a long-standing friendship with the Bakhtiyari Khans who were essential for the protection of the interests of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (18).

Finally British Minister stated: a number of petite tribal chiefs in the Bushehr neighbourhood who were friendly to British during the and did not join the gang of German adventures or the rebelled Gendarmerie “it took, as if, in obedience the outcry of agitators who denounced every Persian who had been on friendly terms with the British, the troops in the south were taking sides against these former friend of ours, this we objected” (19).

Reza Khan said: he had knowledge of such actions, he would, however, make inquiries by telegraph and call for a report if he found that his officers were acting in that way he would stop it. Reza Khan stated: he has no doubt to the British Minister’s statement that a strong and independent Persia is advantageous to the interests of Great Britain and his object is to make an independent and orderly Persia by disarming the civil population and extending the authority of Persian Government throughout the country.

His foreign policy is to maintenance and strengthening the Anglo-Persian Relations. He added that in the past owing to Persia’s weakness, foreign powers had to interfere to a certain extend to protect their own interests, but now circumstances had changed in the last two years owing to the formation of a national army and he hoped that British Minister would do what he could to convince the British authorities in London, Delhi and Baghdad of the difference between the present and the past state of the country. Reza Khan added that he would not move into Khuzestan until the British Legation and the A.P.O.C. express satisfied with projected measure to protect that interest. Loraine believed that Reza Khan realised that he must go slowly in the south and keep in with British (20).

10.2.3. British Troops in Bushehr

Again in 31 May 1923 the British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine, had a meeting with the Persian Prime Minister, Mostowfi al Mamalek and the Minister of War, Reza Khan, to discuss the matters which he had already spoken with Reza Khan. British Minister stated: during the last two years no improvement took place in the attitude of the Persian Government towards British Government and in the settlement of outstanding questions. He was of opinion that British signed a conciliatory and friendly attitude settled the southern 50 years post-offices, outstanding telegraph questions, the presence of British troops on the Persian Gulf, the Indian Sarhad in favour of Persia. He

criticised the civil administration and at the same time admired the very marked progress of the army. He regarded the atmosphere in Tehran suspicious and hostile to Great Britain.

Reza Khan stated: it is not the Persian Government, but the people who were exploited by Russian propaganda against British and British Government often sending note to Russia demanding cessation of propaganda and the Persian Government were often attacked by the press. Reza Khan added the attitude of Great Britain was also; to certain extent responsible for the suspicion existing in Persian minds towards British. The unreasonable insistence on certain matters for instance, the removal of British troops from Bushehr.

British Government admit the establishment and maintenance of order in north Persia was of benefit not only to Persia also to Great Britain and therefore a strong independence Persia was beneficial to the interest of Great Britain why British Government hesitated to remove the few hundred British-Indian troops from Bushehr? Did British Government require proof of the ability of the Persian army to maintain order in the south he was willing to provide it. Loraine replied: British Government did not propose to withdraw the troops until no doubt remained that would be no necessary to send them back again in future, and it would take time to convince British Government that was no longer necessary to maintain British troops at Bushehr.

Reza Khan saw this point as an opportunity for the public to keep alive the grievance regarding foreign interference in the internal affairs of southern Persia. Loraine criticised the aggressive attitude of the Persian Government their method dealing with the question now under discussions. Towards the middle of 1922, during the cabinet of Qavam al-Saltaneh, the Persian Government sent a note demanding the withdrawal of the British troops from Bushehr. British Government put certain conditions on fulfillment as an indispensable preliminary to withdrawal. The Persian Government instead of replying repeated their demand for withdrawal of troops (21).

10.3. A Detachment Towards Shushtar

Loraine told Reza Khan that he promised not to take measures to upset the status quo in Khuzestan until he received the assurance of British Legation and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. Since then the Legation heard that the Minister of War intends to send 200 or 300 troops to Khuzestan via Bakhtiyari road. Reza Khan reaffirmed the news as asked him British military attaché.

British Minister was of opinion that the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan was a mistake. Reza Khan said that he had sent troops to every part of Persia except Khuzestan. He was exposed to the attacks of critics who demanded to know why Persian troops should not be sent there. This part of his task undone and he was obliged to take this step. Reza Khan added he knew that British had very special relations with Sheikh Khaz'al and as far as British interests were concerned for that reason he was sending only a handful of troops to Khuzestan, but this handful must go and he gave his word of honour that he had no intention of causing trouble and damage to the Anglo Persia Oil Company would mean less to Persian Government. He would also not attempt to disarm the tribes in the south until he had received assurances.

Reza Khan realised for some year past that Sheikh Khaz'al maintained a little semi-independent state and ruled with a firm hand to maintain order in Khuzestan and had obliged to suppress in the interests of peace and order. The troops in Khuzestan would be there to strengthen the authority of the sheikh. They might even be used to punish his enemies. His autocratic rule had made many enemies for him, and he would find the troops his allies against those enemies (22).

British Minister requested a written assurance in order to dispel the anxiety of British Government and of the Sheikh. With regard to the Farmans of Mozafar al-Din Shah special rights and privileges whether would now confirm. British Minister offered to send a copy of Farmans to Persian Prime Minister if he was not able to obtain copies easily among of the archives of the Persian Government. The anxiety of British Minister considerably diminished since interview with the Minister of War and the Prime Minister. Loraine described the attitude of Reza Khan on Sheikh Khaz'al and Khuzestan question as follows:

“You would prefer my troops not sending to Khuzestan. I understand and appreciate your reasons and I do not want any quarrel between us - indeed I very much want to be friends. But I do really feel it necessary, and I cannot send Government troops there as elsewhere in Persia I am satisfied for I could not disguise capitulation to your view, can we not reconcile our two points of view? I am now quite clear about yours. You apprehend any change in present situation down there which would endanger your interests and you do not want Sheikh of Mohammareh upset.

I do not wish to threaten or collide with your interests and have nothing against sheikh. I am ready to give you positive assurances on these points, and hope now you will not object to my sending small representative force, please trust me, I am sure you

will not regret it. After that I hope we shall draw closer together, because our main interests are really identic" (23).

Loraine thought British should give the Minister of War this chance. His policy is generally benefited to British so long as it does not collide with British (24). British Foreign Secretary was satisfied with the result of British Minister's interview on Sheikh Khaz'al question and he welcomes the writing assurances by Prime Minister and the Minister of War (25). Curzon agreed to the suggestion that committee of Persian Ministers shall discuss matters with you.

British Minister endeavoured to convince Sheikh Khaz'al for the arrival of army detachment to Khuzestan through British consul in Ahvaz. Khaz'al heard the view of British Minister and replied that he would withdraw his objections only if the written assurance of Minister of War is backed by written guarantee from British Minister. Additionally number of troops will be limited to 200 and not increased after arrival and they will not interfere with his recognised rights and jurisdiction.

Loraine did not think that Sheikh Khaz'al was reasonable and said he must realise that best guarantee of all for his, is restoration of friendly relations between Persia and Great Britain. Sheikh request is impractical and his request that British Minister should guarantee action of Persian Government and future disposition in all circumstances of their troop.

This is absorbed and he asked Loraine to guarantee him against interference by troop not under British order. Loraine added what better of Sir Percy Cox assurance letter of 21 November 1914? Finally he asked British Consul in Ahvaz to tell him that Foreign Secretary considers assurances offered satisfactory if enclosed by Prime Minister (26).

"In response to pressure from Political Resident and British consul in Ahvaz, Sheikh Khaz'al sent the following message to British Minister". "I will not presume so far as to indicate terms to His Majesty's Government. I was asked to state my objections and I have done so. If, notwithstanding, you are satisfied as to bonafides of Minister of War and if you fed wider political consider actions demand that I should give way, I am ready to do so" (27).

At the same time Curzon continued his plan to the possibility of sending some of British ships to Mohammareh and up to Karun River In Support Of Sheikh Khaz'al. Oliphant replied to the letter of admiralty of 17 May 1923 by, that according to the state of British Resident in Bushehr the British ship "Lawrence" "was able to proceed ten

miles up the Karun during the War". Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon, wanted to know "whether any gun boat of similar draught is now in the Persian Gulf and whether she would be available for a similar purpose if it were eventually found necessary to take action in the senses suggested" (28).

I am reporting by air mail on general paralysis of government except Ministry of (29). "Your dispatch of April, You should call the attention of American Financial Adviser to Reza Khan's extravagant plans for expansion of Persian army, which appears entirely disproportionate to Persian resources and ask him whether he considers then compatible with any scheme he may have in mind for setting Persian finance in order generally" (30).

On 16 June 1923, Moshir al-Dowleh as Prime Minister formed the new cabinet. The Prime Minister after consulting the Minister of War stated that departure of troops for Khuzestan was suspended for 2 or 3 months (31). Though Reza Khan intended to dispatch the Persian detachment to Khuzestan, immediately after the receiving of fine from Bakhtiyari Khans, but it was, postponed for some months and finally it was done at the end of the summer 1923.

On 12 September, 1923 the Minister of War left Tehran for Isfahan to make necessary arrangement for dispatching of detachment to the northern Khuzestan and to discuss plan for operations against Lor tribes with the Commander of Southern Division (32). On 21 September 1923 the detachment of Persian troops consisted of 200 infantry and 60 cavalry with two machine guns started for Khuzestan, reported the British consul-general in Isfahan to British Legation in Tehran.

On his return from Isfahan, the Minister of War sent a message to the British Minister to the effect that he personally superintended the selection of troops and their commander, an officer in whom the Minister of War had complete confidence. He had ordered the officer, on his arrival at Shushtar, to proceed at once to call on Sheikh Khaz'al and establish friendly relations with him. In a subsequence conversation, the Minister of War assured the British Minister that this action would cause no disturbance of the peace in the oil-fields (33). On 24 September 23, the British Military Attaché, Colonel Saunders learned from the Minister of War that he intends and plans to disarm the Lor tribes and for the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan.

He spoke of an operation of last spring and he intended to carry out this winter (1924). Reza Khan said that the winter sets in the Lor tribes more south-west into the Lor country bordering Iraq, a force of 4.000 strong with a proportion of artillery and

cavalry would occupy the town Khorramabad, as the tribes return in the spring to their summer quarters, the troops will be to hold all routes and passes and to disarm them as they return. Reza Khan estimated collecting 30.000 rifles from them. The mentioned force base in Khorramabad will suffice to ensure success. The Minister of War told Colonel Saunders that he desired to take over the responsibility for the safety of the oil fields. As a start, he was arranging to concentrate a force of about 1.000 infantry with a proportion of cavalry in Behbahan, and this force would provide detachments to form a protective screen for the oil fields (34).

10.3.1. The Written Assurance

The departure of troops to Khuzestan necessitated a clear definition of the attitude of the present Persian Government towards the under taking previously given by the Prime Minister, Mostowfi al-Mamalek and by the Minister of War, Reza Khan to issue a written assurance guaranteeing that the arrival of the regular troops of the Government in Khuzestan will not cause harm to the interests of the A.P.O.C. or Sheikh Khaz'al. As a result of the Sir Percy Loraine representation, Reza Khan informed the British Minister on 29 September 1923 that the Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh, saw political objections to the issue. Consequently the Minister of War requested the Prime Minister to send an official telegram to Sheikh Khaz'al urging him to believe that the Persian Government had no intention of causing him any harm.

The Minister of War requested the British Minister to state what guarantees which would satisfy the British Government of his sincerity. He added the concentration a force of 1.000 men at Behbahan would disarm the tribes next spring and he had no intention of sending troops to the actual area of oil operations or upsetting the existing arrangements in that area. British Minister requested the Minister of War to send him a letter embodying the sensed the instructions given to the commander of the detachment for Shushtar with regard to the attitude he should adopt towards Anglo Persian Oil Company and Sheikh Khaz'al.

Reza Khan agreed to send the draft of the latter first, for any suggestions or alterations Sir P. Loraine desire to make. A week later, British Military Attaché visited the Minister of War who added the following expression to his previous interviews. He stated the number of troops in Shushtar would be limited to 300 men and detachments

from this force as well as the force in Behbahan (1.000 men) would not be moved to other parts of Khuzestan without the knowledge of British Legation (35).

Finally in 7 October 1923, Minister of War sent the promised letter in a sense form, containing alterations suggested by Sir Percy Loraine. On the same day the Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh sent Sheikh Khaz'al a telegram of assurance and British Legation received a copy of it. Nine days later Loraine sent in a telegram the sense of a letter which he had received from the Minister of War concerning Khuzestan in 7 October 1923: owing to special interest taken by British Minister in preservation of order in Khuzestan and safety of Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

I do not hesitate, said Minister of War, to inform you that my principal object in sending troops to Khuzestan is to maintain order in that province. The local tribes will not be molested as long as they fulfil their obligations to Persian Government and Sheikh Khaz'al will earn support Minister of War by his future loyal services and the officer commanding troops has been especially instructed to prevent the local enemies of Sheikh Khaz'al from using arrival of troops to their own evil advantages (36).

10.4. The Bidkarz Conflict

Meanwhile, the conflict between the Qashqa'is in Bidkarz disrupted the activities of the A.P.O.C. in the middle of September 1923. The Directors of the Oil Company in London and Resident Director in Khuzestan were very apprehensive about the position at the oil-fields. The agreement concluded in 6 June 1922 between Sir Arnold Wilson, the Resident (managing) Director of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, and Sowlat al-Dowleh, the chief of the Qashqa'i tribe, covering the exploitation of oil in the winter quarter of the Qashqa'i and a "Subsidiary Agreement recognised under certain conditions, the Original Agreement concluded by Sir Arnold Wilson with the Kashkulis in October 1921" (37).

The primary object of the Agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh was "to provide a solution to the awkward situation and reconcile that position with the Persian Government's claims to sovereignty over the territory exploited" and Sowlat al-Dowleh "to assert his authority over the Kashkulis (38). Though, the Agreement was concluded in the presence of a representative of the Persian Government. It had not still received ratification by the Persian Government, when an incident occurred in Bidkarz area in September 1923.

From British Legation view point, the Persian Government disliked the arrangement made between the Oil Company and the chief of tribes. The Central Government endeavoured very hard to expand the army and the administration in view to reduce the power of tribes and intended to manage the protection of the Company in accordance with the terms of oil's concession if the Company applies for it. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company, however, did not wait the ratification of the agreement of 1922 and was carrying on its work and „hard already completed two borings in Dasht-e- Qir (39).

In August 1923, one of the Kashkuli chief issued order to the chief of the guard to enforce immediate cessation of work by Persian labours and to remove the guard. Immediate representations made to the Persian Government, who after some hesitation, lest any action on their part should be constructed as a ratification of the agreement 1922 telegraphed to Sowlat al-Dowleh and the trouble seemed to have been surmounted, but it was temporary (40).

Political Resident was of opinion that continual internal dissension among the Kashkuli Khans, owing to “their disagreement as to the division of the half yearly subsidies paid to them by the Company”, were secretly engineered by Sowlat al-Dowleh. He was jealous of the Kashkuli Khans and “endeavoured to assert his control over the oil fields at Mishun. This caused a succession of obstacles in the path of the Oil Company staff at Mishun for seven months (41). On 11 August 1923, Wilson protested to Sowlat al-Dowleh, but he refused to interest himself in Kashkuli disputes, “regarded his agreement with the Company as eminently unsatisfactory and proposal a new one“ apparently without Kashlulis and in 14 September 1923 it broke out again all communication with Mishun was cut off. The Company's labour and guards demanded final payment to evacuating the area (42).

Some of the English employees and staffs, including the Political Officer of the Company Lawson on their way to Genaveh (to obtain money for paying out) were fried and compelled to return fortunately unhurt. After managing to effect the majority of the payments, evacuated the area during the 15 and 16 September, “entailing the cessation of all work at the wells. There was little material damage to the Company's property. Some guards of Hayat Davudi were in Charge of stores” (43).

The Resident Director (Wilson) and the local officials of Anglo-Persian Oil Company were of opinion that the Kashkuli tribesmen (as opposed to the Khans) obeyed the order of Sowlat al-Dowleh in evacuating the area and he was encourage “in

his obstructiveness by the attitude of the Persian Government“. British authorities in the Legation were of opinion that Sowlat al-Dowleh was under pressure of Government to pay his heavy arrears of revenue, he created a diversion or possibly forces the Government revenue authorities to relax their pressure.

The authorities of the Oil Company in the south stated: It was quite evidence that all parties, Kashkuli Khans, Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Persian Government dislike the agreement and it was the origin of the trouble. They believed that Sowlat al-Dowleh intended that the subsidies should be placed in his hands to distribute among the Kashkuli Khans as suits him best and the Persian Government to share the spoil and “to seize the opportunity to influence in these tribal affairs” (44).

British Minister expressed his disagreement with the conclusion formulated by Colonel Knox on Persian Government involvement (45). Loraine in his cable to Foreign Office pointed out that Sowlat al-Dowleh and the Kashluli Khans have broken their Agreement with the Oil Company and the best course for the Company is to denounce both agreements and negotiate with the Central Government for a fresh agreement. He added the time is passed for such Local Agreements which annoy the Persian Government. The Company ought to grasp the present opportunity of getting rid of these two and give Reza Khan „chance of bringing to heed Soulet-ed-Dowleh whom I regard a thoroughly hostile and mischievous factor” (46). Two days later Curzon informed him: “I approve your view” (47).

Nichols, the Director of the Oil Company, wrote to Foreign Office that under the direct orders of Sowlat al-Dowleh, our European staffs drilling there were fired upon. They, with all their men, about 750 in number were force to leave for the coast of Genaveh and some of the staff being badly demoralised. Mohammareh office of the Company instructed their agent in Tehran to discuss with the British Minister “whether would be desirable to threaten the dispatch of Indian troops from Bushire” (48).

Loraine considered any threat about Indian troops unnecessary and unwise. He suggested asking Reza Khan to dispatch a detachment of Persian troops. Loraine in his report to Foreign Office mentioned of his communication with the Persian Government and the representative of the Company on this subject. He repeated that he is entirely opposed to such procedure (Indian troops). He added there are other ways setting the affairs satisfactory (49). Two days later Curzon informed Loraine that I approve your views (50). Meanwhile Reza Khan instructed Sowlat al-Dowleh to protect the Company’s work and employees. In reply to the letter of Foreign Office, the Directors

of the Oil Company in London approved the view of Loraine about the Persian troops, they, however, could not agree to open negotiations with the Persian Government a fresh agreement and they were not prepared to denounce the agreements with the Khans. The Directors of the Company pointed out that as „we are entirely dependent on them for labour’s supplies, etc.

Wilson proposed to make one more attempt to arrange matters with Sowlat al-Dowleh with the approval of the Company in London. The Company also instructed their agent in Tehran and through Foreign Office to ask Loraine “not to take any action in this matter without discussion and agreement with our (their) agent” (51). Curzon informed Loraine that the Company after consulting Dr. Young is strongly opposed to his proposal. They were previously informed of the Curzon, who shared the views of Loraine and Oil Company wished Loraine to know that they differed. Curzon added: “their reasons do not convince me” (52).

Meanwhile the Field's Manager of the Company visited the area of Bidkarz on September, 23, 1923. He reported that everything is quiet in Mishun and should continue to be so. Thirty Guards was arranged to protect the Company’s property from thieves. Heidar Khan of Bandar Rig (Hayat Davudi) sanctioned the Arrangement for his men to guard the Company’s property (53). Loraine, who realised that the views of Company’s representatives in Khuzestan formed the view of the Company, came into contact with Wilson. In his telegram, Loraine said: as you know I am principal opposed to local agreements. He pointed out that the Persian Government with its increased strength would never recognise them.

Loraine saw a way to regularise situation. His idea was for the Company to ask the Persian Government to provide protection for Bidkarz area. If they refuse to do so the Company can make claim for Government’s support of any agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh. If the Company make a revised agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh and leave the Persian Government out of account, you are persisting in a policy “which has given so much trouble over Kashgai Agreement” (54), Loraine added: it is the Persian Government and not Sowlat al-Dowleh, “who interested in future royalties“. Sowlat al-Dowleh “is traitorous and mischievous and will certainly try to play of Company against Central Government” (55).

The case of Sowlat al-Dowleh is not similar to Khaz’al and the Bakhtiyari Khans, who “have title to our good will”. Loraine believed that the Resident Director of the Company under-estimates the military and political power of Ministry of to deal with

Sowlat al-Dowleh, “storm is bound to break over Soulet’s head one day. Loraine repeated his advice and asked Wilson to give Persian Government their chance “if they refuse it then Company is free to make other arrangements” (56). The under Secretary, Lancelot Oliphant, wrote in his minute, Sowlat al-Dowleh “has been a scamp and it is importable that he will endeavour to defend the policy of the Oil Company in making this agreement.

By the D’Arcy concession the Persian Government were bound to protect the Company where ever they chose to bore. “I asked whether the Company had ever specifically mentioned to the Persian Government their intention of exploiting at Bidkarz and he was unable to state that they had done so, this all supports Sir Loraine’s agreements” (57). Loraine added: If the Persian Government accept responsibility protection, they are clearly liable for damage caused, “but if as had happened now, damage occurs under arrangements of which they disapprove they will certainly resent and reject claims for compensation, and with show reason (58).

Two days later, Loraine informed his superiors in London that the Resident Directors of the Company were instructed to insist on Sowlat al-Dowleh accepting responsibility for recent incident. Loraine anticipated that Sowlat al-Dowleh declines and negotiation would break down; these would be no alternative except to ask the Central Government to protect borings under Article 14 (59). In accordance with the request of Loraine, a copy of his telegram to Wilson was enclosed to a letter and sent to the Directors of the Oil Company in London.

In a letter, Oliphant wrote, that the Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon, endorses strongly the opinion of Loraine in his telegram to Wilson (60). As it was mentioned, Loraine intended to make a journey personally to Khuzestan. Nichols wrote to Oliphant, with regard to the telegram of Loraine of 2 October 1923, on further consideration, the Company instructed their agent in Tehran to apply to the Persian Government for protection of Oil Company’s property and staff in Bidkarz in accordance to the concession.

The Company, however, stands committed to Sowlat al-Dowleh and Kashkuli khans by agreements in which the Company undertook to give annual subsidies and also 3% of the share capital of any Company to work oil in Bidkarz. This agreement concluded in the presence of British Consuls and registered at the Residency or consulate. Though, they applied to the Persian Government for protection, they considered responsibility should be placed entirely on Sowlat al-Dowleh. Their

conciliation by the Company “without definite proof of violation by the other side” would be regarded as breach of faith and damage the Company and British reputation and prestige among the tribes (61).

“We (the Oil Company) are not certain even now to what extent, if any, Soulet is involved“. He added: It is true that the agreement should be ratifying by the Persian Government; “but in dealing with native chiefs we do not consider it desirable to take up the technical attitude that without such ratification the agreement is invalid (62). The Company intended to point out to Sowlat al-Dowleh that “his failure to protect operations has left no other course” open to Company (63).

The A.P.O.C. also hesitated to take the initiative in setting aside its agreement with Sowlat al-Dowleh, “for it after transferring the protection of its operations to the Persian Government, the latter failed to take effective measures“ (64), “The Company would be worse off than before and have in addition to face the resentment of the powerful Qashqa’is chief.“ By the beginning of October, the Oil Company came round to the view held by the British Minister and applied to the Persian Government for protection (65).

The Directors of the Company were not certain which policy the company should follow. Wilson urged that someone from British Legation should visit him then. It would have helpful and reassuring effect. Loraine suggested to the British Foreign Secretary it would be most useful if he personally goes to Khuzestan to his discretion as regard situation here (66). Curzon approved and authorised him “to explain the risk which their present attitude as regard Soulet (Sowlat al-Dowleh) may entail.” (67).

The preparation of Sir P. Loraine’s journey to the south at the end of summer and the begin of autumn 1923 coincided with the new efforts of the Minister of War , who intended to bring the whole Persian civil administration under his supervision and consolidate his position in Tehran. Loraine, who was convinced of Reza Khan Centralisation policy’s success at least since May 1923, participated actively in this project.

He intended to persuade the Resident Directors of the A.P.O.C. and the southern British consulates (appointed by the Government of India) towards a new attitude about Persian Government and pacify Sheikh Khaz’al in Khuzestan. It was difficult for Persian Government to confront with two British tribal policies. Loraine had to deal with some other issues in Khuzestan and Iraq. Before leaving for the south, he had consulted and co-ordinated with Reza Khan.

10.5. Reza Khan and Consolidation of Power

Reza Khan, the military commander of the coup d'état in February 1921, was appointed the Commander of Cossack Division and two months later also the Minister of War in the cabinet. After the fall of Coup Cabinet at the end of June 1921, Reza Khan kept his position as the Minister of War in all following cabinets for more than four years.

The political movements and the tribal unrest's were suppressed in 1921-1923 in the northern provinces and then in the south. The authority of the Central Government was gradually re-established even in remote areas of the country. Reza Khan expanded the size of Cossack force, then, he organised a uniform modern army based on available modern forces. As a result of the victory of the army against movements and tribal unrest in the provinces and the station of the military forces throughout the country, the military commanders appeared as a new power in local and provincial politics and Reza Khan, the commander in chief of the army, became the most powerful man in the country (68).

10.5.1. Internal Power Struggle

In summer 1923, Reza Khan continued to consolidate his position by the extension of his authority in Tehran. He began to challenge the power of the Shah, Crown Prince, the Prime Minister and the shadow cabinet's leaders. It was a tradition in the Qajar Court to send the Crown Prince to Tabriz. During the summer 1923, Ahmad Shah, who was anxious of his future and the rapid growth of Reza Khan's power, intended to revive this tradition and send the Crown Prince Mohammad Hassan Mirza, to Tabriz as the governor-general in Azarbaijan. The Shah sent a decree in July 1923 to the cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh. After the approval of Cabinet, the date of Crown Prince's departure in August was announced. Suddenly, the Minister of War opposed to the journey of the Crown Prince. He was stopped by Reza Khan from proceeding to Tabriz, to prevent a possible tribal resistance to his power.

Ahmad Shah was afraid of his future. He prepared to pay another visit to Europe to escape from "possibly final humiliation". Moshir al-Dowleh, the Prime Minister, and the other constitutionalists endeavoured to persuade the Shah to stay in Tehran and

support the cabinet. The frightened Shah rejected this proposal. It was rumoured that Ahmad Shah would appoint again Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh, the only man, who was able to challenge the power of Reza Khan, as the chief of cabinet before leaving for Europe (69).

Suddenly, on 8 October 1923, Ahmad Khan Qavam al-Saltaneh, the former Prime Minister, was arrested by the order of the Minister for War. He was alleged to have plotted against the Minister of War. Ahmad Shah, however, obtained from Reza Khan the promise that he would take no step against Qavam's life without the Shah consent.

The same day, Sir Percy Loraine was leaving Tehran for Baghdad and Ahvaz that he was informed of the arrest of Qavam al-Saltaneh. Two weeks later, Qavam al-Saltaneh was exiled to Europe. At the same time Reza Khan put pressure on Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh, to resign. Moshir al-Dowleh, who did not succeed to persuade the Shah to stay in Tehran, doubted to be able to run the affairs of the country in the absence of Shah and Majles. Loraine had returned from Khuzestan to the capital that Moshir al-Dowleh resigned in 22 October 1923 (70).

While British Minister was in his journey to the south giving also help to facilitate the situation for the Central Government, Reza Khan removed two Persian Statesmen, Moshir al-Dowleh and Qavam al-Saltaneh, from power stage. He forced Ahmad Shah to appoint him as the chief of the Persian council. No one prepared to accept the premiership. With the mediation of Loraine, who had returned from Khuzestan, Ahmad Shah received first a written guarantee for his safety in the Persian soil, then, inevitably, the frightened Shah appointed Reza Khan as the new Prime Minister. Reza Khan introduced his cabinet first and then accompanied the Shah to the port of Anzali. In his report of the events to Foreign Office, Loraine considered: Reza Khan "a man with a strong and definite will" and "there is a chance of the country's affairs being put fairly straight" (71).

10.6. Reza Khan and Sir P. Loraine

As a result of occupation of the Persian territory during the war and afterwards and British interference in the Persian Affairs, there were "for a good many years a certain hostility to Great Britain". With the fall of Seyyed Zia al-Din the hostility reached to its maximum point for almost two and half years, wrote Havard, British

Oriental Secretary. He added: "Government after Government made no attempt to stem that hostility" and "some of them even covertly abetted "In addition to the public, the Persian press and the parliament had a critical view on British policy in Persia.

In these two and half years, Reza Khan indicated to the British authorities in the Legation in Tehran that he is the only person who is able to bring the security to the country, suppress the Bolsheviks and other movements in Persia. Reza Khan developed his relation with the British Legation, particularly with Sir Percy Loraine, the British Minister in Tehran, 1921-1926. Loraine and the other members of the Legation such as oriental secretary, Godfrey Havard and Military Attaché, Colonel Saunders admired the centralisation policy of Reza Khan.

The Shalil incident at the end of July 1922 indicated to the British authorities that the Persian Government determines to re-establish his authority throughout the country as well as south-west of Persia. Loraine realised that the interests of British in Persia and the region would secure by a friendly powerful Central Government (72). In discussion with British diplomats in Tehran, Reza Khan repeated in several occasions that he prepares to take the responsibility for the safety of the oil-fields in the south.

A solid and durable Central Government gradually was established in Tehran. Reza Khan consolidated the army and his position between the summer 1922-1923 and his policy was to bring the southern tribes under direct control of the Central Government. Now, British Minister was of opinion, it was convenient for Britain to deal with one central authority rather than with a pack of local chieftains (73).

After certain fluctuation between the Central Government and the British Legation on stationing of army detachments, Reza Khan and Loraine reached to a compromise on this matter. Reza Khan agreed to go slowly in the south and act in harmony with the British Legation particularly in Khuzestan and Bakhtiari land, where the security of oil-fields, pipelines and refinery was in question. In respond, Loraine and the British Legation supported Reza Khan. They facilitated the situation in the south and in relation with the pro-British tribal chieftains such as Bakhtiari Khans, Qavam al-Molk and Sheikh Khaz'al. Even, Loraine justified and minimised the unconstitutional manner of the Minister of War the (74).

10.7. Loraine and the Southern Question

As a result of almost 15 months-August 1922 -November 1923-close co-operation of the Minister for War with the British Minister in relation to the Central Government's tribal policy in Khuzestan and oil-fields, Loraine did his best to convince Lord Curzon and the Foreign Office that the best course to the British interests in Persia lay on a co-operation with the centralisation policy of the Persian Government and the leadership of Reza Khan.

Loraine did endeavour to convince the British military and political agents in the south as well as the Directors of the Oil Company to a new approach in Persian policy in general and tribal policy in particular. It was clear to Loraine that Reza Khan is an ambitious man. Loraine supported him in various forms in Tehran and neutralised the pro-British chieftains throughout the country. For this reason he decided to go to Khuzestan himself in October 1923.

The journey of Loraine was planned to be coincided with the arrival of the first Persian detachment to Khuzestan. He intended to pacify personally Sheikh Khaz'al and the Resident Bakhtiyari Khans as well as British military and diplomatic authorities in the south and the Resident Directors of the Oil Company in Khuzestan. He also prepared to discuss with British High Commissioner in Baghdad on defense of the oil-fields and Shi'ah U'lama of Iraq.

In addition to pacification of Khaz'al on the gradual presence of the Government's troops in Khuzestan, the payment of his taxation as well as the defense of the oil-fields were the other subjects of discussion in Loraine's journey to Khuzestan. On 8 October 1923 Sir Percy Loraine left Tehran for a visit to Khuzestan. The time of his departure, the affairs of Sheikh Khaz'al reached to a rather crucial stage. The Persian Government under the guidance of the centralising policy inaugurated and pursued by the army campaign under the Minister of War and the support of the cabinet, statesmen, and the parliament as well as press and public.

It was for some time seeking to exert a more direct authority over Khuzestan and the question of sending Government's troops to the north of Khuzestan was about eighteen months. Sheikh Khaz'al saw in this policy a tendency to diminish his own authority and to encroach on the special rights as regards jurisdiction, taxation granted to him in a series of Farmans delivered by Mozaffar al Din Shah (1896-1907).

Sheikh Khaz'al relying on the secret written assurances given to him as a Persian subject in 1914 by Sir Percy Cox, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf counted on British support to resist to any dispatch of Government's troops to Khuzestan and his apprehensions on this subject, fostered by many of his (Cronies) advisers had been growing for some time and it brought to ahead by the dispatch of troops to Shushtar at the end of September 1923 (75).

Though, the Persian Government was aware of close relation between Sheikh Khaz'al and British Government, but apparently they did not know of the nature of the relation. It appears as the Minister of War and the Persian Government understood of assurance, the cabinets decided to station troops in Khuzestan. In order to prevent of British pretext and objection to the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan, the Persian Government agreed to the conditions that Minister of War given written assurances that the troops would not be used against Sheikh Khaz'al or to disturb the existing state of thing in Khuzestan. Furthermore British Foreign Secretary directed Sir P. Loraine, a similar assurance from the Prime Minister as representation the Persian Government.

The request was made by Loraine in spring 1923, when Mostowfi al-Mamalek was Prime Minister. Both, Prime Minister and Minister of War agreed to it in principle, however, it was inconvenient that he should give assurances direct to a foreign representative about a part of Persian territory. It was, therefore, decided to send a suitable telegram to Sheikh Khaz'al and Curzon did not raise any object to this compromise (76).

Meanwhile Moshir al Dowleh succeeded to Mostowfi al-Mamalek and formed the new cabinet in middle of June 1923. As a result of communication of Moshir al-Dowleh with Reza Khan, the dispatch of troops to Khuzestan postponed for another two or three months and they informed Loraine accordingly. In September 1923, the preparations were being made to send a detachment from the Isfahan Division to Khuzestan. Loraine reminded the two Ministers of assurance's letters.

After some discussions Reza Khan agreed to send a draft of the letter to Loraine and asked him to make suitable alterations which it was substantially embodied and Loraine received the final text and a cordial telegram sent by the Prime Minister to Sheikh Khaz'al just before the departure of British Minister for Khuzestan. In the last interview with the Minister of War , Loraine stated he had made a considerable impression on Sheikh Khaz'al to make peace with Tehran particularly with Reza Khan,

though this was somewhat contrary to the Sheikh's tradition, Loraine believed that it is advisable if Reza Khan act in a similar manner. Reza Khan said that this proposal corresponds with his own view (77).

10.7.1. Loraine in Khuzestan

In the course of his visit to Khuzestan, Loraine saw twice Khaz'al. On arriving in Ahvaz in 13 October 1923, after consultation with British Consul who was well acquainted with Khaz'al's habits of mind, received him after mutual compliments. Khaz'al proceeded to re-count his services to the British Government during the war in return he asked for no reward except that he might be allowed to enjoy unmolested the position which he had held in Arabistan for so long (78).

He was apprehension about his position and jurisdiction in future and was greatly perturbed (79). Sheikh Khaz'al told the British Minister that for the last two years he was full of anxiety of the intentions of the Central Government towards him. Sheikh believed that the Government received exaggerated reports of his wealth, but they did not take account the vast expenditure entailed in maintenance law and order in his territory, southern Khuzestan, and in discharging his important responsibilities towards the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

He could not remain in Khuzestan with his prestige diminished and his authority undermined. He would lease or sell his properties and retire some part of the world under British protection (80). Loraine explained British policy in Persia, to which the friends of the British Government in Persia should be friends of Persian Government. Only so could the interests of both be protected without continual friction. Then, he pointed out of his efforts in Tehran and repeated conversations with Reza Khan in which the Minister of War harboured no sinister intention towards the Sheikh (81).

Finally, Reza Khan sent a written assurance letter in which he repeated orally during the last few months. Sheikh Khaz'al said that he put no faith in Persian Government's promises. Loraine asked the sheikh whether he expected the British Government to go to war with Persia to maintain the semi-independence position of him. Sheikh Khaz'al replied he did not wish to be a source of embarrassment to the British Government, but he felt bound to inform British Minister of War his fears. For the rest, he would carry out loyally any instructions which British Minister gives him. If

he found underline his authority by the representative of the Minister of War, he would at once inform British Minister to find a solution (82).

By the end of the interview, Loraine concluded that Sheikh Khaz'al appeared become completely reassured. Loraine, as previously planned, left him a few days and went to visit Meydan-e Naftun, to reflect on what he had said and informs him of his decision on his return. Meanwhile the Minister of War sent a letter to Loraine. He assured that the arrival of Persian troops in Khuzestan would not weaken the position of Khaz'al, or disturb the operations in the oil-fields. This letter was that support of Loraine argument with Khaz'al and the local authorities of the Oil Company.

Reza Khan wrote: "owing to especial interest taken by you in preservation of order in Arabistan and in view of safety of Anglo-Persian Oil Company", my principal object in sending troops to Arabistan is to maintain order in that province. The local tribes will not be molested as long as they fulfil their obligations to Persian Government and Sheikh Khaz'al will be doubt support and appreciation of Minister of War by his future loyal services. Officer Commanding troop has been especially instructed to prevent Sheikh Khaz'al's local enemies from using arrival of troops to their own evil advantage (83).

On 16 October 1923, Loraine in a return call paid to Sheikh Khaz'al. This time sheikh asked him to give explicit instructions as he should pursue. Loraine succeeded in convincing him (or he had no other choice) that the best policy would be to maintain on good terms with the Persian Government and especially with the Minister of War who was the real power in Persia (84). Khaz'al informed Loraine of his meeting with Colonel Baqer Khan, the Officer Commanding the Government troops in Shushtar the previous day. Khaz'al showed the Colonel the letters and telegrams of the Prime Minister and the Minister of War. Baqer Khan replied: "these are exactly the same as his own instructions. Baqer Khan said the Minister of War intended to send an officer to Ram Hormoz to be attached.

To the Bakhtiyari Deputy-Governor there and a second officer to Ahvaz to act in a similar capacity. Then, he asked the Sheikh if he would raise any objection to the presence of a Persian officer at Ahvaz. Sheikh Khaz'al replied that the Minister of War had hitherto insisted of sending detachment at Shushtar if an officer was sent to Ahvaz, it would lead to a misinterpretation of the Government's intentions and might cause trouble.

Sheikh Khaz'al wished to meet and acquainted the Minister of War. He added: he would like to see Reza Khan at Falahiye, and he would send one of his sons to Bushehr to bring the Minister of War to Mohammareh by sheikh's private ship. "A successful interview would clearly afford the best chance for Khaz'al secure his own position" (85). Sheikh Khaz'al was perturbed at the Bakhtiyari situation. He anticipated the tribal fighting in the vicinity of Malamir in winter if the Chahar Lang situation was not strengthened out in mean time.

British Minister agreed with him that the Chahar Lang and Janaki Khan to remain under Haft Lang Ilkhani and Ilbegi. Sheikh Khaz'al accepted Loraine suggestion to write the Haft Lang's khans urging them to do nothing rash, but await the peaceful settlement. In fact, Sheikh Khaz'al had anxiety to be placed in the position of Haft Lang's khans and to encourage his suppressed rivals in Khuzestan. British Minister warned Sheikh Khaz'al no reliance in Amir Mojahed whose daughter was betrothed to Sardar Ajal, the son of Khaz'al. He asked sheikh not to ally with the other Bakhtiyari Khans and the chiefs in Lorestan where the Persian Government was fighting against the tribes to open Tehran-Ahvaz road.

They discussed about the participation of sheikh in Arab chiefs in Kuwait, about tribesmen resided in Basreh, his recent visit with King Feisal and the wish of British Minister that Sardar Ajal to be elected and the request of sheikh the extend of Loraine good office to Seyyed Hassan Khan, the agent of Khaz'al in Tehran. Sheikh Khaz'al also offered to pay the cost of two armoured cars to the army (86). Loraine succeeded to pacify Khaz'al on arrival of Government detachment to the north of Khuzestan and prepared him to pay his arrears and present taxation. Loraine asked Khaz'al to keep on good terms with Central Government as well as the Bakhtiyari Khans.

10.7.2. Security of the Oilfields

British Minister examined also the question of military defense of the oil-fields during his visit in Khuzestan. In fact, security of the oil-fields was maintained by the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al "whose revenue were to a great extent, derived from subsidies received from" the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. The evacuation of British force from Khuzestan and the efforts of the Persian Government in spring and summer 1922 to send a detachment of regular troops to Khuzestan was alarmed the

Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al, who feared the loss of position, rights and possibly loss of property.

After the submission of Bakhtiyari Khans to the terms of Reza Khan in May 1923 (as a result of the terms imposed as punishment for the Shalil incident in end July 1922) was followed by discussing the dispatch of a detachment of regular troops to Shushtar in the north of Khuzestan in which finally happened in September 1923. This step represented the commencement of penetration by the Central Government into Arabistan (87).

“With a view to gaining eventually complete civil and military control of the province“, should hostilities take place between Khaz'al, his allies and the Government troops, “the result should be serious damage to the Oil Company's property, possibly stoppage of work and even loss of life amongst employees” (88).

British diplomatic representative in Tehran participated actively in negotiations between the Persian Government and Sheikh Khaz'al during the summer 1923 “with a view to assuring security for the oil-fields” and assurances were given to Khaz'al that no steps would be taken to interfere with his position and rights. At the same time the defense of the oil fields in emergency's time was a subject of many discussions among the related departments of the British Government and the A.P.O.C. for many years.

10.7.3. Defence Committee

On 24 May 1922 the sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defense agreed a qualified promise of military assistance prepared by the Air staff in Iraq was sufficient to meet the needs of military protection of the Persian oil-fields (the maximum assistance consisted one squadron of air craft based on Shaibad with possible reinforcements from Baghdad), two companies of infantry and a section of armoured cars. It was contemplated a local volunteer force from the European employees of the A.P.O.C. (this proposal, however, was not adopted) (89). The assistance from Iraq rendered if the Air Officer Commanding considered the situation there would not be endangered and men or material should at once be replaced from India or elsewhere.

Under the changed conditions and the raise of the question on sending regular troops to Khuzestan again on 30 May 1923, Sir Henry Dobb, the High Commissioner of Iraq indicated in his dispatch that the British authorities in Iraq could not as hither to accept liability for the defense of the Persian oil-fields. The reduced military garrison in

Iraq would be unable to provide sufficient troops to deal with the situation and should be obtained at short notice from elsewhere (90).

The defense of the oil-fields became a question of Imperial responsibility and it was clear that in an emergency arise, the responsibility for dealing with it should be allocated to a British Military Authority, who had his plans carefully prepared beforehand. With regard to the limitation of British Air Force in Iraq, British consul in Ahvaz revised his view of 15 May 1923 and suggested: British Government should store five to ten thousand arms and a large quantity of ammunition in Basreh, by emergency arises, they should equip the friendly chiefs and Khaz'al. He was of opinion that these would be great opposition from many Arab chiefs against British (91).

In July 1923, the Air Officer Commanding in Iraq reported the Persian troops engaged in operations against the Lor, but the relation between the Persian Government and the Bakhtiyari khans and Sheikh Khaz'al remain cordial, but the Air Staff considered that the Persian Government intends to bring the Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al into subjection. The situation was not entirely stable. The entrance of the Persian troops to Bakhtiyari land and Khuzestan would endanger the oil-fields and the pipelines.

The Air Staff were of opinion that the definite plans for the security of the oil-fields should be prepared. The Air Officer Commanding in Iraq suggested in the event of serious trouble between the Persian Government and the Bakhtiyaris "a force of four and half Battalions, two sections of Armoured cars and supporting air craft will be necessary for the adequate protection of the area" and that as the garrison of Iraq could not safely be depleted by four and half Battalions the question assumes an Imperial rather than a local aspect" (92).

The High Commissioner in Baghdad concurred the proposal of the Air Officer Commanding to the Air Ministry dated 4 July 1923. British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine, received a copy of Sir John Salmond's proposals (93). Loraine concurred these proposals too with the exception that volunteer force should be organised from among the employees of the Oil Company. Foreign Office was already aware of the political reasons of undesirability of such a force (94).

10.7.4. An oil Session

British Legation was in correspondence on this subject with Foreign Office. Sir Percy Loraine also participated in a session during his journey to Khuzestan. He was accompanied by Colonel Saunders, the British Military Attaché in Tehran and was joined by Sir John Salmond, Air Officer Commanding in Chief in Iraq, and members of his staff, Managing Director of the Oil Company accompanied the party to the oil-fields.

Loraine was still in Khuzestan that he sent his suggestion to Foreign Office on military protection of the oil fields: (a) Additional troops material required should be provided by the military authorities in India. (b) The responsibility for the collection of military intelligence in Khuzestan to remain as hitherto with Air Officer Commanding in Iraq. (c) British consul in Ahvaz was the authority empowered to apply to the High Commissioner in Baghdad, in case of emergency. (d) The liability for the defense of the oil-fields should be rest upon the High Commissioner in Baghdad and the Air Officer Commanding in Iraq. (e) A.O.C. should be responsible for formulating plans to deal with any emergency (95).

The Air Staff were in agreement with the views of Loraine except as regard points (d) and (e) above. "The liability for the defense of the oil-fields and responsibility for formulating plans". "Should be a definite Imperial responsibility" and as such should be examined by the C.I.D. Air Officer Commanding was only in a position to provide a limited number of air crafts during minor disturbances (96). Loraine endeavoured also to harmonise the policy of High Commissioner in Baghdad with the Persian Government.

10.7.5. Loraine - Wilson Discussion

As it was previous pages mentioned, with the permission of Curzon, Loraine made a journey to Khuzestan. Before his departure, he informed Foreign Office: "Things seem calm for the moment and I propose to start October the 8th. Wilson has accepted my view regarding Sowlat al-Dowleh (Soulet) and instructed Tehran representative to make application to Persian Government for protection of Bidkarz operations. London Office of the Oil Company has, however, directed Mr. Fairley to defer action pending further instruction which have not arrived" (97) .

In his visit to Khuzestan, Loraine discussed with Arnold Wilson and the other local British authorities in the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. He discussed the new

condition in Tehran. Loraine suggested them to rely more and more on Central Government's force for protection and security instead the chiefs of the tribes. Loraine returned to Tehran on 21 of October. The following day, he informed Foreign Office of his success in persuading the authorities of the Oil Company as well as Sheikh Khaz'al in relation to the Minister of War and the Central Government.

He stated: the A.P.O.C. are now less apprehensive and they applied to the Persian Government for protection at Bidkarz and: They are in discussing and communication for the necessary arrangement with the Persian authorities in Shiraz and Tehran (98). The view of Loraine was based on the new situation in Persia. He argued that at the time of the first agreement was made in October 1921 the Persian Government had neither the strength nor the necessary prestige to protect effectively the area. Today, however, "the Persian Government possess of the necessary qualifications", and they regard the agreements with tribal chieftains "as derogatory to their own authority" (99).

Loraine considered that it is more convenient and more practical for the Company to deal directly with the Central Government and the army organisation of the Government (have the power to protect the Bidkarz operations) and in the near future the Central Government become stronger rather weaker and they intend to disarm the civil population including the tribes in the coming year, if they succeed, their supreme authority over the country will be consulted and "unique in the modern history of Persia".

"If, these be any weakening or collapse of the Central Government British power would be again become the only real on in southern Persia" (100). With regard to the past record of Sowlat al-Dowleh, wrote Loraine, he "is fundamentally ill-disposed towards British interests", and Loraine was glad that the Oil Company should sever its connection with him (101), who is "utterly reliable and unscrupulous".

Loraine disagreed with the view of Colonel Knox, the Political Resident, that Sowlat al-Dowleh was encouraged by the Persian Government in his obstructiveness towards the Company's operations. Loraine wrote: it is more than likely that Sowlat al-Dowleh himself circulated this idea. He is threatened with heavy demands for arrears of taxation and with the disarmament of his tribesmen. He did whatever he could to confuse the issue and to exhibit his own power.

Major Greenhouse, the representative of the Oil Company went to Shiraz and negotiated with the Governor-General in Fars, Firouz Mirza Nosrat al-Dowleh. Loraine was of opinion that the Governor-General in Fars "appeared unwilling to state clearly

with whom the responsibility for the protection of the borings rested, Loraine had several conversations with the Minister of War on this question. Since his return on 21 October 1923 from Khuzestan. He asked a clear understanding on this point. The Minister of War informed him that the Persian Government accepts the responsibility.

An officer and dozen men would be sent from Shiraz to Mishun and he will recruit a local guard of some fifty or sixty men to ensure the permanent security for borings. Reza Khan asked the Oil Company communicate only with this officer, who will be responsible to the Minister of War (102). A month later, Loraine sent new information on this matter.

Consul Chick informed him that a military officer and two men went to Bidkarz to control "all guarding arrangement, including the tribal guards sent by Sowlat al-Dowleh. From Chick viewpoint Sowlat al-Dowleh has come off "too lightly in view of the disturbance which he created Loraine shared this view, but he thought", "this mischievous and revengeful turn for suppression will be in the spring, and now we (British) have gained our main point" at Bidkarz.

He thought, "It is not necessary to press the case further against Sowlat al-Dowleh and preferable to await the action of Tehran in settling accounts with this ruffian" (103). The Central Government undertook to take a written guarantee from Sowlat al-Dowleh and his son, Nasser Khan, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, for the future safety of the operation. The Government had no objection to the Company making a new arrangement with Sowlat al-Dowleh "as regards the land where the Company's operations were being carried on" (104).

10.8. Result of Loraine's Journey

After his return to Tehran, on 21 October 1923 immediately Sir P. Loraine arranged a meeting with the Minister of War. He gave Reza Khan a brief account of his visit of Khaz'al. Reza Khan expressed his profound gratitude for the action of Loraine action and the results were entirely in accordance with his desires. The Minister of War accepted the personal visit of Khaz'al in Khuzestan and welcomes the arrival of Sardar Ajal, the son of Khaz'al to Tehran as deputy to the fifth Majless. He also accepted the cost of the two armoured cars from sheikh. Reza Khan promised to find a solution to the Chahar Lang question in accordance to the wishes of Loraine and Khaz'al (105).

Reza Khan added: if Khaz'al "came towards the government in a spirit of sincere friendship and loyal co-operation" and "if paid his revenue in a manner satisfactory to the government, he would see it that Khaz'al continued in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges conferred on him by his Farmans" (106). Loraine had discussed this matter with Khaz'al as he visited Khuzestan.

10.9. Summary

- (1) The Persian Government stationed the army detachments in the provinces of Fars, Isfahan and the Persian Gulf coast in 1922 and re-established her position even in the remote districts. This action caused a great anxiety to the southern chieftains including Sheikh Khaz'al.
- (2) Again and this time the High Commissioner in Baghdad, Sir Percy Cox, in his return to England, conveyed the message of Khaz'al to purchase arms and ammunition. Cox like the British consulates in southern Persia and the Persian Gulf supported the old British tribal policy and endeavoured to equip southern tribes particularly Sheikh Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans. He caused a new round of discussion on this subject among the related departments.
- (3) British Legation in Tehran was the witness of the increasingly consolidation of the Persian Government and the expansion of Persian army. British Minister was of opinion that with a strong Central Government, the British interests would better safeguard.
- (4) Beside that, British Minister stated: the Minister of War has never shown indifference to established British interests and he has at all events lied to us.
- (5) British Foreign Secretary preferred to have different alternatives simultaneously. He supported the re-establishment of the Central Government in the northern provinces, but he wished British prestige and interests in the south would not harm.
- (6) The question of arms purchasing postponed, but the British Minister came into negotiation with the Minister of War on steadily consultation on southern questions.
- (7) The Minister of War prepared a detachment in Isfahan to send through Bakhtiyari land again. Finally in September 1923, he dispatched a detachment to north Khuzestan via Bakhtiyari route. Some weeks later the detachment arrived in Khuzestan. This was the new begin of presence of the Persian Army in Khuzestan.
- (8) The British Minister, who realised that the centralisation process was unavoidable, prepared to go personally to Khuzestan to convince the British officials and tribal chieftains to co-operation with the Persian Government.

- (9) The incident in Bidkarz between Qashqa'is disrupted the activities of the Oil Company in September 1923, was additional factor for a direct talk with the Resident Director of the Oil Company on the question of its future relation with southern tribal chieftains.
- (10) In summer 1923, the Minister of War, who organised several Divisions and Brigades and stationed Persian troops throughout the country established his position in Tehran. He challenged the power of the Shah and Crown Prince as well as the political personalities.
- (11) When Sir Percy Loraine in Khuzestan pacified and persuades the southern consulates, the high ranking resident authorities in the Oil Company, Sheikh Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans not to oppose to the process of centralisation and co-operate with the Persian Government.
- (12) Reza Khan succeeded to checkmate his political rivals. A few days after the return of Loraine to Tehran, Reza Khan was appointed as Prime Minister and Ahmad Shah left for Europe.

XI: The South between Two Autumns 1923-1924

11.1. Khuzestan in Autumn 1923

The Persian Government intended to extend the authority of Central Government in Khuzestan similar to the other provinces by stationing troops and sending civil officials to the various Governments' administrations. Shalil incident caused that the Parliament, press and the public paid more attention to the affairs of Khuzestan particularly Khaz'al. The Persian Government considered that the situation in Khuzestan was not so easy as in Fars and Isfahan. The Minister of War started to station the army detachments in the neighbouring provinces to Khuzestan, Kermanshah, Lorestan and Posht-kuh as well as Bushehr and Behbahan.

The tribal resistance to the government's troops was broken one after the other and made an effort to open the routes from these provinces to Khuzestan. As it has mentioned, after almost fifteen months finally a detachment of 300 men arrived in Khuzestan in October 1923 and stationed in Dezful and Shushtar. At the end of the same month Reza Khan formed his first cabinet. As a result of political obstacles, the cabinet did not want to dispatch more troops to Khuzestan at this juncture.

It was, however, decided to empower a governorship and to re-establish a powerful and respectable Justice department to show the authority of Central Government to the public and perform law and order. With the approval of Reza Khan, the Prime Minister, Ahmad Kasravi Tabrizi, the reformer scholar, was appointed as the head of the Justice department in Khuzestan. His headquarters was in Shushtar. The cabinet approved to revive the old name of the province, Khuzestan in 1923. The Minister of War justice instructed Kasravi to use the paper marked province of Khuzestan in his correspondence (1).

The Cabinet authorised and empowered Kasravi in his post with additional rights. In a short meeting before his departure for Khuzestan, Reza Khan told Kasravi that the department of justice in Khuzestan should be as respectable as the British on the other side of Shat al-Arab in Iraq (2). The centre of administration's offices in Khuzestan was divided between Ahvaz and Shushtar. It was intended to place gradually all of them in Ahvaz, in the middle of Khuzestan. Such steps caused a great anxiety of Sheikh

Khaz'al who had done his best to keep away the authorities of the Central Government in Khuzestan by bribery and threat of Government's officials.

11.2. Khaz'al in Autumn 1923

For more than two decades, Sheikh Khaz'al expanded his influence in southern and centre of Khuzestan and even to certain extends to the north part of the province. With his loyal co-operation with British army during the Great, Khaz'al expected after the British triumph, his power and prestige would be enhancing in Khuzestan. Then, he dreamed to achieve to the kingdom of Iraq. None of them materialised.

Even his power in southern Khuzestan was jeopardised by a series of events. The departure of British troops from Khuzestan in 1919-1920, the withdrawal of British political representatives from Shushtar and Dezful in 1922-23. The strengthen of Central Government, the rise of Reza Khan and finally the dispatch of army detachments first to Shushtar and then Behbahan filled him alarm and despondency (3).

Khaz'al was opposed to the arrival of the Persian Government's troops even to the north of Khuzestan. He was convincing that at any moment the Persian Government could foment disturbances in his territory and for his overthrow (4). The Persian Government would enable to encroach his hereditary rights and privileges. "Without his being able to lift a finger in his own defence".

"It needed finally a personal visit from Sir Percy Loraine, British Minister, to Ahvaz in October 1923 to convince him, albeit reluctantly, that the safest course was to become the "friend of our (British) friend". Finally, he was compelled in November 1923 to pay his arrears and to undertake to pay in the future "a revenue nearly three times as great as he had paid before the War" (5). The situation was not pleasant for Sheikh Khaz'al, but apparently, he thought if he under takes certain demands of the Central Government, he could keep his position and he expected that the British Government would guarantee his autonomy.

11.2.1. Khaz'al and Taxation

Khaz'al had not paid his taxes for some years. On the year 1920 Sir P. Cox, the British Minister in Tehran, negotiated Khaz'al on behalf. Vothuq al-Dowleh, the

Persian Prime Minister agreed to waive the arrears of revenue unpaid during the war and to set them off against his war expenditure. Vothuq al Dowleh agreed to such favourable settlement due to his friendly attitude to the British interests and the financial and military support of the British Government. The cabinet, however, refused to ratify that settlement.

In summer 1921, Captain Peel, the British consul in Ahvaz, negotiated for him with the Prime Minister Qavam al Saltaneh. Khaz'al refused a somewhat less favourable settlement, however, satisfactory. There was a great difference between the Finance Ministry and Khaz'al on the tax matter. According to Khaz'al, he held clear receipts for all revenues up to March 1920. He claimed as sanctioned, after deductions, he owed only 24.000T for the two years ending March 1922.

Khaz'al communicated with the American Finance Adviser regarding amount for the year ending March 1923. Loraine intended to facilitate the tax question of Khaz'al. He came into contact with the American Adviser, Arthur Chester Millspaugh, in Charge of direct revenues. Millspaugh pointed out to the British Minister that the claim of the Persian Government is very considerable and the clearances of Khaz'al are of doubtful validity. Loraine also doubted "whether Khaz'al's papers will stand very close investigation and he anticipated that the Persian Government will have a strong case"(6).

During the summer 1923, as Moshir al-Dowleh chaired the cabinet, the Ministry of Finance continued its investigation and matter reached a deadlock. British Minister persuades the Persian Government to find a definite solution on this question. He suggested the appointment Colonel McCormack, one of the American advisers, whose ability and impartiality had Loraine full confidence, to go to Khuzestan and come to a direct agreement with Khaz'al.

In his visit to Khuzestan, in October 1923, Loraine spoke very earnestly to Khaz'al on this subject. He was convinced that his language impressed Khaz'al to come to terms. Loraine returned from Khuzestan, the cabinet crisis came about and Reza Khan formed the new cabinet and the decision of previous cabinet to dispatch Colonel MacCormack on the Mission to Khuzestan was maintained. In fact, the reason that the British Minister desired the selection of MacCormack was that he treated the question of the Bakhtiyari revenue with the happy result. As the British consul in Ahvaz, Peel, during his visit to Tehran at the end of the summer 1923, explained to MacCormack the whole circumstances in relation to the Sheikh Khaz'al affairs as well as Bakhtiyari

question which resulted the warm mutual feeling sprung up between them, said Loraine (7).

In spite of this fact, British Minister thought it is advisable to speak to Colonel MacCormack personally before his departure for Khuzestan to impress on him the political importance of the settlement. He explained his efforts to induce Sheikh Khaz'al to settle his affairs and to come to an understanding with the Persian Government. He dwelt the importance of Anglo-Persian Oil Company's operations to the British Government and the prestige of the Sheikh Khaz'al owing to their long connection with him and the service of sheikh to the allied during the Great War.

Loraine considered that the views of MacCormack „were most moderate and sensible, however, two Persian Officials from the Ministry of Finance, who were sharply in criticism of Sheikh Khaz'al accompanied him to Khuzestan and MacCormack had reached the conclusion that the clearance of the sheikh's claim on fulfilment of his obligations was a fraudulent document and could be legally cancelled, but if Khaz'al prepared to conclude a fair deal, he would not proceed to annul it”.

He believed that the indirect revenues if property administered, would give a much greater yield than the present administration of Khaz'al and it would be enough income that the Government would not make a serious inroad on the money of Khaz'al. Loraine asked him, not make any serious reduction in the Sheikh's current income, to safe guard the local prestige of the Sheikh particularly with his own Arab tribesmen and to avoid thrusting the Government officials over Khaz'al's head.

Colonel MacCormack left Tehran in 11 November 1923. British consul in Ahvaz informed Loraine in 24 November that the progress of the negotiations reached a complete deadlock. MacCormack pointed out that his views were most. The American adviser demanded Khaz'al 750.000-600.000T in respect of arrears of revenue up to March 1924, a cash payment of 200.000T at once, the rest to be made in ten yearly installments, 200.000T a year in respect of direct and indirect revenue combined from March 1924 onwards.

After lengthy discussion, Sheikh Khaz'al, offered to pay 200.000T on account of arrears 50.000T down and the in instalment, in addition to the sums amounting to 80.000T which he paid during the last three years. He provided that he was allowed an annual deduction of 30.000T of his pension and the other Charge, he agreed to pay in future years 150.000T.

Loraine communicated with Dr. Millspaugh and immediately met each other, British Minister pointed out the deplorable results from break down of the negotiations and threat to leave on the following day take an ultimatum would danger the whole work of the pacification of Khuzestan and that would seriously threaten important British interests (8). Loraine urged Dr. Millspaugh to intervene in a moderating sense.

Dr. Millspaugh responded to the appeal of British positively and was quite prepared for a compromise on the fiscal issue for the sake of political peace. He dispatched a telegram to directing Colonel MacCormack to remain where he was until further instructed. As a result of a meeting between Millspaugh and the Persian Prime Minister, Reza Khan, the same day, the matter was in a short time satisfactory liquidated.

On 25 November 1923 (equivalent to 03.09.1302) the following agreement was entered into between the representative of Ministry of Finance and Sheikh Khaz'al. He agreed to make an annual contribution to the Persian Government 150.000T to be paid in four instalments on the first day of the 2nd, 5th and 11th months of the beginning March, 1924. In full payment of the revenue due under Farmans, the indirect taxes of Mohammareh and Abadan, he now collects and the indirect taxes of Nasser, which will be collected by him under this agreement. 20.000T to be allowed deduction on account of salary, personal expenses. While this agreement remains in force, the amount to be paid will be increased by one thousand Ts annually (9).

By virtue of the authority rested in D.W. MacCormack, Director of Internal Revenue by the Finance Ministry and the administrator General of the Finance a total payment of 500.000T (100.000 T in cash the balance to be paid in twenty annual instalments on the first day of Chows, 23 November) each year beginning with 1303 through the Mohammareh branch of the Imperial Bank of Persia. MacCormack gave a full and complete clearance of all taxes of every description up to the end of 21 March 1923 (equivalent to 01.01.1302) to Sheikh Khaz'al.

Acceptance of this clearance by Sheikh Khaz'al constituted a quittance by of all claims against the Government on account of Persian and expenses of every kind up to the end of, 1302. British Consul in Ahvaz acquainted the Legation accordingly: (a) the unpaid revenues of Sheikh Khaz'al prior to Nowruz 1924. (b) "The direct and indirect revenue which will be payable by him these after".

The second agreement was, however, provisional and required to be ratified by the Ministry of Finance and even then the agreement was liable to modification if any

new or additional taxes having the force of law were he after imposed by the Government in Tehran over the whole of Persia and Ministry of Finance would discuss with Sheikh Khaz'al to reach an Agreement for the collection of such taxes by him on behalf of the Government within the regions under his jurisdiction" Should the Government effect a change in the system or rate of taxation, Sheikh Khaz'al had right to request a revision. This agreement would remain in force until changed by mutual agreement or brought on six months' notice (11).

Sheikh Khaz'al accepted to pay 500.000T in respect of arrears of revenue. 100.000T down and the balance spread over twenty years for the future some of 150.000T a year to be paid in respect of direct and indirect taxation, a deduction of 20.000T to cover his pension and other legitimate Charges. The Sheikh continued to control the indirect tax, but a financial agent to remain as inspecting officer for the whole province of Khuzestan. Peel stated that Sheikh Khaz'al was disappointed, but would get over it. He added the settlement was a perfectly equitable one and the skilful manner of Colonel MacCormack conducted the whole negotiation on his profound admiration (12).

On Tuesday, 27 November 1923, Loraine saw Reza Khan and expressed his great satisfaction at the conclusion of the agreement and he pointed out that Prime Minister recognise which British played in rendering possible this fortunate result. Reza Khan appreciated the attitude and action of the British Government, who really desire anxious that Persian Government should become a master of its own household.

With regard to the agreement said he had decided to abide the whatever was reached by MacCormack, but there was one thing to which he did object and "that was the inclusion in the deduction to be made from the Sheikh's future annual payments on account of direct and indirect taxation of a sum for the upkeep of armed forces, which were under the Sheikh's control and were not incorporated in the Imperial army.

It was utterly impossible for the Persian Government to acquiesce explicitly in the maintenance of such private forces civil still less to make a money contribution towards them". Reza Khan had resisted to similar pretensions in several other quarters of Persia, where chieftains had for some years enjoyed a seem-autonomous position (13). If he yields in the case of Sheikh Khaz'al, said Reza Khan, he could not reject renewed demands from elsewhere with any show of justice.

Sir Percy Loraine understood his point of view and instructed the British consul in Ahvaz to advise Sheikh Khaz'al on Loraine's behalf to cut out this allusion from the

agreement. Khaz'al accepted this matter. Loraine wrote: I think, it fair to claim, however, that this agreement will prove to be the corner-stone of the future situation in Khuzestan. It could not have been concluded without our active assistance, but another essential factor in the issue was a clear and straight forwards attitude on the part of the Persian Government and the loyal co-operation of the American Adviser (14). The attempt of Loraine and the co-operation of Millspaugh and Reza Khan both parties in Khuzestan came into an agreement. This was one of the mutual understandings between Reza Khan and Sir Percy Loraine since he had formed the Persian Cabinet.

In fact, ten days before the sign of this agreement and almost two weeks after his assumption of the presidency of the Council and formation of the cabinet, Reza Khan in company with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Zoka al-Molk, returned in person the visit of Sir Percy Loraine to indicate his desire to improve the relation between the two Governments of the most friendly and mutually helpful nature (15).

11.3. Bakhtiyari Khans in Autumn 1923

After the Shalil incident at the end of July 1922, Reza Khan, the Minister of War succeeded to bring three of the Bakhtiyari Khans, Sardar Ass'ad III, his brother, Amir Jang and his uncle Sardar Mohtasham to his camp. In the next step, in spring and summer 1923, he imposed a fine of 150.000T for the participation of Bakhtiyaris in Shalil incident. Later on, the Bakhtiyari Khans had to pay 500.000T in yearly instalments on account of arrears revenue.

The process of destabilisation and reduction the power of Bakhtiyari Khans continued. The army commanders encouraged the Chahar Lang tribes, Mahmud Salehi and shortly afterwards Kiyunarsi of Janaki to separate from the Haft Lang Bakhtiyari Governor. It was a great blow to the authority of Bakhtiyari Khans. By these punishments in 1923 the Bakhtiyari Khans demoralised. The Bakhtiyari tribesmen were anxious to be rid of their Khans and cultivate independent relations with the representative of the Persian Government (16).

The Persian Army were admired by both, the settled and tribesmen. A year later, as a severe treatment in dealing with the public, the tribesmen showed a hostile spirit towards the introduction of Persian troops in Chahar Mahal. The recruiting

„contributions were very harshly enforced “. Additionally „cash contribution was leveled in Chahar Mahal alone to the extent of some 150.000T“. It was believed a large amount of this sum went to the pocket of Amir Lashkar and his staff (17).

11.3.1. The Future of Chahar Lang tribes

While Loraine was on his way to Khuzestan in October 1923, the division policy of the Minister of War in dealing with the Bakhtiyari affairs caused the disquiet's of Ilkhani and Ilbegi who were anxious of disruption and anarchy in Bakhtiyari land and oil-fields. Reza Khan who had for a long time especially after the Shalil incident harboured a deep resentment against the Bakhtiyari Khans and Loraine had reason that he would deal stiffly with some of the Khans when he sees the opportunity. At first, the Bakhtiyaris were compelled to pay compensation to the Shalil incident and then the payment of arrears' taxes in which it the Bakhtiyari Khans paid a great sum. They failed to agree among themselves to no minute the tribal governors. They requested the Persian Government to do so.

Reza Khan proposed design to crush the power of Bakhtiyari Khans as a whole. He created division between Sardar Ass'ad III, Amir Jang, Sardar Mohtasham and the rest of Khans. It was, however, well known that the Bakhtiyari Khans would be unable to meet such demand and this was a financial blow to the Khans. The Bakhtiyari Khans could not resist effectively to the authority of the commander of the army. They were even unable to consent on appointment of the Bakhtiyari Governors. As a result Sardar Ass'ad and Amir Jang „who were completely exonerated from all complicity in the Shalil incident“, and joint the camp of Reza Khan, were rewarded as Governor of the province Khorassan and the Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari and their uncle, Sardar Mohtasham as Ilkhani in May 1923.

The next step was the persistence of Reza Khan the complete detachment of the Chahar Lang branch and some other Bakhtiyari tribes from the authority of the Haft Lang tribal governors. A disquieting feature of the Bakhtiyari situation „with the avowed object of undermining the authority of the tribal governor“ was to destroy “any possibility of a united Bakhtiyari front in opposition to the Central Government“ (18). The present Ilkhani, Sardar Mohtasham, had brought the matter to the notice of the British Minister on 22 May 1923, before his departure from Tehran for his post in Bakhtiyari.

He stated; the Chahar Lang sub-division of the Bakhtiyari, consisting of some 2.000 families, who form an integral part of the tribe, had been separated from the rest of the tribe and placed under their own Ilkhani and Ilbegi - Mohammad Taqi Khan and Amir Khan respectively, who were made independent of the central tribal authority. He added that the Chahar Lang tribesmen and their chiefs had been under the control of the Haft Lang khans for the last seventy years, that their grazing grounds are in the middle of Bakhtiyari, and that their separation would cause the disintegration of the tribe and reduces Bakhtiyari to chaos.

He tried to persuade the Minister of War to order the re-establishment of the authority of the Haft Lang Khans over the whole of Bakhtiyari, and had received a promise that he would give the matter his favourable consideration. Nothing was done, however, and the result was soon apparent when inter-tribal fighting was reported in Faridan (19). In fact, the Minister of War pressed by certain discontented elements of the Chahar Lang, who were not slow to seize this opportunity of breaking away from the control of the Haft Lang Khans.

The chief among them was Bibi Maryam, the sister of Amir Mojtahed and grandmother of the present Ilbegi of the Chahar Lang. The Minister of War also was tempted to use these internal dissensions as a means of destroying the power of the Haft Lang Khans. He therefore sent a small body of troops to Chel Cheshmeh to support the Chahar Lang chiefs in their independence, and to introduce thereby direct military control over this section of the tribe, which was now placed under the Governor of Isfahan.

Sardar Mohtasham and Amir Jang, the new Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari were not long in the Bakhtiyari land before they realised the difficulties of their position. Haft Lang fugitives from justice were able to take refuge with the Chahar Lang, where they could not be touched and it was easy to imagine the situation which would arise when the tribes went south and passed through each other's territory.

Amir Jang, therefore, came to Tehran towards the end of August 1923, prepared to tender the resignations of the Ilkhani and himself unless the Minister of War agreed to restore their authority over the whole of Bakhtiyari. Meanwhile, Loraine urged the Minister of War the advisability of supporting the authority of the Haft Lang chiefs. Reza Khan confused the policy, sound for his own interests, of dividing the Khans into two camps, with the step of splitting the tribe into hostile sections. Loraine pointed out that he could detach the Chahar Lang chiefs from their allegiance to the central tribal

authority whenever he wished, but that unless he was prepared to carry out a military occupation of the country.

It was foolish to invite grievances against himself by partial military control over a section of the tribe; that if he placed the Chahar Lang under their own chiefs, with the latter subordinate to the Governor of Isfahan or Behbahan, any friction which might arise would be directed against his military control, instead of against the central tribal authority, and that in the event of any serious blows to the authority of the Central Government the Chahar Lang would at once make common cause with the Haft Lang (20).

As a result of representation made by British and Ilbegi, Amir Jang, was able to return to Bakhtiyari on the 12 September 1923, bearing written instructions from the Minister of War to the governor of Isfahan ordering him to summon the Chahar Lang Ilkhani and Ilbegi to Isfahan to make arrangements for the return of the Chahar Lang section to the Bakhtiyari fold. It also appears that the Chahar Lang themselves, after a short period of military control, are anxious to return to their former allegiance. Amir Eqtedar, the present Governor of Isfahan, is also in favour of conversion to former arrangements, and Amir Jang returned confident that the question should be settled satisfactory (21).

On 10 October 1923, Amir Jang saw the British Consul-General in Isfahan. He, who was very depressed, told Crow that the letters saw of the Minister of War to the governor-general in Isfahan, Amir Eqtedar, and the head of the army in Isfahan instructing them to help him visa vis the Chahar Lang was followed by another annulling the former. When Mohammad Taqi the Ilkhani of Chahar Lang reached Isfahan, Amir Jang was warned not to visit him at all. Amir Jang added the Persian Government was encouraging the Janaki against the Bakhtiyari. Three Khans of Janaki were in Isfahan. Amir Jang was told not to see them either.

This move undermines the authority of the Ilkhani (Sardar Mohtasham) and this was a possibility of fighting between the Janaki and the Bakhtiyari when the letter reached Malamir (22). The following day Amir Jang left Isfahan for Bakhtiyari country and the same day the consul-general Isfahan received a letter from Sardar Mohtasham, the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari saying he would at once resign if the separation of Janaki and Khajeh from the rest of Bakhtiyari take place, as he cannot be responsible for enormous losses which will claimed by the A.P.O.C. as a result of disturbances which are bound to follow. The Ilkhani asked the Consul-General to inform the British Minister at once

to put the matter before the Persian Government in Tehran and also asked Crow to inform the Governor-General in Isfahan (23).

Meanwhile, the British consulate in Ahvaz came to know that Eqbal Nezam Chahar Lang of Qal'ee Tol c/o Parviz Khan to Entezam al-Mamalek and Mo'tazed Bakhtiyari in Qal'ee Tol to the effect that after discussion with Amir Jang in Isfahan, they did not accept his demand to join Haft Lang and their chieftains. They explained in a telegram that the Minister of War is in favour of Chahar Lang Khans and they should leave for Tehran very shortly. They (Eqbal Nezam) also requested the Army commander in Isfahan to wire to Colonel Baqer Khan in Shushtar to send nine men with an officer to Qal'ee Tol to protect his property and the commander promise to do so.

The British Consulate in Ahvaz was informed of another telegram which Eqbal Nezam Bahador al Saltaneh to Behbahan to Teymur Khan at Qal'ee Tol telling him that they did not make peace with Haft Lang Khans and are leaving for Tehran to arrange their business there. They hope they will succeed as they are certain and assured that Tehran Government is in their favour (24). British Minister, Sir Percy Loraine, who was at that time for a visit in Khuzestan instructed British Charge d`Affaires to send Oriental Secretary to see Minister of War the only person, who can alone settle the question. In fact, British Legation wants him to maintain his previous decision to keep Chahar Lang and authority of the Haft Lang ruling Khans. Loraine was of opinion "if the Chahar Lang allowed or encouraged to split off effect on Anglo Persian Oil Company operations at maintain will be very bad and much trouble will ensue both for company and H.M. Legation" (25).

The same day, Crow wired to Ahvaz consulate that he learned from Governor-General in Isfahan, Amir Eqtedar, that the Persian government decided Chahar Lang are to separate from Haft Lang and the Janaki Khans refuse absolutely to be under the Ilkhani of Haft Lang and they maintained that they are Chahar Lang. The Governor-General saying the Persian Government cannot force them their will.

Amir Eqtedar accused that the Russian Consul-General was taking active part the encouraging the separation of different sections of the Bakhtiyari. British Consul-General (was of opinion) doubted the statement of the governor that he had done his best to try to persuade the Janaki Khans to remain with the Haft Lang and Crow regarded him not be very sincere in his efforts (26).

Two days later, Crow stating in another telegram that Akbar Mirza Sarem al-Dowleh informed him the Governor-General and the Army Commander really did try to persuade the Chahar Lang Khans to rejoin the Bakhtiyari fold, but Mohammed Taqi Khan Chahar Lang absolutely refused and in view of the Ministry of War's previous, the Governor-General cannot force them against their will.

Mohammad Taqi Khan and another Chahar Lang Khan were shortly proceeding to Tehran to lay case of Chahar Lang before the authorities in Tehran. The Governor-General and Akbar Mirza were of opinion that the only chance for the senior Bakhtiyari Khans is to get holds him and to bribe him to forget fullness. Akbar Mirza saying the Minister of War preferring to see two sections separated. Bristow intended to see Amir Jang the Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari advising him not to think of resigning until he hears from British Minister (27).

Though by the instruction of British Minister from Ahvaz, the Charge d`Affaires sent the Oriental Secretary to convince the Minister of War of the danger two sections separation was unavailing. The Minister of War told him his previous decision to keep the Chahar Lang under the authority of Haft Lang Khans was conditional on the ability of Amir Jang, the Ilbegi to come to satisfactory arrangement with the Chahar Lang chiefs. The Khans of Chahar Lang refused absolutely and the Minister of War had had to put them under his Ministry and Chahar Lang chiefs were to come to Tehran.

Reza Khan asked the Oriental Secretary to assure the British Minister that the A.P.O.C. operation at Mamatan would not suffer by this arrangement and he asserted his ability to prevent trouble either Haft Lang or Chahar Lang and he guarantee the safety of oil production (28). Loraine asked Monson to inform the Minister of War that he was very depressed at his communication and he would take up the matter with him immediately on his return.

Loraine was sure that the personal influence of the Reza Khan would suffice to bring the Khans of Chahar Lang under the administrative authority of Haft Lang ruling khans. Loraine added that with regard to his study in Khuzestan he felt sure whether tribes come down to the Winter grazing ground (quarter) strife is practically inevitable between the two section pending his return Loraine would warn the Haft Lang Khans though they kept quiet, that any disturbance of the peace by them will be severely visited on them (29).

After the return of British Minister from Khuzestan, British Consul in Ahvaz received a letter from Ilkhani and Ilbegi stating they would resign at once unless

Chahar Lang question is settled in a satisfactory manner to them. Provided the Janaki Khans remain under their control, the Ilkhani and Ilbegi were prepared to submit to the separation of the northern section under Mohammad Taqi Khan and Moghis Khan. Peel asked the Ilkhani and Ilbegi to set fight until hear from British result of representative of Loraine to the Persian Government (30).

11.3.2. Chahar Lang Question

On his return to Tehran from Khuzestan and his meeting with Reza Khan in 21 October 1923, Sir Percy Loraine also explained to the Minister of War the Bakhtiyari situation. Reza Khan who recognised that the authority of the ruling Haft Lang Khans' family must be maintained, but the difficulty was that, early in the year, Reza Khan had promised the Chahar Lang Khans at a time when he was still having difficulties with Haft Lang, that their submission should only be by their own consent.

Reza Khan, however, sent for some of the Chahar Lang khan to come to Tehran and when they arrived he would put every possible pressure on them to accept their former situation under the Haft Lang governors. He had, moreover, sent a telegram to Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari (Sardar Mohtasham-Amir Jang) authorising them to deal as they thought best with any active separatist movement.

Reza Khan agreed with Sir Percy Loraine contention that Haft Lang Khans prestige could not stand any further shocks of this nature without serious risk of the total collapse of tribal authority, necessitating the direct intervention of the Central Government in the administration of the Bakhtiyari which would be almost difficult and complicated task. The prestige of the Khans had already received a severe blow through their dispute with Reza Khan which had done well rather harm, but any further might have disastrous results (31).

Loraine declared in a secret telegram his opinion that the conflict between government and Bakhtiyari would certainly be dangerous to oil-fields and would probably make trouble there to secure British intervention. He, however, said that contingency is now most unlikely (32). Bakhtiyari Khans had their lesson and were decile and promised to follow henceforth British Minister' advise to stand in with control Government.

The same he asked Khaz'al to follow (as previous pages mentioned) and at the same time told Khaz'al in Ahvaz, "While maintaining his present good relations with

the Bakhtiyari Khans, he must jump on any Bakhtiyari tendency to kish against the traces“. Khaz'al entirely agreed that the establishment of good relation between him and khans is the best guarantee to of all (33).

On 2 November 1923, 11 day after the return of Sir Percy Loraine from Khuzestan, the Senior Khans: Sardar Zafar, Samsam al-Saltaneh, Amir Mofakham and Sardar Jang, who resided at that time in Tehran went to see him. Amir Mofakham said that the Bakhtiyari Khans were now convinced the advice of British Minister to their interest and the advantage of their country proved sound to keep on good term with Minister of War ,who was undertaken the duties of the Prime Minister and they felt that alone was capable of performing work of real benefit to the country.

The Bakhtiyari Khans pledge their support to his had received in turn his promise of friendship and assistance. As Persian subjects loyal to the Government, nevertheless they have common interest and close relations with British for generations and they looked for advice to the British representatives. Loraine suggested the reform in Bakhtiyari, as Prime Minister endeavours to introduce reforms in the country, by abolishing the system of armed retainers and was a constant source of danger to the internal peace of their tribal system.

The Khans agreed with the need to reform the Bakhtiyari administration and owing to the expense involved in their upkeep. They were obliged in the past to enforce their authority to keep their interests as individual Khans in the absence Central Government's authority. The British Minister informed them of his communication with Reza Khan on Chahar Lang and Janaki affairs and the solution to the advantage of Haft Lang Khans.

Reza Khan gave full authority to Haft Lang Khans to deal with rebellion of sub-division of the tribe and instructed the military authorities in Isfahan to assist them to suppress the Janaki movement of separation. A movement which it would threaten the work of the A.P.O.C. at Mamatan district where there has just recently found and Sardar Jang possessed considerable property there.

British Minister pointed out that the peace and prosperity of southern Persia could not be better maintained by establishment of cordial and co-operation between the four demanding factors in that region; Reza Khan, Sheikh Khaz'al, the Bakhtiyari Khans and the British. Loraine strives a rapprochement between them. The Khans said: They would always obey the command of British Minister.

With regard to the recent incidents, Loraine wrote to Foreign Office: We have now emerged from a very difficult period in our relations with Bakhtiyari Khans, not only successfully, but actually with increased authority and renewed ability should need arise, to the act as a pacifying interim diary between them and the Central Government. "It must be many years since the Khawanin were in such a thoroughly trackable and amiable frame of mind" (34).

At the close of the year 1923 and the beginning of the year 1924 these matters had not yet been settled. Reza Khan, the Prime Minister, intended to substitute the Persian troops for the guardian the oil-fields (35).

11.4. Army and the Two Chieftains in Fars

As it was previously mentioned, the visit to the south of the Reza Khan, the Minister of War, produced several marked effects on the situation. Reza Khan inspected the Persian garrison and the military situation in the southern coast. As a result of Minister of War's inspection, the early months of 1923, marked the gradual extension of military power and there was a better discipline under the new Commander. The rumour was that a formidable force was to be dispatched from the north to Fars the local authorities were in favour of its use to disarm the province.

Since the summer 1921, that a military regime was set up in Fars by the Minister of War, not as an arm of civil administration, but independent of it, the civil administration was gradually undermined from the army officers. The Governor-General of Fars, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh, resigned in November 1922. His successor Prince Sarem al-Dowleh reached Shiraz on time to welcome the Shah in early December 1922. The new Governor-General of Fars similar to his predecessor did not received effective support from Tehran. He intended, therefore, to resign in February 1923, but then, however, he could establish an understanding with Military Commander (36).

During the spring 1923, the governor-general and his deputy were on close terms with the Army Commandant in Fars. He endeavoured to maintain an atmosphere of calm in Shiraz and security in the districts (37). As the question of election for the fifth Majles arose, the Governor-General and Qavam al-Molk on a one side, Sowlat al-Dowleh on the other side supported their own candidates. It became known in early

June 1923, that the Minister of War also desired to see his own candidates. This subject caused the confrontation between the Governor-General and the Military Commander.

Meanwhile the Military Commander, Brigadier General Fazl-Allah Zahedi, “an ambition to succeed to a military Governorship in Fars”, demanded the use of the Governor-General’s house for military requirements and the removal of Governor-General to another Courtyard. He ordered the occupation of official residency of governor-general and made the situation so difficult for him that finally Prince Sarem al-Dowleh resigned and left Shiraz in 14 July 1923 without waiting for any sanction from Tehran (38).

The sequestration of garden and buildings of Governor-General and the attempt to dispossess most civil departments in order to form a citadel created an unfortunate impression among the public. Even more resented locally was the attempt of the Army Commanders to threat the landowners of Fars into supplying another thousand men from their villages, paying for the conscript’s families and accepting other responsibilities in a province where such method of maintaining an army had never been in vogue (39).

“The broad statesmanship of the Minister of War in his plans for the centralisation of authority, perfecting the security of the trade routes, and suppressing the small potentates on the caravan routes“, “who acquired a position through twenty years of oppression with the support of their armed retainers,“ was not impugned (40).

In the first half of the 1923, the Military and the Gendarmerie extended their authority on the Bushehr-Shiraz road. British consul in Shiraz was of opinion that they removed several chiefs friendly to the British during the war and appointed “all belong to the unfriendly category“. It was plain to all that the military government organisation was more powerful than that of either the great tribal leaders or the impression gained that the ultimate aim of the Central Government was to curtail and perhaps abolish entirely their hereditary control over the named tribes and large regions of Fars.

An impression, which the Khamseh tribesmen were already abusing by making difficulties in their obedience and payment of taxes, Qavam al-Molk lost his influence, firstly from the spring of 1922, owing to his failure to obtain compensation for the looting of his family properties by the Qashqa’i tribesmen. Qavam al-Molk, the chief of Khamseh confederation, was also tired and worried of his position.

Indeed, the resentment and anxiety aroused in him by the expedition of the troops in Fars during the summer 1923 in Doshmanziyari where the Kalantars of his fief “were

imprisoned, milked in several thousand Ts” “his peasants ill-treated and animals and flukes carried off to Shiraz, some of these his personal property” (41).

Qavam al-Molk informed Chick that he was leaving for Isfahan to visit Reza Khan to discuss his affairs with him. In his return from Isfahan in September 1923, Qavam al-Molk told Chick that he desired to change and to go to Europe and then he might proceed to Tehran. Reza Khan suggested that Qavam al-Molk should proceed to Tehran and stay there, instead of Europe. Reza Khan hinting that “his plans for the south” might make the position for Qavam al-Molk difficult “was he to remain in Fars”.

Qavam al-Molk was to welcome the restoration of order and the authority of the Central Government throughout the province of Fars. If done justice and impartially, Qavam al-Molk would appoint his agent or his Monshibashi. British consul, Chick, considered that his staff are generally of poor quality and any prolong absence of Qavam al-Molk would his interests suffer from their administration.

From British view point, the presence of Qavam al-Molk in Shiraz “use to calm excitement of factions, incitement by U'lama and to suppress the extremists and democrat hot beats and against Anglophobe plotters and propagandists. Whether, the Military Command in Fars was ready to exercise those functions and not pandering to `nationalist' sentiments of democrat and priestly politician of Shiraz.

Qavam al-molk besides being hereditary chiefs of the Khamseh confederation, he was hereditary entrusted with the Governorship and administration of nearly the whole of eastern Fars to the territory behind the coast range of the Persian Gulf, including Fassa, Darab, Lar, Bastak Sabeh, down to the confines of Bandar Abbas and Lingeh (42).

Chick suggested the British Minister to make inquiries about the “plans” may include the replacement of the deputies of Qavam al-Molk in these districts by Military governors. Then, he added: “We shall need to study the results of the change”. Chick pointed out: the virtual “exile” of Qavam al Molk from Shiraz is incurring a certain responsibility as regards foreign relations. He went on to say that in the absence of Qavam al-Molk, “we can only and shall look to him and his officers” in Fars to make good influence guiding the Shirazi elements towards moderation and a better understanding towards Great Britain and British interests.

The visible backing was given to Sowlat al-Dowleh by the Minister of War and his officers. Consul Chick pointed out that: “The effect of the elimination of Qavam al-Molk on the position of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the province. An indefinite

prolong action of Reza Khan-Sowlat al-Dowleh entente, unholy alliance would be open to misconstruction". For Qashqa'i chief abusing his position, the assistance and consideration shown by the force to Sowlat al-Dowleh in the past two years conveyed a certain impression to the minds of the most residence of Fars.

In October 1923, on seasonal migration of the Qashqa'i to the south, towards winter quarters, Sowlat al-Dowleh made the occasion near Shiraz for a demonstration, in the shape of manoeuvres and many officials and notables of Fars were guests. Sowlat al-Dowleh if courted still by military authorities, was acute enough to see that after the Bakhtiari Khans his turn would come to put his house in order, and shape his course accordingly.

The policy of Reza Khan towards Sowlat al-Dowleh remained "the velvet glove", and the "steel hand" was not disclosed. Though, Sowlat al-Dowleh received the support of Government in his action in relation to the A.P.O.C. in Bidkarz in September 1923 and his candidate for Majles in Jahrom in November 1923, there was sign that he was uneasy at the ultimate intentions of the Reza Khan and the army.

Sowlat al-Dowleh was called upon to pay arrears of revenue amounting to 300.000T compromising for the payment of 130.000T by instalments and full revenue for the year 1923, British Consul in Shiraz understood that the Central Government under the chair of Reza Khan were making enquiries the validity of the grants on which he holds, some say illegally "the large domains from which he draws his wealth, If so, he may before long illustrate in his person the justice" (43).

Early August 1923, Prince Nosrat al-Dowleh was appointed the governor-general of Fars. He arrived in Shiraz and finished the election. The two magnates of Fars, the chiefs of Qashqa'i and Khamseh, were elected to the fifth Majles. "Each from identical motives of neutralising in Tehran the latent hostility and influence of the other, while as representatives of the nation protecting themselves from pressure by the Central Government, had themselves elected for district and tribal constituencies", both appeared "to have repented of the intentions to proceed to Tehran and to have resigned in favour of the runners up" (44).

The power of army increased in Fars and the Persian Gulf ports by recruiting about 2.000 officers and men from Kerman. In the minutes of Foreign Office to this report was pointed out that: the Minister of War is clearly becoming stronger in the south and the tribal organisation, even of the Kashgai, is being shown up as largely

bluff, but as Mr Chick remarks, a military tyranny working as master rather than servant of civil Government is a disagreeable prospect (45).

The Governor-General of Fars, Nosrat al-Dowleh, skilfully checked the military interference in civil affairs. The détente of early part of 1923 converted into a tranquillity in Fars. The Government of Behbahan and Kohgiluyeh, after thirteen years of Bakhtiyari rule, was replaced under the Governor-General of Fars, at the end of the year 1923. The detachment in Behbahan and Kohgiluyeh was organised by the Divisional Command in Isfahan. About 300 men were sent to Fars. The peasantry and the populace as a whole enjoyed the security as well as the travellers and caravans due to the military force and later Road-Guard service along the main roads in Fars. They “played in making their presence felt in several parts of the province and in intimidating bands of highway robbers” (46).

The knowledge of a strong Central Government in Tehran, a considerable body of troops in Tehran and Isfahan, the re-establishment of Central Government in almost all other provinces had its effect on tribesmen and bandits. The military attitude was stiffer towards Qavam al-Saltaneh. He voluntarily surrendered the old mountain and field guns lent to his father in 1916 by the British Government. Qavam al-Molk undoubtedly contemplated that the Central Government deprive him of his hereditary Government of eastern Fars and Khamseh confederation. He intended to travel to Europe in autumn 1923, but the Minister of War Finance ordered him to recover revenue from eastern Fars.

In November 1923, some 500 men with guns and machine guns went to Dashti to collect arrears and current taxation. The detachment met with no opposition from the chieftains and they compromised at the scheduled rate for two years. In December 1923, it was ordered to the inhabitants of Shiraz to surrender their fire arms or obtain licenses. The numbers of arms were small. An expeditious detachment, about 600 men left Kazerun via Mamassani with the object to the disarmament of the Boir Ahmadi and Kohgiluyeh tribes. For some time, the army intended to proceed to disarmament of Qashqa'i and Khamseh tribes, but even the military officers were anxious that the operation be successful. They believed that the modern weapons may be hidden for the time being (47).

11.5. More Harmony in 1924

On contrary to the British Minister in Tehran Sir P. Loraine, the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon had no confidence in Reza Khan. He doubted that the Loraine's approach in Persian policy and the Loraine's support of Reza Khan's centralisation policy would secure the British interests in Persia. However, less than three months of Reza Khan Premiership, the cabinet of Conservative Government was replaced by the Labour Party in January 1924.

The year 1924 was a crucial year in Persian history. It was also very important on future of Reza Khan. General speaking the international situation was in favour of him. Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Labour Party chaired the new British Cabinet as well as Foreign office. MacDonald had a different approach in British oil policy in Persia in 1914. The change of cabinet in London made it necessary for Loraine to return home for a more clearance in Anglo-Persian relations and it was an opportunity to arrange his private affairs as well.

Loraine asked Reza Khan for a long private conversation prior to his departure, to know the view of the Persian Prime Minister on the question of Anglo-Persian relation in future to assist him in his discussion in London with the British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald. He met Reza Khan and they discussed about various questions. A number of outstanding questioned between the two Governments settled through a Mixed Commission and in regard to others got much nearer to definition (48).

Those days, the partisans of Reza Khan did endeavour to demonstrate their opposition to the Qajar dynasty and Ahmad Shah and the idea of Persian republic announced by the corners close to him. It was an opportunity for Reza Khan to materialise his personal ambitious in the absence of Ahmad Shah.

Loraine, who had left Tehran for England for a leave of absent, in London he defended the centralisation policy of Reza Khan from British point of view. Ramsay MacDonald and then his Conservative successor, Austin Chamberlain, approved the views of Loraine and supported the Government of Reza Khan in Tehran. In less than a month to the begin of spring and the Persian New Year, Reza Khan told quite privately to the British Military Attaché, change would come, but in a perfect order and without bloodshed and eventual result would be republic (49).

As a result of anti-republican demonstration and opposition by various social groupies and classes, Reza Khan told the assistant military attaché of British Legation

in the middle of April 1924 that “the republican movement received a set back and he did not succeed in his efforts to establish a republic in Persia. Though, he was very much depressed and disappointed with the way matters had gone, Reza Khan was still the strongest man and the outstanding personality in the country in the middle of June 1924. Reza Khan intended to employ new methods to achieve his goal. He wished the change should come quietly. Reza Khan had to reshuffle his cabinet and introduce into it certain of routine hereditary politicians in return for their support. He had forbidden his partisans to pursue the matter in the face of resistance offered by the clergy”(50).

11.6. Government and the Tribes in 1924

Question of tribes and their future reached to its zenith phase in 1924. The number of regular forces was increased and the size of the army expanded and new detachments of Government troops were formed and garrisoned in outlying parts of the country. A law of compulsory military service was ratified by the Majles in 1924. The army was equipped with new weapons and the fighter plane arrived in the Persian army.

The policy of disarmament the tribes and re-establishment the civil and military control of Central Government all over parts of Persia co-ordinated with the question of Khuzestan after the Shalil incident. The submission of the Bakhtiyari, Posht-kuh, Lorestan and Boir-Ahmadi chiefs, disarmament of their tribes and opening of four roads from north-west, north, east and south-east to Khuzestan were the next intentions of the Persian Government to break the barriers between Khaz'al and central Persia in 1923.

The Lor tribes in Lorestan ignored the authority of the Central Government for many years. The occupation of Lorestan was taken placed in winter at the end 1923. Military operation, however, continued the whole of the year 1924. A part of tribes in Lorestan were disarmed. The route between provinces Lorestan and Khuzestan was opened in the last months of 1924. At this year, the Persian army occupied Posht-huh and the road was opened to the Government force from Kermanshah to Khuzestan.

The numbers of military force were increased and the size of the army expanded. New detachments were formed and garrisoned in the years 1924 and they were equipped with new weapons. The fighter plane arrived in the Persian army and in Lorestan and the other tribal areas bombarded the insurgent tribesmen. The commercial

routes and main roads were administered by road guard for some time. The security on the roads maintained well during the years 1924. In few instances, the bandits and tribesmen pillaged caravans, "but in many cases, the properties stolen were recovered." The road guard administration still needed funds and right type of man to be improved, Wrote Loraine (51). Military operations and disarmament of tribes continued in Lorestan, Posht-kuh and the other tribal areas.

11.6.1. Khaz'al in Winter and Spring 1924

At the beginning of March 1924, British Political Resident in Bushehr, Colonel Trevor, visited Mohammareh and his old friend, Sheikh Khaz'al,. Trevor wrote: Khaz'al was seriously perturbed and in a depressed mind state of at the line of the Persian Government who take every possible step to undermine his authority and reduce his position of local autonomy. Short time ago, he had received a telegram from the General Officer Commanding the western army, the province of Khuzestan was included, stating he intended to pay a visit to Mohammareh.

This had revived the Khaz'al's apprehensions and he seized the opportunity to explain all his fears of the Central Government and his expectations from the British Government and their representatives as well as the Persian Government. First of all he mentioned of his services to the British Government, especially during the in protection of refinery in Abadan and oil pipeline to secure the protection of British Government and preserve for him an autonomy position. The local British officials such as Cox, Wilson and Trevor who knew the services were leaving the region. Khaz'al asked, Trevor, to bring his case to the notice of British Government.

Khaz'al also pointed out that he compiled the wishes of Central Government, chiefly because British advised him. He agreed to the dispatch of a small number of troops to Dezful and Shushtar where the country was in perfectly good order and troops were not required. He paid great arrears of revenue and agreed to pay a large sum annually as indirect revenue. Finally, he asked Trevor would the British Government preserve him in his former position.

Khaz'al had heard that the Persian Government contemplated appointing a Deputy-Governor and a Kargozar (a representative of the Foreign Ministry) to Abadan. Though, he heard, then, that no such appointment was contemplated at that moment, but he was of opinion that the matter was not postponed for a short time. Khaz'al also

was anxious of the visit of the General Officer Commanding. He would not object to the visit if he paid a visit with no more than hundred men. He suspected of him if would come with considerable force. He did not what to do if they make an unprovoked attack on him.

Trevor pointed out that the same impression prevailed amongst the entourage of Sheikh Khaz'al as well. The long years' adviser of Khaz'al, Haji Rais was also of opinion that the Prime Minister, Reza Khan, seeking an opportunity to reduce the Khaz'al's power. Khaz'al considered that the hostile attitude of the Persian Government is due to his friendly terms with the British. Trevor was of opinion that while this is one of the causes of hostility, but the principal is that Reza Khan, the Persian Prime Minister desired to concentrate all the power in his hands and was jealous of semi-autonomous Sheikh's and Khan,s and desires to suppress them.

In this respect Trevor's firm conviction was that Reza Khan desires to reduce the power of Sheikh Khaz'al and reduce Khuzestan to the level of ordinary Persian province. He would take every opportunity of achieving his object. What attitude the British Government intends to adopt to give effect to the assurances of 21 November 1914. The question depends on the interpretation of what "doing our best "consists.

Trevor realised that it was a very delicate thing to decide, but he pointed out that if British stand by watch the Persian Government reducing Khaz'al's local autonomy, British attitude will have a deplorable effect locally. Trevor added in an enclosure to British Charge d'Affaires that in view of the friendly attitude of Khaz'al and his assistance during the war and since British shall be able to something tangible to help him to retain his position of local autonomyotherwise it will confirm the Khans and tribes in the view.....that it does not pay to be friendly with the British (52).

Esmond Ovey, the British Charge d'Affaires, responded: in view of the assurances given to the British Legation by Reza Khan as regards his future attitude to Sheikh Khaz'al, the Persian Government has done nothing since then and there do not appear any especial grounds for the Sheikh's nervousness (53). As regards the proposed appointment of a deputy governor to Abadan the idea came from Acting Minister of Interior and not from the Persian Government Immediately abandoned the idea (54).

Indeed, both Khaz'al and Trevor correctly predicted that Reza Khan and his cabinet intended to reduce the position of Khaz'al by smoothly establishing the government offices in centre and southern Khuzestan. Colonel Baqer Khan, the Officer Commanding of the Persian troops in Shushtar in his first visit in the middle of October

1923 told Sheikh Khaz'al that the Minister of War was anxious to send a Persian officer to Ramhormoz to be attached to the Bakhtiyari Ilbegi there and another officer to Ahvaz to act in a similar capacity.

Then he asked Khaz'al if he would raise any objection to the presence of a Persian officer in Ahvaz. Khaz'al replied that „the Minister of War had hitherto insisted that the detachment sent to Arabistan“, the nature of personal guard if he send an officer to Ahvaz now it would had a misinterpretation and might cause trouble. Heeded it would be time enough to consider a step of this sort when his own personal relations with the Minister of War had been put on a firm basis (55).

Khaz'al insisted several times that “a personal meeting between himself and Sardar Sepah was essential” for a genuine entente “after which he would be prepared to assist the Sardar Sepah to secure even the throne if he desired it” (56). Reza Khan on one ground or another avoided a meeting and report reached Sheikh Khaz'al from Tehran that Reza Khan harboured sinister design against him (57).

The Justice Department began to summon Arabs living in territory of Khaz'al to attend at court of Justice in Shushtar, a salt monopoly given to an Iraqi subject by Ministry of Public Works without consultation with Khaz'al. It had been agreed that all the indirect taxes were be collected by Sheikh, but steps were taken to assess the value of date's gardens of Khaz'al with a view to further taxation. It was said the commander of the Persian troops in Khuzestan incited one of the Sheikh's sons to kill his father promising to install him in his father's stead (58). Then, Sheikh Khaz'al put no more faith in the promises of Reza Khan's cabinet nor did the Bakhtiyari Khans. Peel wrote: Khaz'al relies only on the good faith of British Government and he listens to the advice of British representatives and refuses, therefore, to lend his support to the rebellion's element in Lorestan and Bakhtiyari.

He was forced to watch the gradual crumbling of the barrier between himself and the armed force of the Central Government, without being able to take step to save himself. He Know if the army can force a passage to Dezful from Lorestan, garrisons will forth with be dispatched to Ahvaz, Mohammareh and Abadan and he himself reduced to a mere cipher and British Government could not intervene effectively on his behalf (59).

11.6.2. Bakhtiyaris in Winter and Spring 1924

After the failure of the Persian Government's plan in Lorestan in 1924, and the treat of immediate resignation of the Ilkhani and Ilbegi, Reza Khan, the Prime Minister and the Minister of War, consented to resolve the Janaki section "once more to Bakhtiyari Government" (60).

The Bakhtiyari Khans recovered much of their moral and a revision of feeling exhibited by the inhabitants of Chahar Mahal, Faridan and Isfahan in favour of the Bakhtiyari Khans. The tribesmen threatened to oppose by force the penetration of Persian troops to Chahar Mahal "with or without the assistance" of the Khans. Another subject which it caused a great anxious among the tribesmen and the Bakhtiyari Khans was the question of disarmament. They feared to lose their properties and estates through the Persian Government after the disarmament.

As a result of Amir Mojahed's intrigues, a memorial was signed by over 1.000 Bakhtiyari tribesmen in Malamir in the middle of May 1924 that they would not hand over their rifles to the Persian Government and "would disown their Khans" and would not help the Government against another nomad tribe and they intended to circulate this memorial among the Qashqa'i and Lor tribes of Lorestan. This action showed that "the khans could count on a substantial following in an emergency" (61).

The Bakhtiyari Khans as a whole did not mobilise their tribesmen did not make alliance with the Lors and Qashqa'i to consolidate their position against the Persian Government. The Bakhtiyari Khans desired "to remain on friendliest terms with His Majesty, s Legation and they believed that Reza Khan and his cabinet enjoy the full support of His Majesty's Government". Also Sardar Mohtasham, the Ilkhani and Amir Jang, the Ilbegi, were appointed by Reza Khan and could not count enhance any acts of rebellion.

The British Consul in Ahvaz believed that there was an economical factor behind this. The system of Bastegan or armed retainers subsidised by individual Khans that it was introduced at a time when the Bakhtiyari Khans were master of Persia and its origin owed "to the jealousies of the Khans and to act struggle for individual supremacy". Since 1922, the Khans lost their Governorship and then they were compelled to pay arrears of revenue. They were not able to abolish the system. They as well as the Central Government desired to complete disarmament of the tribes.

The Bakhtiyari Khans prepared to assist the Persian Government in disarmament of the Lor and Qashqa'i tribes and their own tribesmen. They were not even against "the appointment of a Persian Governor over the Bakhtiari country "provided the Bakhtiyari Khans receive a satisfactory guarantee that their personal properties would not be confiscated by the Central Government.

The Bakhtiyari Khans told the British consul in Ahvaz: "They felt that His Majesty's Government were actively supporting the cabinet of Serdar Sepah, and were in sympathy with its desire to disarm the tribes, and would consequently use their influence on the side of the Persian Government in any struggle which might take place between the Khans and the Persian Government".

If this was the fact they felt they had a right to ask His Majesty's Government to use his influence to protect their interests in any scheme for the disarmament of the tribe" If the relations of the British and the Cabinet of Sardar Sepah was not as such, the Bakhtiyari Khans would asked the British Minister make it clear "to the both parties that he would adopt an attitude of neutrality in this dispute", then they ,the Bakhtiyari khans, would take such steps as might necessary to protect themselves against any attempts of the Central Government" (62).

11.6.3. The Guards of Honour

In 23 January 1924, the Officer Commanding in Shushtar stated in the presence of British consul in Ahvaz that a detachment of an officer and fifteen men would be sent very shortly to the oil-fields, to be increased later on to hundred. Peel explained to him the danger of collision, but the Officer Commanding troop was confident of ability to checkmate with British protection any hostile movement of tribes.

Peel considered that opposition measure by British Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company would be unwise and he suggested that British ought to cooperate with Persian Officer Commanding for protection of Company's property and reported to the British Legation accordingly.

Loraine wrote to Reza Khan and reminded him of his assurances respecting prior consultation with British Legation and the A.P.O.C. as reached any measures affecting security of oil-fields. Whether step announced was actually contemplated and if so whether Persia accepts responsibility for its consequences (63).

Meanwhile in 5 February 1924, the British Military Attaché, Colonel Saunders, met Reza Khan. The Persian Prime Minister was very satisfied with the success of operations in Lorestan, and opening of Borujerd-Khorramabad-Shushtar trade route for traffic. Then, he told the British Military Attaché: with regard to the Oil Company, he repeated the similar view as before that he is anxious to take over the entire responsibility for guarding the south Persian oil-fields in Khuzestan as soon as possible and to abolish the present arrangements under which the Bakhtiyari Khans provide guards and receive a grant money for purpose from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

For making the necessary change, Reza Khan, in a way to run no risk of local disturbance, which would be determined to the working of the Company, he intends to discuss the whole matter at an early date with the British Minister before taking any definite steps (64). A week later, in 13 February 1924, Reza Khan had a long discussion with Loraine. At first, they discussed about the question of guarding the oil-fields in Khuzestan with the army troops. Then they discussed on the other issues (65).

Reza Khan informed Loraine that no instructions had been issued by him for guarding of oil-fields by the Government troops. The Officer Commanding in Shushtar sent a small detachment of troops among tribes to prevent disorders arising out of quarrel between Haft Lang and Chahar Lang section which might have spread to vicinity of oil-fields.

Reza Khan considered, however, that tribal guarding arrangement was not satisfactory and he desired that after exchange of views better permanent arrangements can be made in interests of both Persian Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (66). In the minute of Eastern Department has written that on 16 October 1923, Reza Khan told Colonel Saunders that he „ desired to take over the responsibility for the safety of the oil-fields“ and it does not appear that any objection was raised at that time (67).

Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister, wrote: he is glad to learn that the Persian Prime Minister proposed to consult British Minister in Tehran before making any change on protection of oil-fields and asked Loraine to keep the A.P.O.C. may have an opportunity of stating their views. Loraine discussed the matter with Reza Khan (68). They agreed, both, that the matter should be thoroughly discussed between British consul in Ahvaz, Oil Company representative and commander of troops in Shushtar and the final arrangement proposed should be submitted to Persian Prime Minister and the British Minister before put into execution (69).

11. 7. The Army and the Tribes in Fars

The consolidation of military authority in Fars continued and the Persian Government and the army had the tribal affairs well in hand in this province. Up to the autumn of 1924, Brigadier (Sartip) F. Zahedi held the Command of the Army in Fars. As far as British report concerned Zahedi was “an ambitious politician in uniform“. He was engaged in intrigue against the governor-general and interfered in political affairs of Fars. This report is an indication of the increasing power of the military commanders throughout the country.

The Ilkhani of Qashqa’i, Sowlat al-Dowleh, who elected to the fifth Majles from Jahrom in 1924, remained with his tribe in Fars and did not go to Tehran to take his seat in the Parliament. He was peremptory summoned to Tehran from the Prime Minister, Reza Khan in summer. Sowlat al-Dowleh left Fars for Tehran, where he resided since August 1924. The affairs of the Qashqa’i tribe were being administered by Nasser Khan, his son, who was appointed Ilkhani of Qashqa’i in autumn 1920. Qavam al-Molk still continued to rule over the Khamseh confederation in 1924 and stayed in Fars (70).

11.8. Summary

- (1) In addition to the dispatch of a military detachment to Khuzestan, the Persian Government activated the administration of this province by appointing the determined personalities and empowering them in their office.
- (2) This was alarming to Sheikh Khaz'al. The British Minister pacified Sheikh Khaz'al and asked him to pay the arrears and annual taxes.
- (3) Sheikh Khaz'al thought if he undertakes certain demands of the Persian Government, he could maintain his position. With the mediation of British Legation, Khaz'al and the representative of Finance Ministry reached an agreement.
- (4) Reza Khan purposed to crush the power of the tribal chieftains. In case of Bakhtiyari, first he created a division between the leadership of the tribe. He supported those who were loyal to him against the others who had a hostile attitude towards the establishment of the Persian authorities and Persian Army.
- (5) Secondly, Reza Khan supported the discontent Chahar Lang branch against the leadership. This caused the disquiet of the Bakhtiyari Governors. Then, with regard to the possibility of conflict between the two sides in the oil-fields, Reza Khan asked Chahar Lang to recognise the leadership of Bakhtiyari.
- (6) Thirdly, the Government of Kohgiluyeh and Behbahan was replaced under the Governor-General of Fars after 13 years of Bakhtiyari rule.
- (7) The civil administration of Fars was gradually undermined by the Army officers. The Governor-Generals in the province of Fars had to compromise with the Commander of the Army or resign.
- (8) The chief of Khamseh tribe, Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk, was anxious for his future. He intended to go to Europe or Tehran, but he did not know what would happen to his properties. Qavam al-Molk was not sure that the Army Commanders in Fars would act justice and impartially.
- (9) The policy of Reza Khan towards the chief of Qashqa'i was not disclosed during the year 1923.
- (10) In the first half of 1924, tribal chieftains in the south anxiously looked to the events. The army forces were fighting in western provinces and were opening the routes to Khuzestan.

- (11) The harsh behaviour of the army caused resentment in certain corners, but generally the presence of Government forces brought tranquillity to the roads and in the provinces.
- (12) The Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sowlat al-Dowleh, who elected to the fifth Majles from the town Jahrom, did not go to Tehran and remained with his tribe. He was summoned to Tehran from Prime Minister, Reza Khan. Sowlat al-Dowleh resided since August 1924 in Tehran, where he was compelled to stay the rest of his life.
- (13) With the arrival of Labour Party in power at the begin 1924, the policy of centralisation of Reza Khan received more friendly gesture from London.
- (14) Reza Khan received a setback in republican movement, but very soon re-established his position and the expansion of Persian Army continued.

XII: Insurrection in the South

12.1. Rebellion in Khuzestan 1924

The campaign of the Persian Government to re-establish his authority in the Northern provinces was successful in 1921-1922, but more than two and half years of political and military efforts of the Central Government 1922-1924 in the west and southern Persia, especially in Khuzestan, did not reach to a clear and definite result.

The fighting still continued between the Persian army and rebel Lor tribes in Lorestan. The chief of great Lor tribe in the border province Posht-kuh ignored the Central Government and was always ready to participate in a southern tribal alliance against the Central Government. The Bakhtiyari leadership was divided. Some of the senior khans, most of the younger Khans and their allies' chieftains in Kohgiluyeh were strongly oppose to the presence of the Persian Army in the region (1).

In searching of oil in the south west tribal area, the A.P.O.C. increased its activities and concluded new agreements with some of these tribal chieftains and followed the old tribal policy in the west and southern Persia. They received subsidies and equipped with arms and ammunitions to protect the staffs and the properties of the Oil Company. Additionally, there were other chieftains, who were not related to the oil industry, but they had also close relations with the British southern consulates (2). The war afterwards, the British representatives in Persia played the role of mediator in differences between the Persian Government and southern tribes namely Sheikh Khaz'al, the Bakhtiyari Khans and Qavam al-Molk & so on. This was unacceptable either to the public or the Persian Government.

The station of Persian army and the re-establishment of the Persian Government authorities in Khuzestan, and Bakhtiyari, the areas of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's activities, were regarded by the British Government and the Oil Company, undesirable and hazardous to tranquillity. The chief of Mohaysen tribe and the Khans of Bakhtiyari tribes, who benefited of the situation, supported the British policy.

It is interesting to be pointed out that the Persian Government, who had granted the oil concession, after eighteen months of political struggle March 1922-October 1923 could only station a detachment to north Khuzestan. The appointment of each staff to the Government departments in Khuzestan confronted with the Sheikh Khaz'al

disapproval and British Legation mediated. For the reasons, most of these due course appointments were postponed or cancelled. The Persian Government was aware of this close relation, but they did not know the exact nature of the Anglo-Khaz'al relation (3).

Reza Khan, as Prime Minister and the commander of the army, not only intended to break the military and political power of tribal chieftains, but also he prepared to topple the Qajar dynasty and break the power of modern organisations in Persia, Parliament, press and trade union. The army and the police commanders played important role in the political atmosphere of the capital and the provinces. Reza Khan formed a network of intelligence among the oppositions.

A republican movement was organised by the Commanders of the Persian Army and personalities close to Reza Khan. The movement failed in March 1924. Despite the fact that Reza Khan had the support of the majority in Majles, he could, however, consolidate his position in less than a month. Very soon, the minority and their ally's press, who caused the failure of the republican movement, came under strong pressure and threat. The oppositions could not express freely their views in Majles and press (4).

Meanwhile, the U.S. Vice-Consul was assassinated by a mob in 18 July 1924. As a result of this incident, the Sinclair Oil Company of the United State abandoned the searching and investment in oil in Persia. The A.P.O.C. in Persia remained as the sole power in oil industry. This event also gave an opportunity to Reza Khan to declare martial law in Tehran. The political situation became even harder for the oppositions. The minority interpellated the Government in Parliament. In power struggle, Reza Khan received the vote of confidence in 9 August 1924 and came out of the political crisis stronger than before (5).

During these years of the hot political circumstances in Tehran, the expansion of the army and foundation of new garrisons continued. Reza Khan planned and supervised, himself, the military campaigns against the tribal unrest and tribal disarmament. Since the end of October 1923, when Reza Khan formed his first Cabinet, the process of centralisation and militarisation policy accelerated mainly in tribal areas.

Though, Khaz'al agreed to pay his arrears and current taxes in autumn 1923, but the re-establishment of the Central Government authority in Khuzestan was not resolved. It was the right of the Persian Government to station the Persian Army throughout the country. Khaz'al had no additional right than the other Persian subject. It appears that there was no place for autonomy for anybody in this regime.

After the Shalil incident, Reza Khan did certain military preparations to bring Khuzestan and the other tribal areas under the authority of Central Government. Then, he sent troops to the provinces adjacent to Khuzestan: Isfahan, Chahar Mahal, Shiraz, Bushehr, Kazerun, Kermanshah and Khorramabad. The aim was to bring to an end the tribal unrest in these provinces and open the route to Khuzestan.

Sheikh Khaz'al realised that centralisation policy of the Persian Government would reach to Khuzestan. Khaz'al was anxious for his future. He became gradually dissatisfied with the arrangements for payment of revenue, which he had made with the Persian Government at the end of the year 1923, and regretted of his consent to the presence of the Persian detachment in Dezful and had little faith in the assurances given to him by the Persian Government in October 1923. The British Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Colonel Trevor, who visited Sheikh Khaz'al in March 1924, found him nervous and apprehensive (6).

Khaz'al came into contact with the Crown Prince and the leader of minority in Parliament. They intended to invite the Shah to return to Persia. In real term, the oppositions had not a stable organisation and financially were in difficult situation, but they were influential and enjoy of public support. Reza Khan received the information of this relation. It appears that Reza Khan intended to crack down Khaz'al and the other tribal chieftains, before the correspondence between Khaz'al, and the oppositions in Tehran reach to an organised form (7).

Apparently, two events accelerated the tension in Khuzestan. Firstly, the success of the Persian Army in Lorestan, the clash between military forces and different tribes in Lorestan continued for several months. On the one side, the Lor tribes, who remained untouched for many decades, were not prepared to subjugate to the authority of Central Government and on the other side the behaviours of military commanders towards the tribesmen were arrogant. In summer 1924, the military operations finished in Lorestan and the tribal unrest was brutally suppressed.

The military operations against the Lor tribes in northern frontier of Khuzestan alarmed Khaz'al seriously. Khaz'al financed, equipped and agitated certain Lor tribes with the assistance of friendly Bakhtiari Khans. Now he was the witness of the army victory and disarmed the tribesmen (8).

Secondly, in the middle of July 1924, Khaz'al was informed that the Farmans (Royal Decrees) issued by the Shah in 1903, three months later than the date of his Farmans "revoking all Farmans relating to former State properties in the Gulf ports,

was held to annul his Farmans.“ The Persian Government also refused to recognise the sale of some property which Sheikh Khaz'al sold to the Imperial Bank of Persia, on the ground that the property was not belong to him.

This act was regarded by Khaz'al as a deliberate effort of Reza Khan, the Prime Minister, to undermine his authority in Khuzestan (9). The vast Government land, Khalessah, provided the bulk of surplus revenue for Khaz'al and was essential for maintaining the loyalty of social base of support of the Arab tribes (10). Khaz'al laid the matter before his tribes as well as the other Arab tribes of Khuzestan. They promise in traditional form to support him in his campaign. He began to gather a fighting force of Arab tribes in Khuzestan (11).

British Charge d'Affaires, Esmond Ovey, warned the sheikh not to be provocative and at the same time negotiated on this matter with the Persian Government. The negotiations continued for some weeks. Ovey did not wish that the Persian Government take this question to Parliament. There was little chance that such concession would ratify by the Parliament. He endeavoured to Persuade Reza Khan to pacify the situation. Khaz'al became restless.

Very soon, it was known that certain neighbour tribal chieftains would participate in this conflict. Some senior Bakhtiyari Khans such as Amir Mojahed and most of the younger khans and some of the senior Bakhtiyari Khans and their Kohgiluye allies as well as Vali of Posht-kuh, the chief of Filie tribe, prepared to fight side by side with Khaz'al against the Persian Government in the south.

Nicols, one of the Managing Directors of the A.P.O.C. in London, telephoned to Persian Department in Foreign Office that he received a serious telegram from the company representative at Mohammareh regarding the friction arise between Khaz'al and the military office of the Persian detachments at Shushtar. He sent the text of the telegram of 11 August to George Churchill. The Directors of the Oil Company in London considered the situation in Khuzestan serious. Nicols, therefore, wished to call the Foreign Office with Sir Arnold Wilson Resident Managing Director who was in London to discuss the matter with the department. George Churchill explained that it would better to send a telegram to the British Charge d'Affaires in Tehran in the first instance and await his reply before taking further action (12).

As a result of friendly co-operation of Sheikh Khaz'al with the British authorities in the Persian Gulf and Khuzestan especially since 1897, when he succeeded to his brother, he received several assurance letters in 1902, 1903, 1908, 1909, 1910 and

1914. After the formation of the A.P.O.C. in 1909, Khaz'al concluded an agreement with the Oil Company to protect the oil-pipe in southern Khuzestan and oil refinery in Abadan. Soon, in 1910, in addition to assurance letter, he was decorated and honoured with the titles K.C.I.E. On the eve of the Great War, in 1914, with 51% British Government became the great share holder in the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. Again Sheikh Khaz'al for his services received an assurance letter in 1914 and was decorated and honoured with the titles K.C.S.I. In each letter, British Government assumed more obligations toward Khaz'al (13).

As soon as Nichols, of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, informed George Churchill in the Persian department of Foreign Office regarding the friction that had arisen between Sheikh Khaz'al and the military commander of the Persian detachment in Shushtar, he reviewed the British assurances to Khaz'al as follows: "Our assurances to the Sheikh are explicit and are worded as follow.

"December 1902. So long as you remain faithful to the Shah and act in accordance with our advice we will continue to give you our good office and support". "December 1908. Undertaking... includes the continuance of the state of autonomy which Your Excellency at present enjoys". "October, 1910. His Majesty's Government will be prepared to offer you the necessary for obtaining a satisfactory solution in the event of any encroachment by the Persian Government on your territory and the recognised rights of your property in Persia". "Vis-à-vis the Persian Government we shall do our best to maintain Your Excellency in your present state of local autonomy."

George Churchill writes: About a year ago we observed symptoms of an inclination on the part of Reza Khan "to encroach upon the Sheikh's local autonomy and we thought necessary to support the Sheikh." British Minister made vigorous representations to the Persian Prime Minister, who was induced to give up any plan had in mind against Sheikh Khaz'al. For some time, Foreign Office receives local reports from Khuzestan indicating a move of this kind was not unlikely (14).

In fact, the latest assurance, the assurance of November 1914, became the base of British internal discussions and decisions on southern Khuzestan at least for a decade. As a result of the important of this assurance it was reprinted in many occasions in British reports. The British Resident in the Persian Gulf, Sir Percy Cox writes:

"After compliments-With reference to the assurances conveyed to Your Excellency in my letter no. 307, dated the 15th October 1910 and having regard to the further valued services and co-operation which Your Excellency has rendered to the British

Government and to British interests in Arabistan and the Shatt -al-Arab, I am now authorised to assure Your Excellency personally, and do by this writing, that whatever change may take in the form of the Government of Persia, and whether it be Royalist or Nationalist, His Majesty's Government will be prepared to afford you the support necessary for obtaining a solution satisfactory both to yourself and to us in the event of any encroachment by the Persian Government on your jurisdiction and recognised rights or on your property in Persia. In like manner unprovoked attack by a Foreign Power or against any encroachment by such Power on your said jurisdiction and recognised rights or on your property in Persia. These assurances are given for yourself and for your successors from among your male descendants, and shall hold good so long as you and they do not fail to observe your and their obligations towards the Persian Government provided always that the nomination of your successors from among your male descendants shall be subject to confidential consultation with, and the approval of His Majesty's Government, and so long as you and they shall continue to be guided by the advice of His Majesty's Government and to maintain an attitude satisfactory to that Government. vis a vis- the Persian Government, we shall do our best to maintain Your Excellency in your present state of local autonomy " (15).

The telegram from the representatives of the A.P.O.C. in Mohammareh for the Managing Directors in London was as follows: On the 9 August, at the request of Sheikh Khaz'al, J. Jameson of Anglo-Persian Oil Company visited him in Ahvaz. Khaz'al stated that he was determined resist further interference of the Central Government, if necessary by force. He was collecting troops and was visiting outlying tribes. Khaz'al added that he demanded troops withdrawn from Shushtar and Dezful and return to status que and he would take over customs of Khuzestan. He expressed bitterness against Reza Khan.

It appears that he endeavoured to identical his down fell and opposition to British interests by Reza Khan and concluded that intrigue would be directed against safety of company's property and employees as means of attacking him. He would not relax his vigilance to safe guard Company. S.Clegg interviewed the governor-general, who confirmed attitude of Khaz'al and seriousness of situation. He recommending modification attitude of Prime Minister and stop intrigue which is responsible for grave attitude of Khaz'al (16). T. L. Jacks returned to Mohammareh from Baghdad on the 9 August and discussed the political situation in Khuzestan with J. Jameson and S. Clegg. They agreed serious aspect.

Foreign Office informed the British Charge d'Affaires in Tehran the gist of the report accordingly and pointed out that the Oil Company's local agents considered the situation serious. Foreign Office added: "we must not lose sight of our engagements towards the sheikh and if the facts are as reported you should speak to the Persian Prime Minister and get him to send a suitable telegram to the Military Commander at Shushtar and another of a reassuring Character to the Sheikh" (17).

In fact as a result of the three local agents of Anglo Persian Oil Company meeting and discussion on the situation in Khuzestan, they addressed to the Oil Company London principal and representatives in Tehran and giving them detail information of the position that Khaz'al was collecting troops and visiting his tribes in person to strengthening his position and to resist, by force arms, any further attempts to interfere within his territory and soon.

In view of the foregoing the representatives of the Oil Company in Khuzestan considered "the situation exceedingly serious", with regard to the safety of employees and the pipe-line of the Company. They send a letter to the British consulate in Ahvaz and informed the consul Peel of the contents of their telegrams to London and Tehran, then, asked him to acquaint British "Legation with full details of the position to warn the Persian Government of the serious consequence an open rupture in Khuzestan is likely to have on the operations of the Company" with the consequent large loss of revenue to themselves.

They asked that "all precautionary protective measures will be taken in case disturbances occur" (18). Beside the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's report, British consul in Ahvaz added other reasons for the rebellion of Khaz'al. He stated that Sheikh Khaz'al is not content merely to assume validity of his Farmans, he knows that Persian Foreign Ministry will not attest his sake of deeds, and the non-interference policy of Persian Government will at the best no longer than his life time. Khaz'al wanted to bring matters to ahead and put things on a firm basis for his successors.

He took steps to cement allegiance of his tribes and left for Bani Turuf tribe after then he would go to Fallahiyeh. His plan of operation will depend, said Peel, on extends to which he satisfies himself of British interests but he wanted to be supplied with arms in case of serious developments. Peel was of opinion nothing short of Persian troops withdrawal or their "encroachments" or British Charge d'Affaires intervention on his behalf would restrain Khaz'al at this stage.

12.2. British Respond

The Oil Company was alarmed by possible danger to pipelines. He, however, did not anticipate any immediate danger (19). British Charge d'Affaires replied to the telegram of Peel and repeated to Foreign Office. He criticised strongly the action of Khaz'al. Ovey stated that he was aware of the Persian Government's attitude in connection with the sake of deeds and he realises Sheikh's anxiety he would call the Prime Minister's attention to the grave issues and trust he could prevent Reza Khan from precipitate action.

Ovey instructed Peel to inform Khaz'al of above and at the same time make it perfectly clear that if he instead of awaiting results of British support he commits any rebellious act, British Government would take most serious view of it, and he will be putting himself in the wrong and prejudice his case with. Then Ovey stating privately to consul "If Sheikh thinks Prime Minister's position has been shaken by recent political developments, he is much mistaken. You must use every argument to keep Sheikh quiet pending further instructions from Foreign Office while assuring him that we are not be traging him in any way in his legitimate claim" (20).

MacDonald Stated: "I await further information from you as to facts of situation and your views regarding their important. You will, however, realise that if facts are as represented to the A.P.O.C. a very serious situation may be arise.The British interests involved in Arabistan are so great that cannot view untoward developments there with in difference" (21).

In the next telegram, Foreign Office sent the following message from Ramsay McDonald to the British Charge d'Affaires "I approve the terms of your message to the Sheikh of Mohammareh. "The firmans of 1903 granted certain lands to the sheikh in perpetuity and it would be deplorable if there were now revoked. You should therefore every effort to induce the Persian Prime Minister to desist from his present attitude towards the sheikhs" (22).

A week after the first cable from Anglo-Persian Oil Company's local agents in Khuzestan, the Directors of the Oil Company in Britannic House-London sent a letter to Whitehall - Foreign Office and put pressure on British Cabinet. They wrote: Owing to apprehensions aroused in the mind of the Sheikh Khaz'al by the trend of recent administrative acts of the Persian Government, the relation between him and the Government is strained. The Oil Company enclosed for the consideration of British

Prime Minister, Ramsay McDonald, and a precise of the relations of the Sheikh Khaz'al with the A.P.O.C. and with the British Government as far as they affect the Oil Company's relations with him.

"It will be apparent to you that we have long viewed the recent trend of the Persian Government's policy in s.w. Persia with anxiety, and whilst it may be that no immediate breach of the peace will occur, our experience in Persia taught us that unless the situation of this kind, in which the interests and ambitions alike of the ruling chiefs were at state, was promptly deal with disturbance are likely to follow and rapidly become uncontrollable. In the light of the present situation, we therefore beg respectfully to represent that in the interests of shareholders, of British trade and shipping, and of British interests generally.

It is of urgent importance that a pronouncement shall be made by His Majesty's Representative in Tehran to the Persian Government to the effect the His Majesty's Government view with much apprehension the tendencies of the recent administrative measures in S.W. Persia which are inconsistent with the repeated assurances given to His Majesty's Minister by the Persian Government, and which threaten gravely to imperil vital British interests in that region.

Further, that having regard to the special nature of those interests, both, political and commercial, and to the responsibility which His Majesty's Government have repeatedly assumed, at the request of the Persian Government, of recommending to the Sheikh of Mohammareh at the acceptance of proposals of the Persian Government which would otherwise have been rejected by him (e.g. establishment of Belgian customs in 1902 the location of Persian troops at Shushtar in 1923 and the increase of revenue payments 1924). His Majesty's Government now feel bound to ask the Persian Government to take such steps (including of the confirmation of the Sheikh's Farmans) as well as allay the latter's apprehensions and restore his confidence in the good will of the Central Government and his loyalty, of which he was repeatedly given convincing proofs.

"The above representation is made with great diffidence for the consideration of Mr. Secretary MacDonald and it is hoped that prompt action may be taken. We are most unwilling to contemplate the possibility of a situation which might involve a request on our part for intervention by the Air Headquarters at Baghdad, but in view of the position so far as known to us, we would ask that Air Marshal Commanding in

Baghdad may be informed of the state affairs, in order that he may be able, if needs be, to take military action at short notice” (23).

Again two representatives of the Anglo Persian Oil Company, Jameson and Jacks, met Sheikh Khaz'al in 16 August in Ahvaz. Khaz'al said that it is impossible for him to withdraw from his attitude towards Persian Government until his rights as well as the right of his friends Bakhtiyari “Khans through Amir Mojahed, Kohgiluyeh chiefs, Vali of Posht-Kuh and Sowlat al-Dowleh Qashqa'i were recognised. “They completely distrusted Prime Minister and could not accept assurances from him. He only would accept conditions from the Persian Government were complete withdrawal of detachments from north Khuzestan, revision of his revenue and return to status quo.”

12.2.1. Oil Company and Khaz'al

Khaz'al promised the representatives of the Oil Company to keep them informed ----- and “no action on his part calculated his position with British Government.“ Khaz'al “mentioned in event of open breach he contemplated getting into communication with the Shah inviting him to come to Mohammareh as his guest in connection with scheme for an independent south Persia which is dependent upon reply from people with whom he is communicating” (24).

The agents of the Oil Company met the governor-general in Khuzestan. He stated that he had dispatched from telegrams to Prime Minister urging moderation in seriousness situation in Khuzestan before too late. Jacks and Jameson stated that the recall troops in Shushtar appear certain and cancellation of Khaz'al's Farmans account for his determined attitude and had strengthened with his tribes (25).

The British Charge d'Affaires instructed Ryan, the Vice-Consul that he almost persuaded Reza Khan, to confirm the Farmans. The news of warlike attitude of Khaz'al infuriated the Prime Minister, but provided Khaz'al would send a humble apology, the British Charge d'Affaires in Tehran, Ovey, was confident that Prime Minister would get telegraph confirmation. Finally the Reza Khan informed Khaz'al in 21 August 1924 that “he corrected the mistake and only meant to remind him that the terms of his Farmans forbade sale of his properties to others” (26).

The Commander of the Persian detachment in Shushtar, who was not in harmony with Khaz'al, changed by the order of Reza Khan, the Minister of War and he appointed Major Reza Qoli Khan as the new commander of the force in Shushtar. None

of these actions changed the decision of the Khaz'al. He thought that the correction of the previous telegram was due to the weakness of Reza Khan. On 25 August 1924, Khaz'al received enclair telegram from Prime Minister enquiring reasons for his silence with regard to friendly message sent to him through governor-general. Apparently, the language of this telegram was hard.

Khaz'al continued to collect cavalry and infantry inside Khuzestan. Certain Bakhtiyari khans as well as the governor-general in Khuzestan and the new commander of the Persian detachment in Shushtar joint Khaz'al (27). The following day Ryan met Khaz'al and advising he should not precede Ram Hormoz said Anglo Persian Oil Company telegram, and emphasising that the position of Amir Mojahed with the Persian Government rendered essential if he commits himself, he would prejudice himself with British Government. Khaz'al was annoyed but the A.P.O.C. local agents learned that the visit cancelled (28).

British Consulate in Mohammareh and the Imperial Bank received deputation, merchants regarding safety merchandise stop Bazaar business stagnant on rumour that Khaz'al was moving tribes into Dezful. It was also rumour that the Kohgiluyeh tribes killed three Cossacks strong of Persian force proceeding from Behbahan and were about 80 km from Ramhormoz. In those days, Khaz'al dispatched motor boats in Fallahiye to add with arms and ammunition to Ahvaz (29).

The A.P.O.C. informed the British Foreign Secretary that the Oil Company in London instructed local representatives in Khuzestan to impress strongly on Sheikh Khaz'al the necessity of avoiding action which would only compromise the position of himself and his friends in southern Persia without improving the situation. They acknowledged the efforts of British Government and the improve of situation in Khuzestan, but they added that the Oil Company are still apprehensive of continued tension between Khaz'al and Central Government which may at any moment lead to an renewed crisis.

The latest information indicated that the exchange of telegrams between the two sides did not allay the fear of Khaz'al and the arrival of Amir Mojahed Bakhtiyari at Ahvaz in 30 August, 1924 neutralised such belief (30). Khaz'al continued to collecting force. Some of the Government officials in the north and the south of Khuzestan joined Khaz'al voluntary or reluctantly. The others came under strong pressure and some of the heads of the Government's offices were expelled (31).

12.3. Reshuffle of Persian Cabinet

From the middle of July, Reza Khan negotiated with the British Legation on the question of Khaz'al's Farmans and the security of the oil-fields and simultaneously he prepared the Persian Army for a campaign in the south. Reza Khan was also in struggle with Majles for his survival. Finally in 9 August 1924, he received the vote of confidence, but his second Cabinet collectively resigned. Twenty days later, on 29 August 1924, Reza Khan introduced his third Cabinet to Crown Prince.

In this Cabinet, Hassan Moshar al-Molk was appointed as the Minister for Foreign Affairs. British Charge d, Affaires believed the new Persian Foreign Minister showed constant goodwill in the settlement of various questions. Ovey added he did to certain extend this satisfactory willingness to meet British Government to buy? British support in the unfortunate question arising from the rebellion of Sheikh Khaz'al. Moshar al-Molk endeavoured to find out whether British Government was displeased with the Persian Government (32).

Ovey had a positive view on the new Persian Cabinet. The second consideration in this Cabinet was the presence of a Bakhtiyari Khan, Sardar Ass'ad as the Minister of Post and Telegraph. It is a safe guess that Reza Khan intended to bring the Bakhtiyari Khans or in any price some of them in his side in his campaign. At the end of August 1924, Reza Khan personally paid a visit to Khorramabad in Lorestan and studied the situation of the army, the operations and disarmament of tribes (33).

Ovey informed his superior that there have been rumours in circulation with regard to the British design, include the demand by British Government for northern Oil concession. He went on to say that there is still an unfailing source in certain quarters the constant stream of anti-British innuendo (34). For this reason the Persian Foreign Minister went straight the British Charged, Affaires for enquiry.

12.4. Declaration of Rebellion

On 11 September 1924, Captain Peel, the British consul in Ahvaz, informed the Legation in Tehran that Sheikh Khaz'al was determined to overthrow Reza Khan, the Prime Minister (35). At the same time, he said that he would abandon his "defence

measure „if, “(a) he received written guarantees of safety for himself and his supporters, especially Amir Mojahed, (b) all Persian troops were withdrawn from ‘Arabistan, including Behbahan. (c) his revenue arrangements reverted to the pre-war basis, (d) he received more specific confirmation of his firmans, and (e) the British Government guaranteed him against unfriendly acts by Riza Khan in the future” (36).

Khaz’al intended to make his position safe and stable once forever. The chiefs of Arab tribes in Khuzestan assured him of their loyalty and support. The second step was an alliance of southern chieftains. It appeared that the Bakhtiyari khans would join the rebellion. For the reason, that the Bakhtiyari Khans and tribesmen were dissatisfied with the tribal policy of Reza Khan. Additionally, the Resident Directors of the Oil Company and the southern consulates encouraged them. Amir Mojahed and then some junior khans with their cavalries joined the Sheikh.

He supported by the Gholam Reza Khan, the Vali of Poshtkuh and some of the tribes in Lorestan. Khaz’al sent several telegrams to the Shah in Paris and informed him of the situation and invited him to return to Persia. He suggested that the southern forces would accompany the Shah from the west to Tehran.

British Political Resident in Bushehr received a sensational report on 10 September from a British inspector that the tribesmen were confronting military from Behbahan at Zaidun. Fighting had not commenced and orders were sent from Shiraz and Ahvaz restraining leaders of opposing parties (37).

On September 16, 1924, Khaz’al cabled to Foreign Legations as well as the Persian Parliament through the Turkish Embassy. Some days later, Majles received a telegram from Amir Mojahed on behalf of the Bakhtiyari Khans and headmen and a telegram from the Arab tribal chiefs in Khuzestan with the almost the same contents (38). The news of formal proclamation of rebellion by Khaz’al coincided with the return of Reza Khan to Tehran from his journey to Lorestan, where he appreciated and encouraged the operations of the army against the tribal unrest.

In his letter, Khaz’al considered Reza Khan usurper and aggressor, who had driven the shah from the country. The aim of southern movement was to overthrow the prime Minister, to safeguard the integrity and liberty of the country, the definite establishment of constitutional principles and the return of the Shah. Colonel Reza Qoli Khan, Officer Commanding troops in Khuzestan declared himself to be on the side of Sheikh Khaz’al. With the exception of about 200 men sent to Behbahan, Reza Khan promised to delay counter-measures to allow British Government to mediate (39).

On September 23, 1924, a declaration was published by the southern alliance. They announced of formation the Committee-e Qiyam-e Sa'adat (Committee of prosperity insurrection) and invited the Persians throughout the country to join them in defending of Constitutional monarchy and prevent of the re-establishment of despotic rule (40). Khaz'al sent an emissary to Shi'ah' U'lama in Najaf and Karbela in Mesopotamia to obtain their support of the rebellion. He also sent an especial envoy to Paris to induce the Shah to return.

Victor Mallet wrote in the minute to the telegraphs of Ovey to Foreign Office (41) that Khaz'al seems determined to secure the over throw of Reza Khan and was preparing to resort to civil war and his conspirator include, Amir Mojahed, a rascally Bakhtiyari, the governor-general of Khuzestan, the officer commanding of detachments in Shushtar. They hoped to drag in the Shah as their catspaw.

Moshar al-Molk, the Minister for Foreign Affairs in the new cabinet of Reza Khan, wrote Mallet, seems not willing to play traitor to his Prime Minister. The governor-general of Khuzestan advised to Colonel Prideaux that Ovey should take a hand in a political intrigue. The British ought not to do.

As far as British Documents indicate, Sir P. Loraine had reached into conclusion in his negotiations with Reza Khan that British Government can do business with him. In his return to London in leave of absence, Loraine defended the centralisation policy of the Persian Government under Reza Khan. The new British Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of Labour Party, approved the view of Sir Percy Loraine on this matter.

British Charge d'Affaires, Esmond Ovey, and the British Legation in Tehran strongly supported centralisation policy of Reza Khan. Ovey was the witness of the events and political crisis in Tehran in summer 1924. Reza Khan came out of the power struggle stronger than before. British Government and the Legation in Tehran, however, endeavoured to pacify the Persian Prime Minister on southern rebellion.

Soviet Russia supported the centralisation policy of Reza Khan and prepares to assist him if he requested. From Soviet viewpoint the success of Reza Khan does not let the return of British force to Persia. Reza Khan found this factor useful in his goals against oppositions. The danger to oil-fields is not to be minimised, and fighting breaks out near the oil-fields British may have to face the question of trying to find troops to protect them from the conflicting armies. Prideaux was include to show much sympathy with the local (i.e. Sheikh's) point of view and should be told to use stronger language

to Khaz'al because he put himself in the wrong and cannot expect British to give him support in all of the four demands.

Ovey endeavoured to negotiate on the line of (42) Reza Khan to give written guarantees of safety of life and property for Khaz'al, but Amir Mojahed to leave Persia. More specific confirmation of the Farmans for him, Sheikh cannot expect Reza Khan to agree the withdrawal of troops from north of Khuzestan. He might try to get him to agree not to reinforce existing detachment. As regards the taxation of Khaz'al, British did their best for him last year and they could not assist him to upset the Agreement. Mallet suggested to authorise Ovey to attempt on above lines with Reza Khan and convey a message to Khaz'al telling him: British cannot hold responsible for the consequences if he does not modify his war-like attitude and sends Amir Mojahed out of his territory (43).

Prideaux, the British Political Resident in Bushehr, informed Ovey of the situation in Khuzestan. It is hoped that deputation headed by Governor-General of Khuzestan, Theqat al-Molk consent to visit Ahmad Shah to persuade him to come into Bakhtiyari country. Theqat al-Molk told Prideaux in an interview that British Legation to convey impression to Moshar al-Molk, Foreign Minister and other politicians that British Government are more sympathetic towards Khaz'al than toward Reza Khan, If this done the Prime Minister's majority in Majles will become a minority. British Government should also promise to effect reconciliation between Ahmad Shah and Moshar al-Molk.

It was reported that Amir Mojahed left Ahvaz for Ramhormoz on September 14, to organise defensive measures and Khaz'al intended to go to Zeydun to supervise its defence. The son of Khaz'al and the other subordinate said that they would disown him if he submits to further humiliation at the hands of Reza Khans (44).

The British Charge d'Affaires replied immediately and informed Ahvaz consulate and Whitehall of his view by stating that he was at liberty with openly suggestions of British Political Resident at Bushehr that British Government should lent to plot over turn Reza Khan and recall Ahmad Shah, an entirely internal matter of Persians. The policy of British Government is to protect the just claims of Khaz'al, but to deter him by every means from such a move as he contemplated. He is responsible of war in which he is convinced that the moment is opportune and the Persian Government is powerless for the time being.

Khaz'al can be forcibly restrained from open hostility by threat to send or actually dispatch of warship to Mohammareh, restraining him from further foolishness pending negotiating of settlement. The Persian Government has not taken any movements troops which could be interpreted as commencement of serious offensive operations against Khaz'al. Reza Khan is expected to return very soon and he would have to defend himself by war where he is ready (45).

Victor Mallet wrote in his minute to the telegram of Ovey: the moment is arriving when British shall have to abandon the purely neutral position hitherto adopted in the quarrel between Reza Khan and Sheikh Khaz'al and the effort was directed towards the reconciliation to save the face of both parties. Now Khaz'al put himself in the wrong and is on the verge of open rebellion against the Persian Government, though, he remains nominally loyal to Ahmad Shah.

From time to time, British protected Sheikh Khaz'al from unlawful encroachment by the Persian Government, but British Government has never undertaken to back him to extend his sphere of influence at the expense of the Persian Government which he is attempt to do. If Foreign Office "follow the advice of the A.P.O.C. and back the sheikh through thick and thin, we shall completely destroy the gradually increasing confidence of Persians in the disinterestedness of His Majesty's Government" (46).

"The time has come to tell the Sheikh quite clearly that if he now take up arms against the Persian Government, shall consider all our former under takings and letters to him as cancelled " Half the trouble, said Mallet, is due to the fact that the Sheikh has received, if not encouragement, at least sympathy in his attitude from the local managers of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. Colonel Prideaux, influenced probably by their attitude and also by the traditional Pre-War British policy in south Persia, seems entirely to fail appreciate the position.

Mallet suggested to inform the A.P.O.C. that Foreign Office consider the Sheikh to be in the wrong and we (British) are not prepare to take a hand to overthrow Reza Khan. "If the A.P.O.C. authorities at Mohammerah could be told by their London headquarters to hold out to the Sheikh absolutely no hope of British support, he may begin to see reason, it present he's probably puzzled by the Oil Company speaking with one voice and our Consular officers with another" (47).

The A.P.O.C. was informed that the situation in Khuzestan was affecting the Bakhtiyari position. Amir Mojahed received strong support from tribesmen. The Ilkhani, Amir Mofakham, and Ilbegi, Amir Jang, informed British Consul-General

Isfahan that the Bakhtiyari tribes are completely out of hand, consequently, they intended to resign. Bakhtiyari tribesmen were disgusted with Amir Jang who may march to Khuzestan against Sheikh Khaz'al and causing inter-tribal fighting with consequent, said the Anglo Persian Oil Company agent, danger to oil-fields.

The Oil Company cannot be placed reliance on sincerity of promise made by Reza Khan. The Russian consul in Ahvaz through medium of Governor-General approached consul Peel with object of combining efforts to cause Khaz'al desisted from present attitude (48).

The Oil Company in Khuzestan, were of opinion that Reza Khan conscious of danger to his position and necessity of retaining friendly relations with British Minister in Tehran to enable him withdraws from present impasse. The concentration of Government troops continued in Shiraz and any attack on Khaz'al forces was likely to be made from Behbahan. The Governor-General of Khuzestan and an officer commanding of troops in Shushtar had thrown in lot with Khaz'al (49).

Meanwhile the Under-Secretary of Foreign Office, Sir Lancelot Oliphant, had a long visit from Nichols, a Director of the A.P.O.C. and Dr. Young, the Resident Political Advisor, who was at that time in London in 18 September 1924. Oliphant writes: "I invited their view. Mr. Nichols explained that in the opinion of the company, they were at present living on a volcano and that it was essential that something should be done. How long was the situation to be allowed to drag on? Dr. Young expressed the view that it was impossible to throw over the Persian Prime Minister in favour of Sheikh Khaz'al. (This appeared to me as a great admission for one so intimately connected with oil affairs in Arabistan). I explained to Mr. Nichols that so far as I was in a position to advise my chiefs, I trusted that nothing rash would be done and that the longer we could play for time the better."

He, then, read to them the draft telegram to his "surprise, and little satisfaction, was assured that they both thought it met the requirements of the case completely" (50). From Foreign Office point of view whether it is successful or not, it is at any rate satisfactory to find that "we shall not be subjected to criticism by the Oil Company in view of their concurrence in its terms" (51).

British consul in his return to Ahvaz from Tehran, met Sheikh Khaz'al and the others and then prepared a memorandum on the situation in Khuzestan and the position of Sheikh Khaz'al in particular. He wrote: after the Great War, Khaz'al dreamed of increased power, but he filled with alarm and despondency of British troops departure

from Khuzestan in 1919-1920, the withdrawal of British political representatives from Shushtar and Dezful in 1922-1923, the rise of Reza Khan and the start of Central Government's expansion power and the dispatch of Persian Government troops to Shushtar and Behbahan.

By the arrival of Government's troops, he was anxious to overthrow and deprived from his hereditary rights and privileges. It needed finally a personal visit from British Minister, Sir Loraine, Ahvaz to convince the sheikh, albeit reluctantly that his safest course was to become the "friend of our friend" that British Government could give no more binding guarantee than it had given in 1914. A letter from Reza Khan to the British Minister is a sufficient evidence of his friendly disposition.

Peel reported to the British Legation that Vali of Posht-kuh was starting offensive and resistance of Lurs was stiffening, Bakhtiyari tribes solidly on side of Khaz'al, centralising of Reza Khan failed. If British Legation continues to support him in face of opposition of south result will be collapse against Loraine's sounded warning in 1922. If, policy of neutrality is adhered to sending British troops to Khuzestan will never arise.

In his minute of September 24, wrote Mallet: if we are forced by circumstances to bring pressure to bear upon Sheikh Khaz'al, we shall to certain extent lose prestige amongst the Arab chieftains in the Persian Gulf. If we stand by and allow the Persian Government to oust Khaz'al, we should equally be regarded by the Arabs as having let the Sheikh down, but at the same time getting less credit from the Persian Government. If the Bakhtiyaris are joining Khaz'al we ought to lose no time in bringing him to the senses (52).

It was clear to Mallet and the Persian Department in Foreign Office of the telegrams from Consul Peel in Ahvaz and from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's representatives at Mohammareh that Sheikh Khaz'al attitude was viewed with more sympathy locally than by British Charge d' Affaires, Ovey, in Tehran.

Peel thought that the Reza Khan's centralising policy failed definitely and if British stand aside in this quarrel, Reza Khan will be beaten, but Foreign Office had no indication from Ovey that this appreciation of the position was correct. Peel reported that there is no question of Khaz'al's taking the oil-fields unless attack and Ovey informed Foreign Office that Reza Khan made no preparations and unlikely to attack Khaz'al for some time.

British Government was prepared to mediate on preventing a disastrous outbreak of civil war in the neighbourhood of the oil-fields. Foreign Office showed sympathy with Khaz'al in attempting to obtain at least two of four conditions. It is absurd, wrote Mallet, for Khaz'al to pretend the small detachments at Dezful and Shushtar as a menace to his position. They are outside his territory and since his previous year had not been seriously reinforced (53).

12.5. Isvestia and Khuzestan's Affairs

Foreign Office was informed from Moscow that the official press undeterred? By dementi of Persian Embassy, continue to publish telegrams emanating from Tehran on insurrectionary movement in Khuzestan led by Sheikh Khaz'al and supported by Great Britain. Isvestia wrote in 21 September 1924 that Khaz'al formed a committee applied to British Legation and Majles that they set the task of overturning the Central Government and bringing back the Shah.

In spite of the fact that British intermediaries, the reconciliation between Khaz'al and Reza Khan did not take place. Isvestia continued to write: "the movement of Sheikh Khaz'al, who is entirely under British influence, is an instance of the duplicity of British policy and indicates an endeavour to destroy military means the national progressive forces of Persia. The Moscow Mission stating it is not clear whether this is from Tehran or a contribution from Rothstein's department (54).

Peel reported: Bakhtiyari tribesmen may give trouble, unless at once Amir Jang, the Ilbegi, resigns and Sheikh Khaz'al would welcome presence of British Warship here. He added: the only satisfactory solution is acceptance of Khaz'al demands or resignation of Reza Khan. Khaz'al then soon would come to terms with the Governor-General in Khuzestan. With regard to Peel's reports, the Persian Department in Foreign Office concluded that the Bakhtiyari tribesmen were more inclined to resent the interference of the Central Government than the Khans. The tribesmen incited by Amir Mojahed are now disinclined to obey their tribal governors.

The Ilkhani and Ilbegi were both appointed by the Persian Government from among few Khans who went over to the side of Reza Khan. The Ilbegi, Amir Jang, was the brother of Sardar Ass'ad III who was a member of the Cabinet of Reza Khan. Foreign Office was of opinion that the Bakhtiyari Khans as well as Khaz'al restrained from quarrelling with Reza Khan for fear of incurring the displeasure of British

Government. Peels hold the view that to restrain Khaz'al and Bakhtiyari Khans „further would be too definitely taking sides in order to prop up Reza Khan.

In his minute of 30 September 1924 to this report, wrote Victor Mallet: It is difficult for British representatives on the spot to look on this struggle without being to certain extent prejudiced by personalities engaged in it. From British point of view the quarrel between Reza Khan and Sheikh Khaz'al is an attempt by a powerful Persian, enjoying a certain measure of local autonomy, to increase his own position an authority at the expense of the Central Government held their hand on account of British well-known relations with Khaz'al, but the Persian Government cannot be expected to do so indefinitely.

Mallet continued to say: “we ought not to insist with Reza Khan upon the acceptance of all the Sheikh's demands---If anyone is to be forced to give way, it should be the sheikh, who has put himself in the wrong , but the Persians are adopts at compromise. Ovey may be able to negotiate a settlement”(55). Oliphant wrote: “I entirely share Mr Mallet, s view”

12.6. Majles and Khaz'al

On 30 September 1924, the speaker of National Assembly replied to the Committee:

“I inform you that the present government, headed by Reza Khan, Sardar Sepah, enjoys the full support and confidence of the Majles. Any person, who should rise or take an action against the Government would naturally be considered as an outlaw by the Majles” (56).

Some previous days the speaker of Majles replied to the Arab tribal chiefs. He appreciated their patriotism, but he pointed out that the Cabinet of Reza Khan enjoy the support of Majles almost the same line then was written to Khaz'al. The envoy of Khaz'al came to Paris and stayed there for some time. He did his best to meet the Shah, but Ahmad Shah did not prepare to receive the envoy. The Shah, however, remained silence on the subject of rebellion. The Shi'ah' U'lama rejected strongly any rebellions against the Central Government and they supported the Government in an open declaration.

On October, 2, Consul Peel cabled: furnishes evidence in support of statement that Persian Prime Minister sent an emissary to Sheikh Khaz'al and reports of a

confidential message from leading Bakhtiyari khans to support Sheikh unless it is contrary to wishes of British Government (57). Oliphant wrote: the difficulty of arriving at a just appreciation of this quarrel is shown by the conflicting reports by Foreign Office local officials in Persia as well as by the representative of Anglo-Persian Oil Company of the dispatch of an emissary and this is disbelieved in Tehran.

On 3 October, Peel reported that the Persian Prime Minister is in difficulties, but Ovey who was in the spot explained that this is not so, and the A.P.O.C. in London received a telegram from the representative of the company corroborating Ovey's view and depicting the situation in the capital as entirely in favour of Prime Minister. British Foreign Office should adhere making on more effort to make the Sheikh see reason (58).

Fairley, the representative of Anglo Persian Oil Company in Tehran cabled to London Britannic House October, 3, 1924. He stated:

“It is not correct that Reza Khan is weak and likely to resign or to forfeit the confidante of Majles. It is not correct that Persian public opinion is in favour of the Sheikh of Mohammerah, except in latter vicinity. It is unlikely that Reza Khan would employ two merchants to conduct negotiation with the Sheikh of Mohammerah such as terms of settlement. It is even very doubtful whether Reza Khan would have any such negotiations with the Sheikh of Mohammerah in view of his rebel telegram to Majles etcetera's.” “The rumour is circulated by persons desiring a breakdown of negotiations for a peaceful settlement and interested in fomenting Civil War.” “There is likelihood that, even if Reza Khan was eliminated, the administration at the army will continue the present policy regarding the Sheikh of Mohammerah, which is backed by public opinion. It is urgently important, that an immediate settlement be conducted” (59).

On 3 October 1924, Salar al-Dowleh, the uncle of Ahmad Shah arrived in Ahvaz from Europe with the intention of utilising the situation. Peel reported that he attempted to induce him to leave Persia. Salar al-Dowleh cabled to British Legation in Tehran that he has sworn to assist Sheikh Khaz'al and he would raise the western tribes. He would only desist provided the British Government guarantees his livelihood. The tribal chiefs gathered at a big conference to consider the telegram addressed to them by Majles, and renewed an oath of fidelity to Sheikh Khaz'al. Sheikh pointed out the impossibility of British support. The chiefs replied that they have no quarrel with the British provided

the British does not quarrel with them. Finally, the chiefs replied to Majles by a telegram denouncing Reza Khan.

Meanwhile an emissary was sent to Khuzestan. Fairly considered it as a Bolshevik intrigue (60). Some days later, the representative of Anglo Persian Oil Company in Mohammareh cabled that the emissary is known as a representative of large financial interests and consequence unlikely to be under Bolshevik influence.

12.7. Qashqa'i, Khamseh and Rebellion

Ismai'l Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh, the virtual Ilkhani of the tribe Qashqa'i, was elected as the deputy from the city of Jahrom in 1924. He hesitated for some months to leave his tribe and the province of Fars. He had a friendly relation with Sheikh Khaz'al, but he did not accept his invitation to join the rebellion in Khuzestan. Reza Khan sent a friendly military mission to Fars to persuade Sowlat al-Dowleh to accept his constituency and resided in Tehran. Sowlat al-Dowleh consented to the suggestion, left his tribe for Tehran, since August 1924 (61).

Sowlat al-Dowleh was regarded among the southern Persians and political circles in Tehran "as pure patriots whose efforts and sacrifices had delivered" Persia "from the British yoke". He was one of the few tribal chieftains, who supported the efforts of Reza Khan in re-establishing the power of Central Government. For a time when the Persian army was not enough strong to bring all the local powers under his supervision and Sowlat al-Dowleh was in a strong position, Reza Khan signed first a favourable impression and made him sure of his support. (62).

Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh was a real hostage in Tehran and could move only with the permission of Reza Khan. He realised that his relations were carefully watched. He endeavoured to show his loyalty to Reza Khan and at the same time he opened close relations with the prominent Persian statesmen and politicians such as Mostowfi al-Mamalek (63).

At the beginning of October 1924, there was an unusual activity in military circles in Tehran and simultaneously Reza Khan instructed Isma'il Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh to mobilise his Qashqa'i tribesmen. British Military Attaché in Tehran reported: Sowlat al-Dowleh offered 100 savars(cavalries) to the Prime Minister to assist in operations against Sheikh Khaz'al (64). Almost the same time, General Officer Commanding left the town Kazerun for the town Behbahan and Nasser Khan the

Ilkhani of Qashqa'i instructed the chief of the Dareshuri tribe of Qashqa'i, who were the nearest to Behbahan to supply 200 cavalries to General Officer Commanding on his arrival to this town. (65).

Mirza Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk the chief of Khamseh confederation continued his rule over the tribes in 1924. The families of Qavam al-Molk were a part of high ranking of the Government's administration in Fars. Usually, they did not participate in military campaign against Central Government. Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk had no especial relation with Khaz'al and interest in Khuzestan. The Khamseh confederation resided in eastern of Fars, far from Khuzestan. Additionally, it is not known as if Khaz'al requested any assistance from Qavam al-Molk.

This was Reza Khan that asked twice hundred tribal cavalries of Khamseh confederation. Certainly such small force could not be very effective in a possible confrontation. This was only a sign of solidarity with Central Government. Qavam al-Molk did not respond to the request, but when Reza Khan arrived in Shiraz, Qavam al-Molk entertained the Prime Minister and then accompanied him from Shiraz to Khuzestan via Bushehr in November 1924. Qavam al-Molk accompanied Reza Khan to Mesopotamia. In Baghdad, Reza Khan let him to return to Shiraz via Bushehr at the end of December 1924 (66).

12.8. British Political Resident

The British Political Resident in Bushehr, Lieutenant-Colonel Francis B. Prideaux was of opinion that Sheikh Khaz'al without assistance of Lor tribes and Bakhtiyaris must eventually be defeated and with their support Khaz'al can defy the force of Government for a long time and probably until treasury is quite empty (67). Colonel Prideaux, discussed with Senior Naval Officer and two other ship Commanders on the use of a Warship in Mohammareh for protection of British interests and a form of threat to Khaz'al.

Senior Naval Officer discussed this proposal with Consul Peel and Air Group Captain in Basreh. Air Force only prepared to guard pipe line and pumping stations from a point (35 miles-56 km) north of Mohammareh up to Meydan-e Naftun with assistance of two brigades from India. They would like Navy to guard Abadan, Mohammareh and first 56 km along Karun. Any move of threatening nature against Khaz'al by Navy would have far-reaching consequence. Khaz'als with his army lives in

120 km island and British communities at Ahvaz, Meydan-e-Naftun. British intervening stations would be hostage of his power.

On 6 October, Peel reported: a threat of use of force against Khaz'al convert Arabs from friendship to bitter enmity, with disastrous consequences to the British interests (68). The British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, stating the efforts of British Government succeeded in delaying hostilities. He could not too strongly emphasise the reluctance to proceed to any military or naval intervention. „ At the most, such intervention could only take the form of British lives and vital interests and the warship in Basreh was to be regarded for such purposes.

“There can be no question of a military expedition to subdue the Sheikh. Government, if you did action by the Sheikh's rebellions attitude, can count on His Majesty's Government a straining from assisting sheikh in any way. “ Therefore British Charge d' Affaires should make it clear to the Persian Prime Minister of War their responsibility, if he under takes armed action in Khuzestan. If Khaz'al “persists in rebellion, he will forever forfeit all sympathy and hope of diplomatic support from British Government” (69).

With regard to his meeting with Reza Khan the day before, on 9 October 1924, British Charge d, Affaires replied to Consul Peel. He stating: Reza Khan would guarantee life and property of Khaz'al and if present dispute is settled, he did not desire to increase the actual strength of garrison in Dezful and Shushtar. Ovey was of opinion if Khaz'al comes to Tehran, it is possible to conclude an agreement to extend over a fix period and a fix payment and the British Government should in some way act as sponsors for good faith of each party. British Charge d, Affaires added Khaz'al cannot escape some form of apology or regret.

An alternative is the visiting of capital. Reza Khan, the Prime Minister, and the British Legation would give him guarantee of safety and his son, Abd al-Hamid can carrying on for Khaz'al in his absence. Reply of Majles to Khaz'al “revolutionary call was sent some days ago“, he should take opportunity to cable to Prime Minister and stating that he was misled by intriguing person and he is loyal and carry out orders of the Persian Government (70).

The same day, Ovey sent another telegram to Ahvaz and London. He pointed out that the enemies of the Persian Prime Minister are very active, but he has had new lease of life in the past two months and he is determined more than ever to assert himself. From view point of his own prestige, Reza Khan cannot accept conditions and

humiliating himself (71). British Charge d, Affaires took another step and sent a message to the British Consul in Ahvaz and asked him to translate into Persian send it Khaz'al from Ovey or read it to him personally.

It was becoming increasingly evident to the British Charge that Khaz'al had been misled with regard to attitude of British Government, "His Majesty's Government while anxious and determined to protect in every way possible your just rights and privileges, are absolutely opposed to any attempt by you to gain by force fundamental modifications of existing arrangements,-----Mediation by Legation is only way in which an honourable settlement can be reached and by which immensely important British interests in Arabistan and your own future prosperity can be protected. His Majesty's Government will not hesitate to protect those interests if, endangered by every means open to them" (72). "Door of peace is still open do not be misled by any intrigues, rumours, stories or telegrams" (73).

12.9. Persian Forces in the South

The Persian Government determined to station and increases the army detachments in western provinces, Kermanshah, Lorestan and Posht-kuh, to the northern Khuzestan. Some of the chiefs of Lor tribes resisted to the Government's forces. In October 1924, the force of Vali of Posht-kuh fought two battles with Government troops in 50 km from Kermanshah. The result was 200 casualty by Vali's force and very heavy casualty by Government troops. Vali was one of the allies of Sheikh Khaz'al.

In the second half of October 1924, the British Military Attaché met the Prime Minister. He reported the military situation in Persia with regard to the information of the Persian Government and British authorities in the south on the military measures were taken by the Central Government. A force of 600 men arrived in Shiraz from Isfahan on 11 September and another force in 12 October 1924. A force of 200 men sent to Behbahan during September Reinforcements were dispatched from Shiraz to Behbahan already about 1000 infantry, 3 Machine guns and 1 mountain gun between 12 and 20 October 1924.

A detachment of 120 men arrived in port of Deylam at the end of September, intended to send to Zeydun near Behbahan. However, they were still at the end of October in this port. Four hundred eighty infantries, one mountain gun and three

machine guns were sent from Isfahan to Chahar Mahal to reinforce the Government force of about 200 men supporting the Ilkhani and Ilbegi and the other loyal Bakhtiyari khans. The number of troops available in Isfahan was about 2.300 and in Shiraz 1.500 men.

A force of about 250 cavalry and 1.500 infantry with 12 machine guns left Tehran for the south in 14 October 1924. This column left the city of Qom in 21 October and its destination was to be Isfahan. They may be used for an advance through Bakhtiyari land or may proceed to Shiraz and Behbahan (74).

General Officer Commanding the South Division received order to prepare a landing ground for aero planes at Behbahan. Reza Khan promised the British Charge d'Affaires that no forward movement beyond posts previously occupied by Government troops in Khorramabad, Chahar Mahal, Behbahan and port of Deylam without warning to British Legation. Reza Khan instructed Officer Commanding troops at Behbahan to issue warning to local chiefs that the Government force prepared to commence campaign against Sheikh Khaz'al's force. The Persian Government will accept responsibility for protecting pipe-line and oil-fields as soon as their troops are in possession of them (75).

Reza Khan was of opinion that the loyal Bakhtiyari Khans with supporting the Government troops can protect oil-fields and assert the authorities of the Central Government. The information from Consul Peel indicated that unless Khaz'al climbs down, Reza Khan may meet with more serious opposition in Bakhtiyari than anticipated. The internal tribal fighting may break between the supporter of Khaz'al and the Government.

British Military Attaché had the impression that Reza Khan talked in most warlike and determined to exterminate Khaz'al even if he had to rise large loan and largely increase his forces, however, he definitely assured Ovey that he would not attack unless British Government failed. (76).

Peel reported that Khaz'al can mobile 25.000 Arabs. The unity among the tribes surprised Khaz'al himself and this encouraging him to maintain his defiance. Khaz'al increased his forces in Zeydun to 8.000 men. Reza Khan believed as soon as Government troops begin, the majority of Arabs would come over to the side of Government. Meanwhile the Oil Company informed Foreign Office: It is said that Reza Khan ordered the Commander of Government force in Behbahan to attack Zeydun. He repeated the same instruction to Arab tribes as well as the notables in Behbahan

districts. Mahmud Khan Dalun received instruction from the Commander of troops in Behbahan to attack Ram Hormoz (77).

Since 21 October Ovey had endeavoured to prevent an outbreak of hostilities before the arrival of Loraine in Persia. Foreign Office was of opinion that Khaz'al was given a reasonable opportunity of settlement when Reza Khan made the proposals. Khaz'al refused to take the first step by sending a conciliatory cable to Persian Prime Minister. Reza Khan, therefore, did not postpone mobilisation of his forces in view of the winter. Khaz'al put also himself in the wrong by planning a rebellion and insisting on No 2 and 3 of the four conditions (78).

12.10. Bakhtiyari Khans and Rebellion

At begin of summer 1924, the problem of Chahar Lang was solved and reached to an agreement. This branch of tribe returned to Bakhtiyari tribe. Very soon a new trouble arose. Amir Mojahed and certain Haft Lang Khans refused to recognise the authority of the Bakhtiyari Ilkhani and Ilbegi, Sardar Mohtasham and Amir Jang, who achieved to this position with the consent of Reza Khan. The military expedition to Chahar Mahal the situation in Bakhtiyari went from bad to worse. General speaking, the Bakhtiyari Khans were not in favour of Persian Government's centralisation policy. Reza Khan, however, succeeded to weaken the position of Bakhtiyari Khans in the tribe and in the state as a whole in 1922-1923. Reza Khan won the support of certain Khans and he appointed the Ilkhani and Ilbegi of this group. With regard to the presence of Persian force close to the boarder of Bakhtiyari land and division between the ruling families, the situation was in Bakhtiyari tense, when Sheikh Khaz'al declared rebellion in Khuzestan.

Amir Mojahed was one of the dissatisfied Senior Khans, who in earliest time came to see Sheikh Khaz'al. He instigated Khaz'al in continuation of rebellion and participated in the Committee-e Qiyam-e Saadat without hesitation. He encouraged the others Bakhtiyari Khans to bring their forces and join the rebellion and Sheikh Khaz'al prepared to pay generously (79). Morteza Qoli Khan with a large number of Bakhtiyari cavalries came to Khuzestan and then Shahab al-Saltaneh joined them. Of the Bakhtiyari Khans in Bakhtiyari land, Amir Jang the brother of Sardar Ass'ad III, who was in the cabinet, Sardar Fateh and Sardar Eqbal Amir Jang with their 400 men were definitely for Reza Khan (80).

The supporters of Reza Khan were not in a strong position inside the tribe in summer-autumn 1924. It appears that the appointment of Sardar Ass'ad III Bakhtiyari as the Minister of Post and Telegraph by Reza Khan was with the political consideration. The senior Bakhtiyari Khans in Tehran endeavoured to prove that they had no engagement what so ever in southern rebellion and were ready to follow the advice of Reza Khan (81). Certainly the events of previous years as well as the strong position of Reza Khan after the Parliamentary crisis affected in their decision. Sardar Zafar was among the influential Bakhtiyari Khans, who resided in Bakhtiyari land, when Khaz'al declared rebellion. Sardar Zafar, was an ambitious man and had no sympathy for Reza Khan. He came to correspondences with Khaz'al (82).

The Bakhtiyari Khans promised him the Ilkhaniship of Bakhtiyari and financial support. He sent his son with a message to the British consul in Isfahan that he was anxious to act in accordance with British Legation's desire, but force of circumstances compelled him to join the other and go south. Even the A.P.O.C. in Khuzestan received information that on 13 October 1924, Sardar Zafar, left Malamir where he intended proclaiming himself Ilkhani and Shahab al-Saltaneh, who had arrived in Ahvaz from Europe, intended proclaiming himself Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari.

Meanwhile, Sardar Ass'ad the Minister of Post and Telegram, sent several telegrams to his uncle, Sardar Zafar,(certainly with the approval of Reza Khan) and asked him to stay there until he reaches there. The Prime Minister instructed Sardar Ass'ad and the senior Khans in Tehran to gather in Isfahan and discuss their affairs with the Interior Minister. They left the capital on 23 October 1924 (83). The Ilkhani and Ilbegi as well as Sardar Zafar and the other Bakhtiyari Khans in Bakhtiyari land were also summoned to Isfahan.

At the meeting most of their differences were discussed and as expected Sardar Ass'ad and the senior Khans recommended Sardar Zafar and Sardar Jang as the Ilkhani and the Ilbegi (84). This suggestion was accepted by the Khans and signed in 29 October. Amir Mojahed was the only Senior Khan, who did not participate in the meeting in Isfahan, with his Bakhtiyari followers went for Behbahan. Some of the khans of Kohgiluye and their tribesmen joint him.

Peel reported that Morteza Qoli Khan and forty subordinate chiefs of Bakhtiyari tribes refused absolutely to accept Sardar Zafar and Sardar Jang as tribal Governors and would oppose by force any attempt on the part of latter to proceed southwards (85). “ The situation remained thus pregnant with danger until the British Minister arrived in

Ahvaz in November 1924 and persuaded the Sheikh to submit to the Persian Government“. Morteza Qoli Khan and “his Bakhtiaris announced likewise their wish to submit“.

On 5 November, Reza Khan left for the south. In Isfahan, the new Ilkhani of Bakhtiari waited to meet him. Sardar Zafar received what he requested, but he was in Charge to pacify the Bakhtiaris and prevent of their fighting with the Government’s troops (86). Then, while Sardar Zafar, the Ilkhani, returned and was in Bakhtiari land, he received a telegram from the Persian Prime Minister saying if he wants troops, they would be sent from Isfahan (87).

12. 11. Towards Ahvaz

Reza Khan prepared the army in more than three months and it was aimed to concentrate the Persian forces around the province Khuzestan. He mobilised first the southern and then the western Divisions by sending more military equipment and new forces. He sent a force from Azarbaijan through Kermanshah to suppress the well-equipped force of Vali of Poshtkuh. The roads were gradually opened from Kermanshah via Poshtkuh to Khuzestan, from Tehran via Lorestan to Dezful, from Shiraz via Behbahan to Khuzestan and from Chahar Mahal to Ram Hormoz. The tribal barrier between Tehran and Khuzestan was broken and Persian army was moving towards Khuzestan from several directions (88).

The negotiation between Reza Khan and Sheikh Khaz’al through British Charge d’Affaires did not reach to any specific arrangement. Khaz’al neither prepared to apologise nor to disband his forces. In his last meeting with Esmond Ovey, in 4 November 1924, Reza Khan argued that the negotiations of the British Charge d’Affaires having broken down , he should be given a free hand to defeat Khaz’al. Reza Khan was absolutely confident that he could do. Ovey persuaded Reza Khan that,“ as he had waited so long, he could wait another week, and give Sir P. Loraine a chance of bringing the Sheikh to reason” (89).

British Government was in favour of reconciliation between the two sides without the arrival of Persian Army in Khuzestan. Reza Khan agreed to postpone the military campaign in Khuzestan until the arrival of British Minister in Ahvaz. He, however, considered the situation so serious that he did not postpone his journey to the south (90).

On 5 November, 1924, Reza Khan left Tehran for Isfahan. Mohammad Ali Foroughi, the Finance Minister, was appointed as the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of Reza Khan. The Prime Minister was accompanied by a number of high ranking officers and officials.

When the news of Reza Khan's departure towards the south reached London, British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald stated that Khaz'al's "attitude is disappointing, but there still appears to be some hope in the fact that the Persian Government so not seem anxious to precipitate a conflict" He added that "Sir P. Loraine should see the Sheikh at the earliest opportunity, and should endeavour to induce him to take whatever steps may be necessary to satisfy the *amour-propre* of Reza Khan and amble the projected Bushire meeting to be held " (91).

Reza Khan was on his way to Isfahan that the Conservative Cabinet returns to power in 7 November, 1924. Austin Chamberlain, the Foreign Secretary instructed Sir P. Loraine to proceed with the utmost dispatch to Baghdad and Mohammareh.(92).

In Isfahan, Reza Khan repeated his promise to the British consul-general to postpone the military campaign in Khuzestan, but he complained bitterly of constant importation of arms and propaganda of pro-Khaz'al's Iraqi newspapers (93). He stayed in Isfahan some days and then left the city for Shiraz. Reza Khan was on his way to Shiraz that Sir P.Loraine reached in Ahvaz and met Sheikh Khaz'al. Reza Khan arrived in Shiraz on 14 November 1924 (94).

12.12. Return of British Minister

Sir Percy Loraine, who was in leave of absence in England, on October 29, 1924, some days after his marriage, left for Paris with his wife. Before leaving London he was supplied with a file of the relevant papers showing the course of events and negotiations up till 26 October. In his short staying in Paris, he met Ahmad Shah. Apparently, the Shah could not persuade the British Minister to secure his life and position if he would return to Persia (95).

During his voyage from Marseilles to Alexandria, Loraine was able to study the correspondence. the "salient points" appeared to him was: The Persian Government was resolved to carry out the intention, since 1922, of asserting its authority over the province of Khuzestan in one form or another; Sheikh Khaz'al put himself in the wrong by his overtly rebellious and defiant attitude and was unfaithful to his promise to be

guided by the British advice. "The situation, as regards British action, was governed by the policy of neutrality, with a bias in favour of the Central Government, laid down by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald" (96).

The Loraines resided in the British Residence in Cairo by Lord Allenby for some days and then in 7 November 1924, they went to Jerusalem as the guest of Sir Roland Storres, British Governor of the country. The same day was to administer an oath to the Conservative Cabinet under Stanley Baldwin in London. The instructions of new British Foreign Secretary, Austen Chamberlain reached Loraine in Jerusalem to proceed to Khuzestan with all haste and carry out the proposal of the Esmond Ovey, the British Charge d'Affaires in Tehran.

He should talk to Sheikh Khaz'al and persuade him to make submission to Reza Khan, the Persian Prime Minister and the Minister of War. It appeared to Loraine to constitute a fresh development in the attitude of British Government and a variation of the previous proposal which was approved by the British Government just before he left England. Hurriedly, Loraines left Jerusalem for Baghdad, where many telegrams waited of him. Foreign Office instructed Loraine:

"We have all along strongly discouraged the idea that the Sheikh should leave as he offers to do. Our attitude towards both the Sheikh and the Persian Government is clearly defined.--Our efforts have been directed to preventing an outbreak of hostilities before your arrival. The Sheikh was given a reasonable opportunity of settlement when Reza Khan made the proposals. Unfortunately he has so far refused to take the first step by sending a conciliatory telegram to Reza Khan. As a result the Persian Prime Minister appears unwilling to risk postponing mobilisation of his force any longer in view of the approach of winter" (97).

The Foreign Office held the view that sheikh put himself in the wrong by planning a rebellion. It may indeed be necessary to speak strongly to Khaz'al, because clearly Reza Khan cannot be expected to ignore the implication of the Sheikh's telegram's to Majles and foreign legations, and will not so far humble as to meet the sheikh without some preliminary expression of regret from His Excellency. Chamberlain added: Loraine can point out to Khaz'al that British Government has not forgotten his service during the Great. For this reason, they were still doing their best to help him out of difficulty. British Foreign Secretary instructed Loraine without any detail to persuade Sheikh Khaz'al to make the first move towards reconciliation. They expected that then Reza Khan would ready to listen to him.

Immediately, British Minister arrived in Ahvaz from Baghdad on 13 November 1924. Loraine met the Sheikh and asked him to send a telegram to Reza Khan and apologise for his actions. Loraine himself drafted the text of the telegram for Khaz'al, who sent it the day after to Shiraz (98). "The situation was in Khuzestan pregnant with danger. British Minister persuaded the Sheikh to submit to the Persian Government." Morteza Qoli Khan and "his Bakhtiari announced likewise their wish to submit" (99).

12.13. Reza Khan in Shiraz

Reza Khan arrived in Shiraz on November 13. He received a telegram from Khaz'al, who apologised for his past conduct (100) and requesting an opportunity to meet him. Reza Khan replied: he accepts the apology of Khaz'al on condition of his definite submission. (101). The British Acting Consul in Shiraz also brought a message from British Minister. He asked Reza Khan to stop military advance towards Khuzestan. Loraine argued the presence of Persian forces in the province would cause the collision in oil-field and oil-installations and mentioned of British-Khaz'al relation.(102).

Simultaneously, Reza was informed from Tehran that Reuters Agency has reported that the British Minister as the representative of the British Government intends to mediate between the Persian Government and Sheikh Khaz'al in Bushehr. At a public meeting in Majles the policy of Reza Khan was criticised and some days later, in a secret session the leader of minority asked why the British was allowed to interfere in the Persian domestic affairs and the question of Sheikh Khaz'al. (103).

It is considered probable that if Reza Khan proceeds with Bushehr conference, he will fall, wrote British Charge d'Affaires Monson. Persian U'lama in Iraq issued proclamation calling upon all Persian Muslim to oppose Sheikh Khaz'al (104). Reza Khan denied the report of Reuters. In an official statement from Reza Khan published by the Military Governor of Tehran, he denied rumours about peace with Sheikh Khaz'al and the intervention of others. Reza Khan stated he will do what he considers in the interests of the country whether peace or war without advice from anyone (105).

There would be no meeting in Bushehr or anywhere else. In reality, despite the pressure from Majles and Russian protection, Reza Khan had revealed on many occasions to the British authorities a strong inclination for a peaceful solution and the mediation of British Minister (106). It was reported that the Persian forces occupied

Dehmolla and Hendijan in the south-east Khuzestan. The Qal'evand tribe defeated the rebels near Dezful in northern Khuzestan. Several Arab sheikhs had taken sides against Sheikh Khaz'al and the Arabs Bani Turuf and Hovizeh burnt the palace of the sheikh and caused panic. (107).

Reza Khan left for Bushehr on November 15 and military advance towards Khuzestan continued. He stayed in Bushehr for almost ten days between 17 and 26 November 1924. British Political Resident, Colonel Prideaux and Oriental Secretary, Godfry Havard, who followed Reza Khan from Tehran and now was in Bushehr, went to see him (108). Havard negotiated with Reza Khan on Sheikh Khaz'al's affairs many times and finally they reached to understanding and certain arrangements.

Before the news of the more assuring Character negotiation of 25 November in Bushehr reach Loraine, news arrived from Tehran of the issue of an official declaration stating that as Reza Khan's demand for an unconditional surrender by Sheikh Khaz'al had met with no response, the Persian Prime Minister intended to March into Khuzestan as the Commander of the Imperial troops. Loraine wrote: he came into conclusion that Reza Khan had chosen war than peace and friendly mediation to affect his purposes. In 24 November, 1924, he, therefore, made certain recommendations to the British Government as regards measures with which to confront this new situation and to provide protection for the lives and properties of British subjects in Khuzestan in the event of hostilities (109).

He suggested political and military measures including the station of a British Battalion in Basreh. In his telegram, Loraine pointed out: "In view of situation arising out of Reza Khan's announced intention to march on Mohammerah I have request H.M.S "Crocus" to stand by at Abadan. Please request Admiralty to order at least one more warship to stand by in these waters if possible at my disposal as developments cannot now be foreseen" (110).

With regard to the British difficulties in Egypt as well as the international and the Soviet Union reaction, British Foreign Secretary, Austen Chamberlain, informed Loraine that the British Government are oppose to military intervention in Khuzestan, because it should be taken place in a large scale. However, two gunboats was sent by the British Navy to Abadan (111). Chamberlain responded:

"Situation created by Reza Khan's breach of faith, altogether serious, appears to be from point of view of British interests and more particularly safety of oil-fields no worse than it would have been if crisis had broken out at any time during the past

negotiations. The question how far in fact British material interests are likely to be seriously affected owing to outbreak of hostilities requires further elucidation. Even if Persian troops approach pipe-line and oil-fields it is by no means certain that they will damage them. The main danger which we foresee now as in the past is retreating Arabs may damage the pipe-line and pumping stations. This is a risk which we have always known might have to be run and which we must face. Without resort to force, we can do no more at present than warn both sides to refrain from doing damage. At regards warships for Abadan Admiralty have instructed commander-in- chief, East Indies, to meet your demands.

As stated in my predecessor's telegram of October 9th, I cannot emphasise too strongly the reluctance with which Majesty's Government would embark upon any military intervention in Arabistan. In order to afford complete protection to British interests, such as intervention would be on a very large scale would entail action and obligations that would have grave reactions on general policy of His Majesty's Government, which could only be faced if absolutely unavoidable" (112).

In continuation of his previous telegram in same day Chamberlain stated:

"The Sheikh of Mohammareh by dispatching to Reza Khan a submissive telegram (of November 14) from Mohammareh put himself in the right. And it is Reza Khan, who is now to blame for the danger situation which had arisen. His Majesty's Government are most anxious, particularly at the present moment, to avoid embroiling in south Persia, but they were impressed by the importance of abiding by their obligations towards the Sheikh of Mohammerah" (113).

It is necessary that it should be brought home to Persian Prime Minister that His Majesty's Government takes the most serious view of the manner in which he has deceived and broken faith with them. They consider that the time has arrived when no good purpose can be served by not informing the Persian Government officially of their definite obligations towards the Sheikh of Mohammerah.

You should therefore arrange to have placed in the hands of Reza Khan as soon as possible a communication containing the substance of the letter of November 21st, 1914, from Sir Percy Cox to the Sheikh of Mohammerah in the form embodied in my immediately following telegram. I suggest that you should have this message formally handed, in writing, either by Resident at Bushehr or consul in Shiraz, wherever Reza Khan may be. Mr. Monson should simultaneously communicate to a similar note to the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs.

You may reinforce this message to Reza Khan by a personal communication from yourself, explaining that His Majesty's Government have all along endeavoured to mediate in order to prevent outbreak of hostilities, and that they have abundantly proved their good faith to the Persian Government by inducing the Sheikh of Mohammerah to take their advice and submit himself to the Persian Government.

That His Majesty's Government are still desirous of doing everything in their power to secure settlement of dispute satisfactory to the Persian Government, but that if the Persian Government persist in attacking the Sheikh, That His Majesty's Government reserve to themselves the right to take such necessary measures as they may think fit in pursuance of their assurances to the Sheikh (114).

John Monson, the British Charge d'Affaires (15 November-15 December 1924) handed over the text of the British assurance to Khaz'al of 1914 to the Persian Minister for Foreign affairs. British Foreign Secretary also threatened the Persian Government that the British reserved the right "to take their own measures if, when and how they consider necessary to protect lives and properties of their subjects. The Persian Government prepared a note to protest to the British Government and reject the British interference in the Persian internal affairs, but Reza Khan instructed the Persian Cabinet to return the British note to the British Legation (115).

Much excitement caused in the city and among the parliamentarian by the rumours of the presentation of notes by the British and Soviet Legations on the situation of Khuzestan. It is said that the Persian Government was informed that the Soviet Government sent two corps of its troops on the Persian frontiers to assist the Persian Government in the west and the north if the southern trouble extending. Soviets were in favour of complete occupation of Khuzestan by the Persian army and "against the granting of lenient terms to Sheikh Khaz'al" (116).

Persian Government denied that they have received any note from British Legation. With regard to Reza Khan-Godfrey Havard understanding, and intensification of the anti-British sentiments in Tehran after the publication of the British note and the reaction of Soviet press and Government, Lorraine requested the suspension and the cancellation of Foreign Office telegrams. Foreign Secretary approved (117).

On 25 November 1924, British Oriental Secretary reported of his last negotiation with Reza Khan, the Persian Prime Minister in Bushehr. This report let Lorraine hope that after all the way to a peaceful solution was not yet barred. The declaration of Reza Khan was really meant to stifle the opposition and silence his critic in Tehran. Reza

Khan assured Havard that only the newspaper accounts of the projected meeting in Bushehr had made it impossible to hold it. He pointed out that his public statements were not to be taken seriously.

He would take only ten or twelve of his personal entourage and be the Sheikh Khaz'al's guest in Mohammerah, provided the Sheikh sent a further message of his complete submission. The presence of Sir P. Loraine would be welcome on that occasion, but he urged that the British Minister's presence not to be made public beforehand (118).

On 27 November, Sir P. Loraine sent a message from Baghdad, to the British Oriental Secretary, Godfrey Havard, now in Bushehr. First, he congratulated Havard for his success and then informed him that he was advising the Sheikh to send the requested telegram. Loraine asked Havard to inform Reza Khan secretly the gist of above mentioned instruction of Chamberlain. Loraine told Havard: you should inform Reza Khan privately that he told British Government that Persian Prime Minister had chosen war despite British friendly and pacific efforts and advice. British Government still desire peaceful settlement and shattered their confidence in his good faith.

Loraine emphasised that British Government determined to protect British subjects and the vital interests and to see Khaz'al receives a fair deal and no attempt to humiliate him publicly or privately or to exact material penalties for him. And ,, not make any exaggerated demands similar to those which he out lined to the British Consul in Shiraz (119).

Reza Khan left Bushehr for the Deylam port near the eastern border of the Khuzestan province and not far from the Persian military camp. As he landed on Deylam on 27 November 1924, he received the Khaz'al submission telegram. Reza Khan accepted his submission and pointed out that he has not any intention against him, his aim is to safeguards the centralisation policy and finally agreed to see him (120). The day after, Khaz'al disbanded his force and asked the chiefs of Bakhtiyari not to confront with the Government forces.

On 30 November 1924, Loraine sent a telegram to Foreign Office on the right of Persian Warship in Shat al-Arab water way. In respond to his telegram, on right of Persian Warships to sail through Shat al-Arab: Foreign Office stated: "There are no adequate grounds for protesting against the passage of the Persian Wwarship through the Shatt el- Arab. "Foreign Office also pointed out that Admiralty's information from

Port Said is to the effect that „Pehlevi“ is unarmed and has crew of only fourteen” (121).

Reza Khan announced in 27 November and 1 December that the Persian columns of the Isfahan troops arrived in Behbahan through Bakhtiyari land and three parties from Azarbaijan reached Kermanshah. Meanwhile it was reported that 1.000 Government troops reached Dezful on 30 November and expected to be followed by more shortly. These troops passed through Lorestan and at the same time Anglo-Persian Oil Company received a telegram, reassuring as regard the safety their property (122).

In his minute of 3 December 1924, Victor Mallet wrote that Khaz'al was not in a position to a military resistance to the Persian Government army and he hoped on British support. Foreign Office took the policy wait and see the success of diplomatic solution without resort to threat by Loraine. Mallet continued to say: the departure of Khaz'al from Khuzestan would cause a period of lawlessness among the Arab tribes and would damage to the British reputation all over the area. In case a guerrilla war in neighbourhood of pipeline, British should be justified in sending troops to Khuzestan. He added „ It might be well to ask the India Office whether they could arrange for a battalion in readiness in India to embark at short notice if require to do so (123). Osborne suggested in his minute that the request to India Office should go forward and he added “we should prepare in the department a memorandum on the various methods of implementing our pledges in various possible contingencies” (124).

Despite the fact that the British authorities showed great anxiety, the meeting between Reza Khan and Sheikh Khaz'al was taken placed much easier than expected. Khaz'al insisted on leaving Ahvaz for Mohammareh provided meeting at mohammerah can be arranged with least possible delay and troops do not advance beyond Dezful. Consul Peel was hopeful to cope with situation. Loraine prepared to arrange a ship taking off in Bushehr and bring Reza Khan to Mohammareh. Khaz'al prepared to go to Hendijan by sea provided Reza Khan promises to return with him to Mohammareh. Reza Khan decided to meet the Sheikh in Ahvaz.

On December 4, one of the sons of Khaz'al went to welcome Reza Khan near Hendijan in eastern Khuzestan, where he resided. The day after, Reza Khan left for Ahvaz with few of his entourages and reached Ahvaz in the afternoon (125). To the advice of Loraine, Khaz'al apprehensions yielded and left Mohammerah. He arrived in Ahvaz at night. Loraine left Basreh for the same place the following morning day as it was planned (126).

Khaz'al informed the British Minister of War his meetings with Reza Khan on December 6 and 7. Khaz'al and the rebel Bakhtiyari khans were pardoned. Amir Mojahed, however, was asked to leave the country for some time. Loraine informed Foreign Office that Khaz'al was quite well received by Reza Khan this morning and the business talk would take place the following day. The same day, December 6, in the afternoon, Reza Khan met Loraine, but he did not want news of their meeting to get about (127).

Reza Khan told Loraine that there had been too many people about to admit of any real discussion. The British Minister explained the attitude of British Government that the position of Khaz'al „ should be substantially maintained“. Reza Khan assured Loraine without resort to pressure. Reza Khan wanted to maintain Khaz'al in an effective authority in a „manner as to disarm his critics in Tehran“. Reza Khan promised not move troops farther than Dezful-Shushtar on the one hand and Ram Hormoz on the other.

Sunday morning in December 7, in the second meeting Reza Khan and Khaz'al swore friendship on the Qoran. Government troops would remain at Shushtar till the spring if by then pacification of Lorestan is completed main body would withdraw. The Persian Prime Minister appointed a governor at Ahvaz, but this would be restored to the Khaz'al in spring.

Though the question of police, jurisdiction and taxation would be discussed in detail between Sheikh Khaz'al and Reza Khan, the Governor had no authority to interfere with Khaz'al's authority over Arab tribes. It was ordered to the Persian official including military officers to work in harmony with Khaz'al. In a meeting with Reza Khan in the afternoon of 7 December 1924, Sir P. Loraine welcomed the result of the Reza Khan and Sheikh Khaz'al negotiation and stated:

“It was in accordance with the desire of His Majesty's Government to see a united, stable and friendly Persia, and it seemed to me (Loraine) wholly compatible with Persia's own best interests. I wished all the friends of England in South Persia to be the friends of Tehran, to stand by and help their own Government; I wished the Persian Government, who had many anxieties, to feel that the south was safe, loyal and peaceful, so that, should danger arise from other quarters, the south could be relied on.

The line indicated therein, I am persuaded, the one most constant with our abiding interests, for a stable and united Persia is a far more valuable asset to us than a weak and divided one. To bring the south into agreement with Tehran, to make Serdar Sepah

himself realise that, so far from supporting a separatist policy in the south we are genuinely desirous of uniting the south with Tehran, and to carry this policy into effect gradually, will make not only Persia's position, but also our own far stronger than hitherto and will give us the best guarantee obtainable in present circumstances against any attempt by Russia at absorption or aggression.

What it amounts to is making Serdar Sepah and his Government a present of our friends in the south, and of the so-called "southern alliance" the principal members of which are the Sheikh of Mohammerah, the Bakhtiari khans, the Vali of Posht-i-Kuh and Kawam-ul-Mulk (128).

Reza Khan appointed Brigadier General Fazl -allah Khan as the Governor-General of Khuzestan, Brigadier General Mohammad Hassan Mirza as the Military-Governor of Kohgiluyeh and Bakhtiari, Brigadier General Abol-Hassan Khan as the Military-Governor of Poshtkuh, Colonel Abd-al-Ali Khan as the Military Governor of Dezful. On December 8, 1924, the Bakhtiari force of about 800 men under the command of Amir Mojahed were defeated in eastern Khuzestan by the Persian troops and entered the town Ramhormoz. The same day, Reza Khan left Ahvaz for northern Khuzestan.

He visited Dezful, Shushtar and the Bakhtiari oil-field "Sardar Zafar was to winter quarters when Reza Khan arrived there. Amir Mojahed was persuaded to go to Europe (129). Reza Khan returned to south-west Khuzestan. On 15 December 1924, he left Persia for Iraq through the port of Basreh to visit the holy Shi'ah cities Karbela, Najaf and Kazemain and meet the Shi'ah U'lama. In less than three weeks, on December 24, when Reza Khan was still in Iraq, British consulate in Ahvaz informed the Legation that two hundred troops reached Ahvaz of whom fifty left for Mohammareh. Three hundred more were expected shortly. Half of them would go to Mohammareh.

A Deputy-Governor was appointed to Mohammerah and a military Deputy-Governor will be appointed to Abadan. British Consulate pointed out: "These measures constitute flagrant breach of solemn promises given to you by Prime Minister here" he added: there is every indication that this occupation is intended to be permanent and authority of Sheikh Khaz'al over towns and tribes in southern Khuzestan has already reduced to nil and he was completely pessimistic to his future. Reza Khan, the Commander of the Persian Army, did prepare to secure any places even for the loyal tribal chieftains in the Persian power politic.

12.14. Reza Khan and Peacock Throne

The peaceful settlement in Khuzestan consolidated the position of Reza Khan inside the country and his relation with foreign powers. British Government and even the Managers of the A.P.O.C. realised that their interests would be better safeguarded by Reza Khan and the Central Government than the tribal chieftains (130).

Great Britain and Soviet Union, both, for different reasons, supported the centralisation policy of Reza Khan at this juncture. American advisors also assisted the Persian Government to implement the financial and administration reforms throughout the country. The relation of Persia with the European countries as well as Turkey was in a good shape.

With the end of semiautonomous hereditary governorship of Khaz'al, the Central Government re-established throughout the country. Now, the Persian Army also dominated the power in south-west Persia. After the submission of Sheikh Khaz'al and his allies Bakhtiyari Khans in Khuzestan and the station of Persian troops in provinces in south-west provinces of Persia at the end of the year 1924, Reza Khan returned to Tehran triumphant in January of the year 1925. He began to consolidate his position by imposed his will to be appointed as the commander of the army by the Persian Parliament, a position in which was belonged to the Shah according to constitutional law.

In the provinces, the commanders of the army imposed their wishes on local affairs. The civil administration and the local powers lost gradually their influences. Reza Khan tided his relation with the Commanders of the Army and relied on their support in his struggle for the Peacock throne. The previous instructions of the Commanders of the army in the provinces were to pave the way for a republic. It was significant that now they were secretly warned after his return from Khuzestan of probable impending changes in internal and foreign policy (131).

Reza Khan intended to access to the highest rank position in the country. He had previously in 1923 failed to recognise the power of influential groups as well as public opinion in republican movement. This time, after his success in Khuzestan, he prepared first to expand his relation with the influential strata and personalities. The Shi'ah U'lama in Persia and Iraq had denounced the rebellion of Sheikh Khaz'al and his allies and supported the Persian Government. Reza Khan visited Karbela, Najaf and

Kazemian in Iraq to express his appreciation and to secure the support of the U'lama to his plans for a change of dynasty (132).

Reza Khan followed the same policy in his return to Persia. He met the influential U'lama in Tehran, Qom many occasions during the year 1925. Reza Khan participated in religious ceremonies and endeavoured to remove the suspicious of Shi'ah clerics (133). Reza Khan had previously opened a close relation with the single influential moderate nationalist fraction in Majles in 1924. He consulted with them on important state's affairs. In his return to Tehran at the beginning of the year 1925, and in continuation of mentioned private secessions, Reza Khan met these Deputies after his return.

With regard to his differences with the Shah and Crown Prince, said Reza Khan, he could not work with them and he did not feel himself secure in his position. Reza Khan pointed out that the Shah has the power to appoint another ranking officer in his place. With their support, the Persian Parliament ratified an article that Reza Khan was recognised as the Commander in Chief of the Persian Army on February 1925. A military Rank that belongs to the Shah of Persia. Reza Khan was determined in his decision and it was only a smooth step towards sovereignty.

In summer 1925, Reza Khan improved his relation with one of the influential Deputies in Majles, the head of minority, Seyyed Hassan Modarres, The Prime Minister met the head of minority many occasions and holds consultation with him on important political issues privately. Reza Khan reshuffled the Cabinet and appointed three new ministers acceptable to both sides in new cabinet on 10 August 1925. Very soon, the brought up the future of Qajar dynasty. During the months August, September and October a huge number of telegrams were send from the provinces to the Persian Parliament against Qajar dynasty.

British consulate in Tabriz reported on 8 October 1925 that Military authorities and Police compelling people to telegraph to protest against the return of the Shah. It was reported from Rasht on 9 October 1925, that Military authorities were pressing U'lama and merchants to send telegrams against Shah. It was reported from Kerman on 17 October 1925, that agitation against return of Shah was being led by chief Mullah here, who was under guidance of officer commanding, but people generally were at heart indifferent. It was reported from Isfahan on 29 October 1925, that commandant of troops here had drawn up anti-Qajar telegram, which he was getting merchants, editors and Mullahs to sign. Similar telegrams were received from Khuzestan and Azarbaijan

(134). Additionally, wrote Loraine, Reza Khan himself started disturbances with the intention of scaring the Shah into staying abroad (135). With such preparation, Majles deposed Ahmad Shah and his dynasty and entrusted the provisional leadership of the State to Reza Khan on 31 October 1925. Reza Khan Pahlavi succeeded to the throne by the Constituent Assembly on 16 December 1925.

12.15. Consolidation of Position

In the year 1925, the policy of strengthening the authority of the Central Government in tribal areas continued. Destroying the semi-autonomous tribal systems and extending the Central Government administration to the tribes was pursued with varying success throughout the year [1925]"(136). Destroying the semi-autonomous tribal systems and to extend the Central Government administration to the tribes was pursued with varying success throughout the year [1925]" (137).

The power of few remaining important tribal chieftains such as Sowlat al-Dowleh, Sheikh Khaz'al, Sardar of Bojnurd, was definitely broken. Military operations were taken placed against the rebel Lor tribes in Lorestan, Arab tribes in Khuzestan, Turkmans and Baluch tribes of Sarhad. Military operations and disarmament of tribes continued in Lorestan, Posht-kuh and the other tribal areas.

The commercial routes and main roads were administered by road guards. The security on the roads maintained well during the years 1924-1925. In few instances, the bandits and tribesmen pillaged caravans, "but in many cases, the property stolen were recovered" The improvement of road guard administration still needed more funds and right type of man (138).

12.16. Disarmament and Tribal Chieftains

The disarmament of the tribes and settled population continued without delay. Reza Khan felt confident that the southern tribes (Qashqa'i, Bakhtiyari, Khamseh and Boir Ahmadi) would disarm without fighting. He presumably to the Qashqa'i, Khamseh and Bakhtiyari tribes (139).

12.16.1. Tribal Chieftains in Fars 1925

Reza Khan decided to clip the power of tribal chieftains including Sowlat al-Dowleh and disarm the Qashqa'i tribe (140). The aim of Reza Khan was to end the power of the ruling clan of Qashqa'i. The Shahilu families were in power in Qashqa'i tribe at least since 18 century. On 12 April 1925, the newspaper Shafaq-e Sorkh published an article about Sowlat al-Dowleh. He was accused as having committed many crimes and shed to blood of many innocent persons for the sake of his own avariciousness. It calls on the Prime Minister to break the power of these tribal chiefs. He added that there will be no difficulty as the subordinate khans of Qashqa'i will readily co-operate with Government in getting rid of him. British Military Attaché comments, that "It appears likely that this article was inspired by Prime Minister....." (141).

It was known that Ali Dashti the editor in chief of the Shafaq-e Sorkh newspaper was a staunch supporter of Reza Khan. The principal khan of Qashqa'i sent telegrams to Majless and the Prime Minister making complaints against Sowlat al-Dowleh. They expressed hope that he would not be allowed to return to a position that he could continue to oppress them (142).

Reza Khan felt confident that the southern tribes would disarm without fighting, he presumably, to the Qashqa'i, Khamseh and Bakhtiyari tribes. Amir Lashkar Commanding the Southern Division and the chiefs of Qashqa'i tribes had some conversation regarding the handing in of their arms. Provided the neighbouring tribes disarmed, it was expected that the Qashqa'is would not object it (143). The disarmament of Qashqa'i was too indefinite. Some sections handed in arms without opposition (144). Two weeks later, in his visit to Tehran, the Chief of Staff of the Southern Division discussed plans for disarmament of Qashqa'is with the Government (145).

"On the 3rd and the 5th July 1925, the Amir Lashkar (Major General) of the army issued notices to the people of southern provinces generally and to the owners of village property in particular, giving twenty five days grace for all arms to be surrendered under heavy penalties for weapons discovered subsequently by in former" (147). The army began to disarm the Qashqa'i and Khamseh tribes and the villagers near the district of Shiraz.

In the middle of July 1925, about 3000 rifles were collected from Qashqa'i tribesmen, said the chief of the staff of Southern Division. Qavam al-Molk stated: the number of rifles was collected from Khamseh tribes was at 1.200. British Consulate in Shiraz were of opinion that in both cases represents a very small fraction of a moderate estimate of the rifles in possession of these tribes (148).

Meanwhile an important event was taken place on the tribal affairs of Fars in 1925. On August 1925, the Ilkhaniship of Qashqa'i tribe was entrusted to a Military Officer (146). A Military Governorship was created for the Qashqa'i tribe with the approval of Reza Khan, the Prime Minister and the Commander of the Persian Army. Nasser Khan, who was the nominal Ilkhani of Qashqa'i since 1920, after the departure of his father from Fars and residence in Tehran in August 1924, the affairs of the Qashqa'i tribe was administered by him, was dismissed and ordered to reside in the city of Shiraz the capital of the province of Fars.

He had no permission to leave the city, where neither was the winter quarter nor the summer quarter of the Qashqa'i tribe. The Financial Department appointed three revenue agents, the first one stayed in the northern districts of Fars, the second resided in Firuzabad and the third one migrated with the tribes to collect the taxes from tribes and the village headmen who use to pay their taxes to the Ilkhani.

In September 1925, the collection of arms still continued slowly. The following figure was given by the chief of the Division Staff: (a) 3.200 by the Qashqa'i tribe, (b) 4.000 by the Khamseh tribes, (c) 1.200 by the district of Shiraz.

Some of the sub-tribes of Qashqa'i and Khamseh as well as lesser tribes had not surrendered their arms. It was intended near future to send troops to Dashti, Dashtestan and into Lorestan. British consul in Shiraz writes: "a large pro portion of the weapons surrendered by tribesmen and villagers are of older and obsolete types, newer patterns being hidden". "The measure as a whole has been carried out without the dispatch of troops to districts at all". "As a rule, the overlord of tribe or district has sent out his representative, accompanied income cases by two or three settlers, to receive the rifles, only in case of the Kashqa'i was a senior military officer posted nominally to assist the Ilkhani with some thirty men at first" (148).

It was a remarkable phenomenon, when the troops were on disarmament duty, they had not attacked and that measure as a whole carried out without dispatching of troops to the districts at all. The villagers around the cities were well content with the disappearance of weapons. The people could travel throughout the country "without

seeing a single armed man“. Meanwhile the Government prohibited the carrying and having of arm. It could carry the arm only with permission. The disappearance of the arm from the scene secured the society to some extent at all. Annual reports Chick-Clive 1925, British military and political opinion had looked upon disarmament of Fars as an operation of extreme difficulty if undertaken under British control, wrote British consul in Shiraz (149).

During the year 1925, the family of Ilkhani and the tribe Qashqa'i were under permanent pressure. It appears he endeavoured to pacify the difficult conditions. As far as the report of British Legation concerned, during the year 1925, Sowlat al-Dowleh showed his readiness to reconciliation with British Legation and Sheikh Khaz'al mediated on this matter. This suggestion was in accordance with the British tribal policy in the south.

Meanwhile after disposal of Qajar dynasty in autumn 1925, Qavam al-Molk, like Sowlat al-Dowleh, elected to Constituent Assembly. As a member of the Constituent Assembly in autumn 1925, he went to the Persian capital to participate in the Assembly. British Minister thought that the opportunity might be used to affect reconciliation between Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh through the British in Tehran, “which ought to smooth things for our (British) interests in Fars” (150).

Qavam al-Molk reconciled with Sowlat al-Dowleh at a luncheon in the British Legation the last days of the year 1925. Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk the chief of Khamseh confederation continued his rule over the tribes in 1925 and retained his power and position. Mirza Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk, as the head of Khamseh confederation and the owner of many villages, farms and gardens, realised the gradual strength of Central Government and his establishment in the province of Fars and the south as a whole. He considered that his governorship and his estates in violation. In order to save his estates and its revenue from Government's army, in June 1925, he put himself under British protection.

He approached the British Consulate in Shiraz with an “extraordinary proposal that he should make over all his estates to run by the consulate or by anyone, British or Persian, appointed by the British authorities in Persia. He himself to receive an income from the proceeds of the estates, the balance of the revenue from leases”. “In his idea, he would under such an arrangement be able to leave and Fars, knowing that his interests were protected.”

British advised him to shape his suggestion into bringing trained agricultural experts. It was sanctioned the engagement of expert, but rejected by the Prime Minister, Reza Khan. Qavam al-Molk sent representatives with a military escort to begin the disarmament of the confederation of Khamseh tribes. The disarmament and the collection of rifles from villages of Kazerun and Marvdasht of Fars began in summer 1925 (151).

During August 1925, Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk suggested to Reza Khan to leave the governorship of Khamseh confederation and the Eastern regions of Fars to improve his loyalty to Central Government. Reza Khan, however, asked him to continue his job. The Khamseh tribesmen expected the termination of hereditary rule of Qavam al-Molk family, but at this juncture Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk played his role royally to Reza Khan.

It appears that Qavam al-Molk hold his job because it was the policy of Reza Khan not to fight at once with several united oppositions. He used to send out one after the other. For the reason he ordered the appointment a military governor in Qashqa'i, but he kept Qavam al-Molk in his post, in spite of his resignation's offer as the governor of eastern region of Fars in August 1925.

In September, Qavam al-Molk realised that there was a movement by Reza Khan and his assistants to deposit the Qajar dynasty. He put himself at the head of the movement in Shiraz and the deposition effected and lead to Tehran a group of deputies from Fars to the Constituent Assembly , pledged to nominate Reza Khan Pahlavi the Prime Minister and the Commander of the Persian Army as the Shah“. Qavam al-Molk spent lavishly in entertainment in Tehran in honour of the new Shah's accession. Apparently, he won the confidence and the approval of the new sovereign. Finally as it was mentioned Qavam al-Molk reconciled with Sowlat al-Dowleh at a luncheon in the British Legation the last days of the year (152).

12.16.2. Bakhtiyari Khans in 1925

Amir Mojahed, who was one of the Bakhtiyari Khans directly responsible for the Shalil incident and the first Bakhtiyari Khan, who allied with Sheikh Khaz'al in rebellion against Reza Khan and invited the other Khans to join them in summer 1924, was forgiven if he leaves the country. Walter Smart, the acting Consul in Damascus, Syria, reported that about the middle of February 1925, Amir Mojahed during his

passage through Damascus went to see him. Amir Mojahed asked him to report that he was ready to serve, whenever his assistance required.

Amir Mojahed said that his properties had been sequenctered, but then given back as a part of arrangement, whereby he was to leave the country peacefully. He was anxious that the military might make trouble for his villages and render the collection of revenues impracticable. Amir Mojahed asked whether it would be possible for the British Minister in Tehran to recommend to Reza Khan with a view to obviating the molestation of agents in Charge of his properties in Bakhtiyari. Meanwhile, he informed smart that he intends to see Armitage-Smith and call at the Foreign Office in London (153).

Captain Peel, the British Consul in Ahvaz reported in the middle of February that Sardar Zafar the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari was in Malamir one of the winter quarter of Bakhtiyari. He failed to square the Commander in Chief of Southern Division over the Janaki tribe of Chahar Lang question. The latter wanted 10.000T for concluding the deal, but the Ilkhani was without the funds (154).

There are many reports from British authorities in southern Consulates of these years that they accused Military Officers to the rapacity and arrogance. This was an indication that the military and political power changed from the traditional forces to new comers. The Military Officers were in a strong position in Khuzestan and Bakhtiyari and some of the officers abused of their position against the tribal chieftains as well as tribesmen and ordinary people.

One of the aims of the Persian Government in the south was to substitute direct Government responsibility for protection of the oil-fields and pipe line instead the Bakhtiyari khans and Sheikh Khaz'al. The station of a detachment of regular troops in Shushtar at the end of the year 1923 followed by stationing a force of 600 men in the garrison of Behbahan close to the Bakhtiyari land and Khuzestan. The situation, however, indicated that more troops and forces should station in those districts for the protection of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's interests.

The question of responsibility for the protection of oil-fields became merged gradually in the whole question of the future status of Sheikh Khaz'al and the Bakhtiyari khans (155). At the end of the year 1924, though the Persian troops stationed all over the region and Khuzestan, but the security of the oil-fields, oil pipe and oil installation remained theoretically as before.

In the year 1925, the governorship of the tribe Bakhtiyari remained as before. Sardar Zafar was the Ilkhani and Sardar Jang was his assistant or Ilbegi. Sardar Ass'ad III was also unchanged as Minister in the Persian Cabinet. The disarmament continued in Bakhtiyari and a proportion of rifles were already surrendered. Some negotiations between the Persian Government and the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari on disarmament of the tribe were taken place. Reza Khan asked the Ilkhani whether he needs troops for this purpose (156). The Bakhtiyari Khans were still responsible in protection of the oil-field, but the Bakhtiyari road was policed by "the imperial authorities, and according to recent travellers in a quite efficient manner" (157).

12.16.3. Khuzestan and Sheikh Khaz'al in 1925

The station of military in southern Khuzestan was proceeding steadily in January 1925. Military detachments were posted at the headquarters of all the tribes, who previously owned allegiance to Sheikh Khaz'al. The control of Sheikh Khaz'al over these tribes lapsed. Ahvaz, Mohammareh and Abadan each had their Military Deputy Governors. The police force was being taken by Persian officials. Sheikh Khaz'al and his son were deprived of all the power and practically retired into private life (158). New municipalities were "being set up and controlled by locally elected committees" and arrangements were being made for opening of courts of justice in Ahvaz, Mohammareh and Abadan.

Brigadier General Fazl-allah Khan, the Military Governor of Khuzestan stated that the Persian Government has no intention of restoring Sheikh Khaz'al to his former position. The organisation of Administration's departments was undertaken by Persian officials on line of being permanent (159). The Arab tribal chieftains, who suffered of Kaz'al's rule and then co-operated with the Military Commanders now they were placed in Charge of the tribes. The political position of Sheikh Khaz'al step by step had been weakening. The development of the situation in Khuzestan indicated that Reza Khan would not fulfil his promise to the British Minister.

For a long time, Loraine was of opinion and suggested to Sir W. Tyrrell, the Under Secretary in Foreign Office, from Baghdad on November 1924, a settlement that would liquidate British obligations to the Sheikh Khaz'al by substitution of a Charter from the Persian Government. This view was supported by Foreign Office and let the British Minister to negotiate on this matter with the Persian Government (160). At the

beginning of January 1925, Loraine even anticipated progress in Anglo-Persian Relations in the following months. (161).

As the news of re-establishing of the Persian authority in Khuzestan reached the British Legation, Loraine recommended to Foreign Office the policy of wait and see until spring and at the same time continued to say that he thinks: "if we do not wish to risk again becoming embroiled in this Khuzestan question, the course which I suggest is the only possible one". (Co-operation in the south against the possible threat from the other side) Loraine made a recommendation an extract from a minute written by Havard the Oriental Secretary to the diary from Ahvaz.

"In view of the new order of things which, so far as we can judge, has come to stay, the Sheikh cannot possibly expect all his old authority to be restored to him, and I think we should be wrong in trying to obtain it for him. His position was incompatible with the present centralisation, and he would be well advised to adapt himself gradually to the new conditions. We have a strong Central Government, and the Foreign Office, it appears to me, wishes to support, but if we ask the Persian Government not to treat Arabistan in the same way as any other part of Persia, that Government will suspect us and probably refuse to listen to us,Therefore, on the assumption that we are going to have permanently a strong Central Government, the best thing the Sheikh does is to adapt himself to present circumstances" (162).

Although certain arrangements were made at the end of the year 1924, and it was expected that Sheikh Khaz'al return to power in spring 1925, but Reza Khan did not prepare to return to old system. There were all indications that Reza Khan permitted neither in southern Khuzestan nor in other provinces that the political and administration run by the tribal chieftains. Even, the governors of the tribes were and often replaced by military officers.

During March 1925, Reza Khan endeavoured to persuade Sheikh Khaz'al to come to Tehran. He told British Legation a visit offered of finally settling the question of Farmans and the properties. Sheikh Khaz'al did not prepare to go to Tehran. He informed Reza Khan that he wished to divide up his properties among his sons. He also asked permission to travel abroad for treatment. Meanwhile towards the end of March the British Consul in Ahvaz, Captain E. Peel, vacated Ahvaz Consulate and Herbert Monypenny was sent to Ahvaz as the new British Consul.

Monypenny was received by Reza Khan before leaving for Ahvaz. Reza Khan requested Monypenny to convey a personal message to Sheikh Khaz'al to assure him

that the Prime Minister “wished to regularise and legalise through Majles the Sheikh position as regards his properties and that this could be done if the sheikh were in Tehran.” At the beginning of April, Reza Khan asked Sir P. Loraine to use his influence with Khaz’al and induce him to come to Tehran. British Minister agreed and on 14 April 1925, telegraphic invited him, but he was still reluctant to come to Tehran.

Reza Khan received information that Sheikh Khaz’al intended a permanent retirement to his Iraq properties near Basreh, where he was busily repaired and renovated his house. This would create a difficult position for the Persian Government. On the night of 19-20 April 1925, Sheikh Khaz’al and his eldest son were suddenly arrested by the military authorities in Mohammerah and taken by car to Ahvaz. “It transpired that on the morning of the 19th April, Mr. Monypenny had delivered the Minister’s message, but that the sheikh had definitely refused to come to Tehran.....and had reiterated his request for permission to go abroad.” He was brought to Tehran via Khorramabad under escort and arrived in Tehran on 10 May.

He was considerately treated on his journey and received well by Reza Khan and a house and garden outside the city was placed at his disposal. It was officially stated that the Prime Minister summoned Khaz’al to Tehran to discuss future arrangements for the control of Khuzestan and the settlement of his properties, but he failed to obey (163).

Sir P.Loraine received the news about the Sheikh in Shiraz. In his return to Tehran, before the arrival of Khaz’al, he met the Prime Minister. Reza Khan pointed out that there was a certain amount of propaganda going on in the Arab press even as far away as Egypt in connection with the Sheikh, and that he was obliged to withdraw the bulk of his force from Khuzestan he felt that he could not leave the Sheikh there, or as near there as Basreh possibly trying to create reactions in his own favour, without incurring considerable risk and possible great expenditure, if he had to dispatch troops again to that region.

He therefore felt that he had no option, but to bring the Sheikh to Tehran. Additionally, the display of authority in the south put Reza Khan in a stronger position to assert the authority of the Persian Government in the north to counteract Russian influence (164). The effect of the new regime in Khuzestan on the interests of the A.P.O.C. was a direct reaction on British interests.

The A.P.O.C. found its relations with the Persian military authorities in Khuzestan “quite satisfactory“, “and its operations were continued in absolute

tranquility". At all events showed to the Company and the British Legation that Reza Khan was to permit no interference with the exploitation of the oil-fields and assured their protection. British Minister could not neglect this important aspect of the situation, when Reza Khan brought Sheikh Khaz'al to Tehran (165).

Though, the arguments of Reza Khan about Sheikh Khaz'al sound to listen. The success of the Persian Army in tranquillity in Khuzestan was admirable, but Loraine was of opinion that the action of Reza Khan had placed him in a position of extreme embarrassment. The Sheikh had suffered a public humiliation and could not be repaired. In other words Loraine was not pleased with the new situation. It had gone beyond his wishes and he was not in a position to change it. The situation was frustrating

Chamberlain studied the case of Khaz'al carefully and with precautions considered that the time of these assurances is over. He wrote: we live in a world different from the world that these assurances were given. It is a fact that with the covenant and League of Nations, the implementation of previous policy is almost impossible. Chamberlain asked his Under-Secretary to inform Loraine that his views and acts in this difficult subject had been having the full support of the Foreign Secretary and he would finish it successfully. Loraine was decorated with K.C.M.G. (166).

At the end of the year 1924, there were 8000 Persian troops in Khuzestan. Six months later, however, it was reduced to almost 750 men in the garrisons of Mohammerah, Ahvaz and Shushtat-Dezful. The Military Governors were appointed over the Arab tribes. After the removal of Sheikh Khaz'al to Tehran in April 19, the Arab tribesmen were suspicious of the military forces. Three months later, on the dawn of 24 July 1925, 400 Arabs broke into Mohammareh, temporarily immobilised the small garrison and occupied the town for some ours. The Persian army had only forty men in the small garrison and fighting continued between the troops and the rebels throughout the day.

It was rumoured that Sheikh Khaz'al had been assassinated in Tehran. Arnold Wilson, the Resident Director of the Oil Company, requested the British High Commissioner in Iraq the urgent dispatch of a gunboat and British troops to protect the Oil Company's interests. Arnold Wilson also informed the Persian Commander in Ahvaz over the telephone. He placed his motor transport at the disposal of the Persian Commanders. During the night the Persian troops reached Mohammareh and the

following morning restored the situation. By midday the Arab rebels were driven from the town. It was found unnecessary the arrival of British force from Iraq. During subsequent days reinforcement arrived from Ramhormoz and Bushehr. The rebellion was quelled rapidly by comparatively small forces and easily the Persian troops re-established their superiority over the tribes. This indicated “well for the efficacy of Persian methods in tribal warfare” (167).

Two questions remained to be answered. First of all, Arnold Wilson, the Resident Director of the Oil Company, ignored the independence of Persia, when he requested British authorities in Iraq to send troops to Persia. Reza Khan protested to the action of Wilson. British Minister endeavoured to convince the Persian Prime Minister and at the same time he informed the British Consul in Ahvaz that British force have no right to arrive on the Persian territory unless the written consent of the local Persian authorities requested (168).

It is interesting that Wilson expressed his opposition to the instruction of Loraine privately and in a letter. The Directors of the A.P.O.C. in London supported the view of Wilson and wrote officially to Foreign Office that British Minister in Tehran with approval of British Government has given instructions to the British consular officers ...that in no case is the assistance of British armed forces to be invoked for the protection of British lives and properties in Persia territory unless the written consent ...obtained.

The Company continued to say: “The standing orders above referred to radically modify the previous existing understanding for the protection of the lives of our employees and of our oil-fields, pipe-line and refinery by His Majesty’s armed forces in case of need. In view of our reasonable apprehensions, we beg that His Majesty’s Government may consider afresh the recently enunciated policy” (169).

Second question was the grounds of rebellion. As far as the British documents indicate British authorities mentioned various factors as the background of the outbreak at Mohammareh in 24 July 1925. Loraine writes: it appears that economic nature caused by lack of rain and consequent failure of the crops. This coincided with a transitional period in the method in Khuzestan. They had no time to win sympathy of the inhabitants or to gain necessary experience to establish confidence. The visit of a financial commission in searching a new source of revenue hitherto little known caused the anxiety of Arab population (170).

British Consul in Ahvaz, Herbert Monypenny, concluded that the removal of Sheikh Khaz'al and its substitution by a Government of official and officers that was not yet sympathetic to local population and the new regime could not deal satisfactory with the partial famine. New tax on date palms increased their apprehensions. The Sheikh's tribal leaders and headmen (ex-Gholams) were removed and replaced by men of inexperienced and no influence and enemies of the Sheikh.

The Ex-Gholam wrote to the chiefs of Ka'ab, Howizeh and Bani Turuf urging them to rise against the military. The former agreed with them. It appears, therefore, that the revolt was the natural outcome of the general discontent prevailing among the Arab tribes of Khuzestan and that Dehdashti and a small intriguers sought to instigate a general revolt to synchronise with the local trouble which was brewing at Mohammerah and which was a spontaneous and unorganised outburst against the intolerable condition. The plan for a general revolt was no doubt hastened owing to the knowledge that the local garrison of Persian troops had been reduced to about forty men (171).

One year after the event at Mohammareh, it was reported that the Arab tribes “were further agitated by the intrigues and incitement of the agents of parties, whose interest it was to create trouble for the Central Government or to provoke disorder that would affect British interests and Anglo-Persian relations (172).

12.17. British Policy in Persia 1925

The briefly plan of British Minister was to build up a stable Persia bound to British by ties of common interest in whatever interval remain, before the resurrection of Russian power. If British can get America to associate in such programme so much better, if not “let us it ourselves” (173).

Loraine intended to secure British long term interests in the south and at the same time to reduce British obligations. British Government was confronted with difficult circumstances in Egypt after the murder of Sir Lee Stack in autumn 1924. Loraine endeavoured “to secure from the Persian Government a Charter for the Sheikh, guaranteeing his main interests and personal tranquillity, which would act as a substitute for, and might even permit the withdrawal or lapse of, the former British undertakings to the Sheikh” (174).

He put forward a tribal policy and approved by the British Foreign Secretary that to draw all the great tribal chieftains in the south and south-west of Persia with whom

British Government had long-standing friendship and influence, Sheikh Khaz'al, Vali of Poshtkuh, Bakhtiyari Khans and Qavam al-Molk and the others "Into close amity with and support of the Central Government under Reza Khan, so that the latter should feel the south solid behind them, and thus have their hands free to meet any dangers which might menace them from north, the probability of such danger being in direct ratio to consolidation at home of the Soviet power and to the intensification of the Soviets' efforts, thereby rendered more possible, to reduce the northern provinces to state of economic, and the Tehran Government thereby to a state of political, dependence".

British Foreign Secretary, Asten Chamberlain approved Loraine suggestion and informed him accordingly.

"I share your view that the policy of His Majesty's Government in Persia should be to discourage separatist movements likely to weaken the central authority of the Persian Government, and am of opinion that the policy outlined in your dispatch, of rallying the tribal chieftains of South Persia to support of Persian Government, is best calculated to improve the relations of His Majesty's Government with that Government. The chieftains themselves will thus be led to realise that their traditional friendship with His Majesty's Government is fully compatible with their duty as loyal Persian subjects " (175).

In December 1925, as far as British Documents are concerned Qavam al-Molk and Sowlat al-Dowleh reconciled in British Legation. Sheikh Khaz'al was also present there. Loraine wrote that they "have understood and realised that our policy is to help and befriend Persia, and not fractions of Persia, and that our good opinion of them mainly depends on their faithfulness to their own Sovereign and Government. It has taken a long time to make this point of view prevail, but it is now being grasped (176).

12. 18. Summary

- (1) Reza Khan expanded the army garrisons in the west and the south of Persia. He sent more troops to these provinces in the years 1922 -1924.
- (2) The Persian Army had some success in Lorestan in the years 1923-1924 and the routes in adjacent provinces to Khuzestan were opened. Sheikh Khaz'al was anxious of the army operations in Lorestan.
- (3) Khaz'al protested to the appointment of civil staffs for the Government's department in Khuzestan and finally the gradual efforts of Central Government in re-establishing his authority in Khuzestan caused a formation an alliance of certain southern tribes in the west and southern Persia against Reza Khan in summer 1924.
- (4) The rebellion was rejected by the Persian Parliament and Shi'ah U'lama in Najaf in Persia and Mesopotamia as well as media and the public.
- (5) The chief of Qashqa'i and some of the Bakhtiyari Khans did not participate in rebellion and even supported the Persian Government. The chief of Khamseh remained neutral and then accompanied Reza Khan in his journey.
- (6) British Legation, southern consuls, British authorities in London, the Resident Directors of the A.P.O.C. as well as the representative of the Company in Tehran and Directors of the Oil Company in London had different interpretations of the situation.
- (7) Finally, British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, Ramsay MacDonald, asked the British Minister in Tehran, Sir Percy Loraine, who was at that time in England, to leave for Khuzestan to pacify the rebels and mediate between the two sides.
- (8) Persian Army was dispatched from Shiraz, Isfahan, Kermanshah and Lorestan towards Khuzestan. Then, Reza Khan, the Prime Minister and the Minister of War, joint the force in the south-east border of Khuzestan.
- (9) Khaz'al and his allies submitted and with the mediation of British Minister their life and properties were secured.
- (10) The Persian forces arrived in Khuzestan from three directions. Reza Khan appointed Military Governors for the province and the cities of Khuzestan.
- (11) Reza Khan visited Iraq to develop his relations with the Shi'ah Ulama Karbela and Najaf.

- (12) In the year 1925, the authorities of Central Government stabilised inside tribes and the semi-autonomous tribal system was destroyed in many areas.
- (13) Several tribal chieftains including Sheikh Khaz'al was called and brought to Tehran.
- (14) The process of disarmament continued and many rifles were collected from tribesmen.

XIII. Conclusion

In the classical Persian works on politics and Government's theory, it is essential to have a permanent army as an important factor on continuation of the political power. In practice the Persian dynasties followed the mentioned view. For many centuries the Persian Government organised an army of cavalry forces including tribal unites and infantry forces mainly from peasant origin. Usually the Persian forces were able to defend of the borders and secure the tranquillity in the country.

The use of artillery in the Persian army began in the 15th century. The modern army unites were organised in the first half of the 17th century. However, as a result of internal power struggle among the tribal confederations and short duration dynasties in the 18th century, the Persian Government could not modernise and expanded the Persian army in a world level.

In the first half of the 19th century Persia confronted first with the invasion of Russian and then British forces, the two new powerful neighbours. The expansion policy of Russia and Great Britain caused a series of confrontation and wars. Persian army resisted severely to the Russian attack for several years, but finally was defeated. Persia suffered territorial losses due military failure and had to grant also certain commercial and judicial privilege rights.

The two colonial powers occupied new areas in the northern and eastern region in second half of the 19th century and reduced Persia to the present size on the eve of Great War. The Persian Government could not fully modernise the army due to internal and external obstacles. At the last decades of the 19th century, the Persian army lost gradually its capability.

During the years 1896-1921 as a result of economy crisis, internal political upheaval, the Anglo-Russian colonial policy in partition of Persia, the situation in Persia went from bad to worse and made the Central Government weaker than before. The Persian Army also began to decline.

The Persian revolution 1905-1911, caused the political and military confrontation between the constitutionalists and the despotic elements. Despite the fact that the constitutional groups succeeded to establish a modern Government, but they were not in a position to defend of the country against foreign aggression. The occupation of certain areas of Persia by the Russian and British 1909-1914 and the occupation of neutral Persia during the War 1914-1918 by the forces of belligerents ruined the military power

of the Central Government. For the reason, the Persian Government determined to organise a modern army in these years, but due to the Anglo-Russian opposition, the idea postponed for some years.

The Russian revolution in 1917 changed fundamentally the political situation in Persia. German Government also responded positively to the desire of Persia in Brest-Litovsk. German and Russian recognised the independent and integrity of Persia and the Bolshevik Government withdrew the Russian troops from Persia. The Bolshevik Government also annulled and disclosed the Tsarist agreements with Persia and the other countries about Persia in 1918.

With the victory of British in Mesopotamia 1917 and the presence of British troops in Persia, the political officers of the Persian Gulf School and the British Residency in Bushehr became more active in the regional British policy. In the absence of Russian, British sent more troops to Persia and also organised new forces under British command in 1918. British Government sent military forces and missions via Persia to Caucasus and Central Asia and gave military and financial support to the anti-Bolshevik movements in these areas.

There was a struggle between the moderate nationalist Persian Cabinets and British on the future of Persia. The two sides were united on necessities of financial and administration reforms as well as organisation a uniform modern army. There was a difference between the Persian Government and the British. The Persian Government intended to invite advisors from different industrial countries as they did in previous times. British Government endeavoured to establish an advisory system in Persia under British military and civil advisors.

In the first half of the year 1918, British Legation in Tehran succeeded to topple the moderate cabinets and bring finally a pro-British Cabinet to power in summer 1918. Then, Sir Percy Cox, the British political Resident in the Persian Gulf, was sent to Tehran. After the Armistice, British forces did not evacuate the Persian territory and even recruited new forces in Persia. British of the Persian Gulf School did their best in this region to materialise the dream of Curzon in creating an Empire from Burma to South Africa.

With the Curzon's approval, Cox concluded the agreement 1919 with this friendly cabinet in Tehran, whose existence was due to the British strong support. This agreement was a developed form of the agreements 1907 and 1915, but this time, British would receive a monopoly position on Persia similar to a protectorate. The aim was to

establish an advisory system. It was foreseen the administration reforms and organising a uniform army under British advisors with additional power. Consequently the Joint Commissions were set up in 1920.

The failure of British expansion policy in Russia 1918-1920, saved also the independence of Persia. Russian Bolshevik returned to the old border in Asia in spring 1920, and opposed to the British supremacy in Persia and asked the evacuation of British force from the Persian soil.

The United States and France the allies of British also rejected the Anglo-Persian agreement 1919 and supported the Persians, who could not freely express their views in their oppositions to the agreement 1919. After the War, the United States of America arrived in international politics and challenged the monopoly market of the colonial Powers. The United States wished to have more economical activities in Persia particularly in oil industry.

In spite of the internal and the international opposition, as a result of Curzon's insistence on continuation of his policy, the political situation in Persia reached to stagnation. The coup d'état of 21 February 1921 was a military response to the situation. British military officers in Qazvin and British Legation in Tehran, apparently without the knowledge of Foreign Office, financed and supported Persian Cossack, who occupied Tehran in 21 February 1921 almost bloodless.

It was aimed to secure the capital against possible occupation of Tehran by the Gilan Republic with the assistance of Russian Bolshevik. Then the organisation a uniform army and administration reforms came again into discussion to strengthen the Central Government and to suppress the Bolshevik and the tribal unrest. The Coup Cabinet was only about hundred days in office, but the process of administration reforms and the organisation of the army accelerated in the following cabinets in the years 1921-1925.

Since 1906 and formation the Constitutional Monarchy in Persia a modern nation-state building was in process and the Persian Cabinets determined to modernisation the Persian administration and military to strengthening the power of the Central Government. The administration reforms and organisation a modern army, however, postponed due to mentioned internal and foreign obstacles.

After the war, despite the fact that the Persian Cabinets were not in an appropriate financial condition, but since 1921 the army found the priority in budget distribution. The Persian Parliament responded positively to the Persian Government and ratified the

bills. This time, the process of the nation-state building was in a better condition. An American mission was invited in 1921 to modernise the Persian financial system. The mission under Dr. Arthur Millspaugh began to modernise successfully the financial department in 1922. The financial reforms as well as the administration reforms were implemented and the modern education system was developed throughout the country.

In 1921, the size of Cossack force expanded to 17,000 and Reza Khan the Minister of War sent the Persian Cossacks to the Northern provinces against the Soviet Republic of Gilan and the Jangal movement. The rebellions were also suppressed in Khorassan and Azarbaijan. With the success of the Persian forces during the year 1921 the Persian Government re-established its power in the Northern provinces.

In 1922 the Minister of War organised an army from the available modern Persian forces, the Persian Cossack, Gendarmerie, the Central Guard and the others. Then, the army detachments were sent and stationed in the west, south-west and south-east. Reza Khan expanded step by step the size of the Persian army.

The army Divisions were formed in Tehran and the other cities. With the gradual station of the Persian army detachments throughout the country, the power of the Central Government re-established. In many areas the Persian Army confronted with the tribal unrest and the opposition of tribal chieftains.

In the Persian history, especially in the second millennium, there was always confrontation between two power centres: the Central Government and the nomad tribes. The Central Government endeavoured to bring the tribes under its surveillance and nomad tribes, who resided in remote area, were practically semi-independent units and centrifugal elements.

The chieftain of a tribe was appointed from the ruling family by the Government with the approval of the Shah. The support of Government gave legitimacy to the chief of tribe against his rivals and claimants. The Government paid attention to loyalty and capability of a chief as if he could run the affairs of the tribe. It was expected that a chieftain secure tranquillity in the tribe and maintains in a peaceful relation with the neighbour nomads and settlers.

The tribal chieftains had a strong military position in Persia. A chieftain had the authority of a ruler, a commander, a tax collector and judge. Certain nomad tribe chieftains provided cavalry for the Government as a part of their responsibility. The cavalries served under the command of a member of ruling family. The nomad cavalries were a part of the Shah's army without causing any expenditure for their maintenance.

At the same time, the tribal chieftains of the border areas were responsible to defend of the country's borders for many centuries. The nomad tribes were the first barriers against foreign invasion. Some of tribal chieftains were the hereditary rulers of the border cities and provinces. Since 18 century, the tribesmen were gradually equipped with fire arms. The new weapon increased the fighting potential of the tribes.

With the arrival of the two colonial powers into Persian political affairs in the 19th century a new factor appeared between the Central Government and tribes. Russia and Great Britain as two great political and military powers opened friendly relation with some of the tribal chieftains. They were in a position to instigate and equip the tribes against Central Government. Despite the mentioned fact that the Central Government was still in a position to take military expedition against the tribal unrest and suppress the uprising.

In the second half of the 19th century the two powers developed their commercial and economic relations in Persia. They, both, gained various concessions including road construction, Banking and exploration of mines. Also Russian and British extended their relations with tribal chieftains in the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century

Since the opening of Suez Canal in seventieths of the 19th century, British enterprise developed their trade and economic activities in southern Persia. British enterprises opened several branches of Imperial Bank of Persia, Telegraph House and Lynch Transport Company in southern cities and ports. The commercial routs in the southern Persia, Bushehr-Shiraz- Isfahan, Bandar-e Abbas -Shiraz and Mohammareh-Hamadan, passed through tribal areas.

A new short route also was constructed between Mohammareh - Isfahan via Bakhtiyari land. A British company participated in construction of Bakhtiyari commercial route in the last decade of the 19th century to connect the central Persia to the southern ports in Khuzestan. The chieftains of the Bakhtiyari were responsible for the security of the Bakhtiyari road. For the reason, at the beginning of the 20th century, most of the tribal areas in the southern Persia could not be considered as the remote areas.

Some of the great and lesser tribes in the south-west of Persia co-operated with the British enterprises particularly the Oil Company. The chiefs of the tribes concluded agreement with the British to form watch guard and secure the safety of the companies. British oil concessionaire began his activities in the south. In 1908 the oil was

discovered in commercial level in winter pastures of Bakhtiyari tribe. The Oil Company concluded two agreements with the Bakhtiyari Khans in 1905 and 1909. The Oil Company also concluded an agreement with the Sheikh of Mohaysen tribe in 1909 including formation of a watch guard to protect the staffs, pipelines and the installations of the Oil Company in Abadan. They received arms and ammunitions as well as financial support from the British Government and Oil Company.

The Anglo-Persian Oil Company was formed in 1909 and some years later on the eve of the Great War in 1914 the British Government became the greatest share holder of the Company with %51 of the shares due to the important of the Persian oil for British Navy and British Empire. The output and production of oil and refinery of Abadan increased each year and the important of oil became obvious during the Great War. The Oil Company expanded its activities in other tribal areas in the south-west Persia after the war.

The strategically importance of Persia as well as production of oil caused the neutral Persia became the theatre of the War in 1914-1918. The belligerents persuaded the tribal chieftains to co-operate with them in the War. They financed and equipped the tribes with arms. There were certain tribal chieftains, who participated voluntarily in the war chieftains with their tribesmen.

In the southern region, the tribes were divided between the two sides. The ruling families of several tribes also were divided and followed different directions. The participation of the tribes in the War and their co-operation with the belligerent troops in Persia caused the lost of Central Government's power in the provinces and disruption of trade and agriculture throughout the country. In the weakness of the constitutional Government, the tribal chieftains expanded their political and military influence in the provincial level.

Nomad tribes also participated actively in the constitutional revolution in the years 1907-1911. Some of the tribal chieftains were in favour a Constitutional Government and the other fought against it. The influential Bakhtiyari Khans supported the constitutional movement and conquered Isfahan and Tehran. For the reason during the 1909-1922 the Bakhtiyari Khans participated in the national politics as the chief of the cabinet and minister.

The Bakhtiyari Khans were also appointed as Governor-General in southern and central provinces. The Bakhtiyari tribesmen accompanied their chieftains as their retinue and fighting force. The Bakhtiyari Khans and the other tribal chieftains, who

were appointed as Governor had no idea of modern state and tribal relation itself was an obstacle to the modernity and modernisation. The Persian Government was in a difficult situation and had to ignore the non-constitutional actions.

The weakness of the Central Government 1896-1921, strengthened the position of the tribal chieftains. The foreign military and financial support consolidated the position of the tribal chieftains. Their power was over their tribal capacity. Some of them even formed private force. Sheikh Khaz'al was the first chieftain in the south who developed a private fighting force. Sardar Zafar as the Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari organised a force of his relatives during the Great War.

Some other Bakhtiyari Khans followed the same direction to be able to compete with him. Qavam al-Molk the chief of the Khamseh tribal confederation intended to bring a third section of the South Persia Rifles under his Command in 1921 before the dissolution of the force by the British authorities in Persia. The idea, however, was rejected strongly by the Persian Government.

In the 19th century, Persia played the role of a buffer state between the two colonial powers. With regard to the political process in Asia and strategically important of the Persian oil in British Empire, British Government came to understanding with Russia. According to the Anglo-Russian Agreements in 1907 and 1915, the zone of influence policy succeeded to the buffer state policy. The southern tribal chieftains found a new weight in the British zone of influence policy in Persia.

The future and the role of the tribes was also a question for the Persian Government and the provincial administrations for some time particularly during the Great War. The Persian Cabinets determined to organise an army as soon as possible. The immediate object was the strengthening the position of the Central Government and the re-establishment of order and tranquillity throughout the country.

With the appearance of the Bolshevik Government and the change of Russian foreign policy, British Government revised British policy in Persia. It was intended to bring the country as a whole under British influence in an advisory system instead the zone of influence. From British view point it was necessary to organise a uniform Persian modern army at that juncture due to the political situation in Russia, the political movements and tribal unrest in Persia.

The pro-British Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh July 1918-June 1920 intended to strengthen the position of Central Government. Vothuq al-Dowleh prepared to suppress the internal movements as well as tribal unrest. At the same time Vothuq al-Dowleh had

to agree to a draft of the British Government in which the administration reforms and the organisation a uniform army would be implemented through an advisory system.

For the reason the Joint Military and Financial Commissions were set up based on the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919. The report of the Joint Military Commission indicates that the Persian Officers in the Commission had the same view on the question of tribes as British. The nomad tribes were regarded as the most menacing factor to the internal security. This question, however, was postponed due to the fall of the Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh.

Practically, Vothuq al-Dowleh and his Cabinet co-operated with the British in 1918-1920. As Vothuq al-Dowleh came to power in summer 1918, he supported the British military campaign against the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i in Fars, Sowlat al-Dowleh, who had received a signal from the previous Persian Cabinet and had reacted to the occupation of Fars by the British forces and the station and aggression of the S.P.R in this province.

The Governor-General of Fars and British authorities encouraged his brothers and then appointed as Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Qashqa'i. He agreed to the appointment of brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh as the Ilkhani and Ilbegi of the Qashqa'i tribe. Vothuq al-Dowleh also supported the British and Bakhtiyari campaign against Boir Ahmadi tribes and the suppression of rebel nomads in autumn 1918.

After the War, the anti-British tribal chieftains lost their power throughout the country and even were severely suppressed. The friendly tribal chieftains such as Sheikh Khaz'al, Vali of Posht -kuh, Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk, two Brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh, some great and lesser chieftains in other provinces and in the coastal area were among the personalities, who remained in power. After the Armistice, the friendly Bakhtiyari Khans such as Ilkhani of Bakhtiyari, Sardar Zafar, remained in their position and continued their friendly relations with the British Consulates and British Commanders.

Vothuq al-Dowleh determined to secure the commercial routes from the highway robbery. In the absence of Persian Army, he asked the Bakhtiyari Governor-General of Isfahan to disperse and arrest the bandits around the province of Isfahan. The Governor-General and some other Bakhtiyari Khans and a Bakhtiyari force as well as the columns of the S.P.R. in a military expedition followed the bandits. Most of them were killed and arrested. The leaders of the bandits were executed in Isfahan in 1919.

In summer 1919, the Bakhtiyari Khans protested to the agreement of 1912. They preferred to return to the agreement of 1894 and to appoint a new Ilkhani instead Sardar Zafar. Their opposition did not reach to any result in this year due to the support of Cox, the British Minister in Tehran, and the approval of Vothuq al-Dowleh Persian Prime Minister.

Vothuq al-Dowleh co-operated with the British Legation and Sir Percy Cox on other tribal affairs question such as tribal taxation. Cox negotiated with Vothuq al-Dowleh on Sheikh Khaz'al behalf. Vothuq al-Dowleh agreed to reduce a large amount of the areas and annual taxes of Khaz'al. Before the results of the negotiations reach to a final approval by the Persian Cabinet, Sir Percy Cox was appointment as High Commissioner in Baghdad. Vothuq al Dowleh also resigned due to his differences with Ahmad Shah.

In two years in office the Cabinets of Vothuq al-Dowleh approved British tribal policy and co-operated with the British authorities in the south. Vothuq al-Dowleh' and his Ministers were of opinion that the success of their political aims was depended to their friendly relation with the British Government.

The occupation of the port of Anzali by the Russian Bolshevik and foundation the republic of Gilan by the left coalition Government created a new condition in Persia and brought a considerable change in Persia. The immediate effect of the Bolshevik invasion was the fall of the pro-British Cabinet of Vothuq al-Dowleh in July 1920. Then the moderate nationalist Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh came to power.

The moderate Government respected the local personalities including tribal chieftains. The criterion for the moderate Government was the loyalty of the tribal chieftains towards the Central Government and the tranquillity of tribal areas. For the reason the Cabinet of Moshir al-Dowleh responded positively to the request of the notable of Fars and agreed to the appointment of Mohammad Mossadeq, the moderate politician as the new Governor-General in Fars. The return of moderate nationalists to power in Tehran and Fars, gave an opportunity to Sowlat al-Dowleh to return to power.

Despite the fact that the British forces and the S.P.R still resided in Fars, with the approval of new Governor-General Sowlat al-Dowleh, the ex-Ilkhani of Qashqa'i appointed defacto the Ilkhani of the Qashqa'i. British did not oppose to the appointment of Sowlat-al-Dowleh due to the British calculation on possible occupation of Tehran by the Gilan Republic. Sowlat al-Dowleh was the only person in Qashqa'i, who was able to unify the tribesmen against external attack.

British authorities agreed to the changes due to the new condition in the north provinces. It was aimed to strengthen the force of resistance in centre and southern Persia against the Bolshevik attack. The moderate cabinets were regarded by the British as the interval Cabinets.

The Bakhtiyari Khans, who were discontent with the agreement 1912 and since 1919 had expressed their view in Bakhtiyari annual gathering, could return to the agreement 1894 in summer 1920 and reduced the power and income of the Ilkhani and his assistant,. British authorities agreed to the changes in these circumstances. It was aimed to strengthen the force of resistance in centre and southern Persia against the possible Bolshevik attack. The moderate cabinets were regarded by the British as the interval cabinets.

With the Cossack Coup 21 February 1921 the Military Officers found a new weight in the Persian politics. During the year 1921 the Persian Government and the Minister of War were busy with the question of the northern provinces and the expansion of the Cossack force. The same year certain important incidents occurred in southern Persia.

In December 1920, Foreign Office came into conclusion to send a political officer with Persian experience to organise a Bakhtiyari police force and persuade the chieftains of the great tribes in the south to form a confederation in the south. The aim was to transfer the capital from Tehran to Isfahan. The force of southern tribes as well as Bakhtiyari police force would defend the centre and the southern Persia and the oil industry against the possible Bolshevik attack.

In spite of the Persian Cossack Coup, Foreign Office sent Major E. Noel to Persia. He reached the winter quarter of Bakhtiyari in April 1921. The protection of oilfields was a part of the Noel's proposal. Noel began to study the local situation, but his plan to organise a Bakhtiyari police force remained unfinished due to the opposition of southern consulate officers, Resident Directors of the Oil Company. He intended to exclude the southern consulates from his plan in Bakhtiyari land, where the British Consuls and the Resident Directors of the Oil Company regarded as a part of their territory. They regarded Major Noel as a troublesome outsider, who meddles in their internal affairs.

The consular officers in the south were of opinion that the presence and the intervention of an outsider in southern affairs would interrupt their authority. They suggested other projects to Foreign Office, but under their supervision.

Major Noel was aware since the war's time that the Bakhtiyari Khans were malcontent with the Anglo-Bakhtiyari agreements 1905 and 1909 as well as the way that the authorities of the Oil Company in the south deal with them. Noel needed the cooperation of the Bakhtiyari khans for his proposal at this juncture. At the same time, he was anxious that the Bolsheviks would abuse the discontentment of the Bakhtiyari Khans and make propaganda against British interest. He confidentially suggested to the Directors of the Company a revision in the Bakhtiyari agreements in which would facilitate the organisation of a Bakhtiyari Police Force.

The way that he presented his view, gave an opportunity to the authorities of the Company in the south. The Directors of the Company in London received a negative impression and information about Noel's view and activities. The Directors of the Company in London were not expected to hear such critical expression even in a confidential letter. They expressed their dissatisfaction with the work of Noel and asked his return from Persia. Foreign Office instructed the British Minister in Tehran, Herman Norman, accordingly. The success of Cossack force in Northern provinces at the end of summer 1921 was a good reason that the formation of a confederation of southern tribes no longer needed.

In the same year, the province of Fars was also the witness of new stage of tribal confrontation and the old rivalry between the chief of Khamseh tribe and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i tribe. Since the return of Sowlat al-Dowleh to power, his brothers lost their political position. Sowlat al-Dowleh was not prepared to give a power share to his brothers. The chiefs of Kashkuli tribe of Qashqa'i were not in a relation with Sowlat al-Dowleh, the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. The chief of the Khamseh, who had gained considerable influence in Qashqa'i after the war in 1919-1920, with the return of Sowlat al-Dowleh to power, he could not use his influence on Qashqa'i affairs and Kashkuli Khans.

The British Consul in Shiraz, Herbert Chick, had the same problem as Qavam al-Molk. When Chick came to Shiraz, he wrote, he expanded the Consulate and his personal relations with the certain tribal chieftains namely the chiefs of Kashkuli tribe even more than his predecessors. His aim was to consolidate the position of British in southern Persia. Sowlat al-Dowleh rejected the interference of outsiders in the affair of Qashqa'i tribe. For the reason Chick was also in a tense relation with Sowlat al-Dowleh.

The Governor-General of Fars, Prince Nosrat al-Saltaneh (1921-1922), who had a friendly relation with Qavam al-Molk and British Consulate, joint the oppositions of

Sowlat al-Dowleh in Fars: the chief of Khamseh tribe, the brother of Sowlat al-Dowleh, the chiefs of Kashkuli tribe and British Consul in Shiraz. They were all united to topple Sowlat al-Dowleh even in a complot. However, Sowlat al-Dowleh was enough strong to defend of himself and neutralise the efforts of his rivals and enemies. Beside that he had the support of the public, press and the Persian parliament.

One of the events that intensified the enmity between the two rival tribal chieftains in Fars was the dissolution of the S.P.R. The Persian Government rejected to recognise the S.P.R. as a Persian force and as a part of the Persian army in 1921. British Government instructed the commander of the force to disband the S.P.R. in three stages in summer and autumn of the year 1921. The presence of the S.P.R. in the south 1916-1921 strengthened the position of British consuls as well as the chief of Khamseh and the other pro-British tribal chieftains in the region.

The chief of the Khamseh tribe wished to keep his superior position in Fars. For the reason he informed British Legation through and with consent of the British consul in Shiraz, Herbert Chick, that he is ready to supply the necessary finance requirement to hold a third part of the S.P.R. or about 2000 men. The suggestion of Qavam al-Molk was strongly rejected in Tehran by the Minister of War, the Persian Cabinet, and the Persian Parliament. Qavam al-Molk made, however, Sowlat al-Dowleh responsible for his failure.

It is true that Sowlat al-Dowleh was against the Qavam al-Molk' proposal, but it was the Persian Government and the Minister of War, who were against Qavam al-Molk's proposal or the presence of any other independent military force in the country. Apparently, neither Qavam al-Molk nor Chick realised at that juncture that the Persian Government and the Minister of War were determined to re-establish the authority of the Central Government throughout the country.

Almost the same time a new event happened in Fars. The Oil Company came to Fars in search of oil after the war. The winter pasture of Kashkuli a tribe of Qashqa'i was chosen for boring of oil. The Oil Company, however, postponed its activities in the year 1919-1920 due to the presence of Farmanfarma, the Governor-General of Fars. The authorities of the Company were of opinion that if Farmanfarma supports the drilling for oil in Kashkuli winter pasture, he would expect to be given thing. Farmanfarma left Shiraz in autumn 1920.

One year later, in October 1921, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company concluded an agreement with the chief of Hayat Davudi with the assistance of British consulates in

Bushehr and then, the Resident Director of the Anglo Persian Oil Company reached to an agreement with the Kashkuli Khans near Shiraz. The Kashkuli Agreement was similar to the Bakhtiyari Agreement and signed in the presence of British consul in Shiraz without the knowledge of the Persian Government and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. One of the chieftains who, was in the S.P.R. was responsible to organise the watch guard. British provided arms, ammunition and the annual salary for him.

Very soon, the Political Residency in Bushehr announced to recruit 300 men of disbanded S.P.R. The chief of the Khamseh tribe also, with the approval of British consul in Shiraz, transferred 300 rifles and ammunitions to the chiefs of Kashkuli tribes. It was unusual and strange that the authorities of Oil Company concluded an agreement with the chieftains of a sub-tribe. In tribal system the chief of the tribe is responsible to deal with outsiders and he is the only authorised person, who had the right on land and water in the tribe. With regard to the previous agreements, this subject was known to the British consulates and the Oil Company.

The aim of British consul in Shiraz, Herbert Chick, was to strengthen the position of friendly sub-tribe chiefs of Kashkuli. He intended to separate the Kashkulis as an independent tribe from Qashqa'i tribe with the assistance of the Governor-General of Fars and the chief of Khamseh and to break the power of the powerful Ilkhani of Qashqa'i, Sowlat al-Dowleh. The southern British consuls and the Resident Director of the A.P.O.C underestimated the power of Sowlat al-Dowleh.

Sowlat al-Dowleh, who was informed of the Chick's relation with the Kashkuli Khans, endeavoured to reach to understanding with the British Legation, apparently with less success. After the sign of the agreement, he tried again to reach to understanding with the Director of the Company. British authorities promised that Wilson will visit him in near future, the time of visit postponed in several occasions. Chick advised Wilson not to come to Fars and he hoped that Sowlat al-Dowleh would be toppled in one way or another and the brothers of Sowlat al-Dowleh would return to power and due to their weakness they would not create an obstacle for the company.

Sowlat al-Dowleh waited for some time, but without result. He informed the Persian authorities in Fars and Tehran. The news of the agreement and formation of watch guard without the knowledge of Persian Government and the news of the other movements one after the other such as transfer of 300 rifles to Kashkulis and the announcement of recruit of 300 men of disbanded S.P.R. by the Political Residency in

Bushehr only a short time after the dissolution of the S.P.R. caused the suspicious of the Central Government on British policy in southern Persia.

Persian Government protested to the action of southern consulates and the Oil Company. With regard to the agreement 1901 the concessionaire should ask for the land and watch guard from the Persian Government. At this juncture the efforts of the rivals of Sowlat al-Dowleh in the province and the British Legation in Tehran against Sowlat al-Dowleh did not function. As a result, the Minister of War paid attention to the affairs of Fars.

He sent an officer to this province to take the command of 400 Persian local force and asked him increase the force to 1.200 after the dissolution of S.P.R. He intended to organise a southern division and station 10.000 of the Persian army in the south. The Persian Government accelerated and developed the relation of Persia with the United State and invited American enterprises namely the oil companies to Persia.

In summer 1922, with the consent of the Persian Government an agreement concluded between the A.P.O.C. and the Ilkhani of Qashqa'i. Reza Khan sent also a military mission to Fars to reconcile between the two great tribal chiefs. Neither Sowlat al-Dowleh nor Qavam al-Molk take the mission seriously. Very soon, however, they realised the Central Government and the Minister of War expected that they to come to understanding and reconciliation. In new circumstances the Central Government did not tolerate the permanent local conflicts. The number of troops increased in Fars and a Persian detachment stationed in the garrison of Bushehr.

The Persian Government was discontent with the Governorship of Bakhtiyari. In absence of an army and a strong Central Government" the Bakhtiyari Khans were appointed as Governor-General and Governor of the provinces and the cities in the centre and southern of Persia since the conquest of Tehran by the constitutional forces in 1909. The Bakhtiyari Governors were accompanied by the Bakhtiyari riflemen. These men not only did not bring tranquillity to the region, but also caused chaos and the public feel insecure.

This question was known in the Tehran, but the Persian Cabinets had no other choice at the time. It was certain when the Central Government could re-establish his authority; the tribal chiefs would be removed from civil administration. Bakhtiyari Khans, who gained a high political position in the Persian administration, as a result of this process first two Bakhtiyari Governors in central cities were replaced by the civil

administration at the begins of 1922. The Bakhtiyari Khans lost also the Governorship of the provinces Kerman and Yazd.

The Central Government determined to re-establish his position in the south. An active Governor-General was sent to Khuzestan in 1921 to take the responsibility of the Central government after the evacuation of British force. It was decided to send a detachment as guard of honour to Khuzestan. The Minister of War prepared to station an army detachment there. Neither British authorities in London and Persia nor Sheikh Khaza'l and Bakhtiyari Khans were in favour of the Persian force in Khuzestan. The Persian detachment on his way to Khuzestan was attacked in Bakhtiyari land by the tribesmen. Many soldiers were killed, injured and looted at the end of July 1922.

The Persian Government postponed the despatch of a new detachment at that juncture, but at the same time it was prepared to set out a force for Khuzestan as soon as possible. The strategy of the Central Government remained as before, but its tactics changed slightly. The Persian troops were sent to Kermanshah and Lorestan to suppress the rebel tribes and re-establish the authority of the Central Government in this tribal region and open the routes to Khuzestan. Lorestan was the scene of military confrontation between the army and the tribal chieftains for some years.

The Persian Government and the Minister of War were suspicious of the activities of Bakhtiyari Khans and Sheikh Khaz'al and their involvement in Shalil incident. The Bakhtiyari Governor-General of Isfahan was compelled to resign. A Military Commander close to the Minister of War was sent as the new Governor-General in Isfahan. Bakhtiyari Khans lost also the governorship of Behbahan and Boir Ahmadi. The Bakhtiyari Khan claimed that they could not collect the annual taxation from the tribes of Boir Ahmadi. The province of Boir Ahmadi was annexed to Fars. The Bakhtiyari Khans lost their governorships outside the Bakhtiyari land as well as other privileges.

At the end of the year 1922, the Minister of War visited personally the south, the cities of Isfahan, Shiraz and Bushehr. He increased the size of the Persian forces and expanded the garrisons in the centre and southern Persia. The number of road guards was increased and the safety of passengers and the merchandise was improved in southern roads. The Commanders of the Southern Division became the visible and the strongest power centre in the south.

The investigation commission on Shalil incident returned to Tehran in 1923, it was officially known that the Bakhtiyari Khans were involved in Shalil incident. For the

reason the Bakhtiyari Khans were compensated by Reza Khan a large amount of cash. The American Financial mission, who studied the financial situation in Tehran in 1922, they intended to implement their financial reforms. The Minister of War supported the financial reforms. Tribal taxation was one of the important sources of the Government income in new financial reform. Reza Khan looked forward to find new financial sources for the expansion of the Persian Army. The tribal taxation was one of them.

Very soon, the Bakhtiyari Khans were compelled to pay their annual and arrears taxes in 1923. Sir Percy Loraine, the British Minister in Tehran mediated in both cases Reza Khan' agreed to reduce the amount of his huge demand. The Bakhtiyari Khans lost their prestige and their power.

Sheikh Khaz'al had not paid also his taxes for several years. The financial department sent a financial claim and asked him to pay his annual and arrears taxes. A financial mission of the Persian and American went to Khuzestan. The British Minister in Tehran mediated between the Persian Government and Sheikh Khaz'al. Finally both parties reached to an agreement in autumn 1923. The lesser and great tribal chieftains throughout the country had to pay their annual and arrears taxes. This was an indication of the power of the Central Government.

British Legation in Tehran gradually realised that the process of centralisation would happen and the Persian Government determined to station the Persian detachments throughout the country. From British Minister view point a strong Central Government with an army would be able to secure the tranquillity in Persia and secure British interests in the south. With regard to the strategically and vital important of the Persian oil in British policy, a powerful Central Government was in a better position to safe guard the current of oil instead several tribal chieftains.

The Shalil incident indicated that the British had influence among certain tribal chieftains in the south. At the same time it was a signal that the Persian Government intended to re-establish his authority. The British Legation and the Persian Government began to discuss their differences. The Persian Government pointed out that the Persian troops would station throughout the country, but they assured British authorities in Tehran that the Persian Army would secure their interests in the south. For the reason, the British Minister in Tehran informed his superior in London of new condition in Persia.

Though, Curzon preferred a combination of zone of policy and strengthening of the Central Government, but he had to agree to certain request of British Minister.

When the negotiations in Tehran reached to understanding, gradually Loraine supported the centralisation policy of the Commander of the Persian Army in one way or another in 1923-1925.

The British Consulates in southern Persia, in the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia as well authorities of the Oil Company in southern Persia were of opinion that the best way of preserving the British interests in Persia is the continuation the pre-war policy in relation to southern tribal chieftains. In October 1923, the British Minister went to Khuzestan personally to persuade Sheikh Khaz'al to a better understanding with the Central Government and asked him not to oppose to the station a Persian detachment in Khuzestan. He endeavoured to persuade the Resident Director of the Oil Company to a new approach in relation with the centralisation policy of the Persian Government.

In a matter of year, the Persian Army pacified the tribes in the provinces adjacent to Khuzestan. The efforts of southern consulates and the Resident Directors of the Company in instigation and support of Sheikh Khaz'al and his allies could not stop the Persian Government military activities. With the rebellion of Khaz'al and his allies in summer- autumn of 1924, as usual Reza Khan moved against the rebels consist a series of political negotiations and military actions.

He negotiated with the British Legation on rebellion and the oil process. At the same time, he increased the military forces in Lorestan and Kermanshah. Reza Khan summoned Sowlat al-Dowleh to Tehran, where the chief of Qashqa'i supported the army campaign to Khuzestan. Some of the chiefs of Arab tribes in Khuzestan, who were under Khaz'al's pressure, were encouraged to revolt against his rule. He succeeded to neutralise the majority of the Bakhtiyari Khans as well as the chief of Khamseh confederation. The military forces stationed in the adjacent provinces of Khuzestan.

Meanwhile he continued his negotiations with the British authorities, the Oriental Secretary and the British Minister in Tehran, who returned from London and arrived in Baghdad. Finally he mediated between the Persian Government and the rebels. Khaz'al and his allies of Bakhtiyari surrendered. The military forces moved into Khuzestan from different directions. The military campaign to Khuzestan finished with few casualties.

An Army Commanders was appointed as the governor-general of Khuzestan. The high rank officers were also appointed as the governor of the cities. The chief of the Mohaysen lost his power. Ahvaz became the capital of the province. The army detachments were stationed throughout the provinces. The Government administration

established one after another in the cities. The oil industry developed and the commercial activities increased.

The army began to disarm the tribes as well as the settlers in the villages and the cities throughout the country. The Central Government did not want any potential tribal forces and did not let the tribesmen to carry out fire arms. The tribal chieftains lost their political and military superiority to the modern army and modern political structure.

After the suppression of tribal unrest and the disarmament of the tribes, the Commander of the Army removed most of the tribal chieftains from the leadership of the tribes and appointed military officers as the head of the tribes in the year 1924-1925. The role of the army increased in the provinces particularly where there were a high percentage of nomad tribes.

It appears that Reza Khan had two reasons for his decision: firstly, the tribal chieftains were still in a position to mobilise the tribe in any circumstances and the tribesmen could be easily equipped with arms. Secondly, with the new military governors of tribes, the outsiders and foreign powers had less opportunity to instigate the tribes against the Central Government.

During the years 1921-1923, the Persian administration, the Persian Cabinets and the moderate nationalist Prime Ministers, A. Qavam al-Saltaneh, H. Moshir al-Dowleh and H. Mostowfi al-Mamalek, constantly supported the organisation and the expansion of the Persian Army, the station of the Persian forces throughout the country namely in the Province of Khuzestan. They provided the necessary funds for the Minister of War. As soon as the army detachments stationed in southern cities, they did not hesitate to push aside the tribal governors, their tribal retinue and tribal force.

The civil Prime Ministers defended the interests of personality such as Sowlat al-Dowleh against his rivals in Fars, but they were expected the tranquillity in their tribal area. For example: Moshir al-Dowleh supported the return of Sowlat al-Dowleh to power, but in spring 1922 he received many complaints about Qashqa'i highway robbery in Fars. He wrote to Sowlat al-Dowleh and reminded him that he expects the safety of roads in Fars from highway robbery.

The Persian statesmen had friendly relations with the chiefs of the tribes particularly the great ones. They endeavoured to be continually in touch with them in various channels. The representatives of the great tribes in the Persian parliament were somehow the representatives of the chieftains. The Persian politicians preferred to strengthen the power of the Central Government. There were, however, variety

suggestions from partition of the great tribes to disarmament, but in a smooth and civil form.

In autumn 1923, Reza Khan, the Minister of War was appointed as the Prime Minister. Reza Khan and his Military Commanders paid less attention to civil administration. The tribal areas came under the Military Commanders. Their solution and treatment to the tribal question was rather military than political. The army took the responsibility to defend of the Persian borders. The Commanders of the Army did not prepare to divide their power with the other group.

The study of British general and tribal policy in Persia 1919-1925 indicates British Government stationed British forces and the forces under British Command throughout Persia in 1918. British Government intended to reach to an agreement with the Persian Government to establish an advisory system in Persia. Based on the agreement 1919, the Joint Commissions were set up in 1920 to study the questions of the administration and financial reforms and the organising an army. The report of the Joint Military Commission declared that the nomad tribes as the main internal hazard to the security of the country.

British policy after the war, during the years 1919-1922, when the British troops stationed throughout the Persia, was to strengthen the Central Government. At the same time, the friendly southern chieftains continued to be equipped with arms and ammunition. The southern consulates under the guidance of Curzon and the Oil Company continued their friendly relations with the tribal chieftains.

There is, however, no evidence that the Acting (later) British Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon and British authorities in Persia intended to bring any fundamental changes in British tribal policy in the south and had no plan to cut their friendly relations with the southern tribal chieftains. Some of these tribal chieftains depended financially to the Oil Company. British policy in Persia after the war was a mixture of two policies: it was intended to strengthen the Persian Government through a British advisory system and at the same time British Government and the A.P.O.C. intended to continue and develop her relation with friendly southern tribal chieftains.

British were well aware that the re-establishment of the Central Government's authority would weaken the position of tribal chieftains, but at the same time it would suppress the tribal unrest as well as the Bolshevik and the other anti-British movements and prevent of their spread to the British Colonies and mandates in Asia.

Sir Percy Loraine, the British Minister in Tehran 1921-1926, was not against the continuation of war time's British policy, but under the internal and international pressure in post war the British forces were compelled to evacuate the Persian soil. He was the witness of organisation of the Persian Army and the gradual re-establishment the authority of the Persian Government throughout the country. The Persian Army suppressed the power of traditional and modern groups. He realised that the Persian Army would station in the south and the collision between the army and southern tribes would be inevitable.

Loraine was of opinion that British should abandon the old tribal policy and co-operate with the Persian Central Government. A stable and friendly Persian Government would secure British interests. He argued that there is an opportunity for British investors to participate in modernisation of Persia. The economic ties strengthen a durable Anglo-Persian Relation and British foreign policy in Persia. He added Reza Khan is the person, who can man do business with him.

The British Officers in southern consulates and the Resident Director of the Oil Company Colonel A. Wilson used to develop the British relation with the local and tribal chieftains. They were of opinion that the British interests would be better safeguarded if the southern tribes would be supported and equipped with arms. Reza Khan is in a weak position and could be easily toppled.

Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary, was reluctant to give full support to the proposal of the British Minister in Tehran. The British relation developed with the tribal chieftains in the southern Persia, when he was the Viceroy of India 1898-1905. He was psychologically related to southern tribal question. So long as Curzon was in power, Loraine could only persuade him partly to his proposals.

Ramsay MacDonald the new British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary in 1924 had a different political approach. Some months before the rebellion, he had approved the proposal of Loraine when he returns to London. In the Khuzestan's rebellion in 1924 the southern consulates and the Directors of the Oil Company had a different approach from the British Legation in Tehran. Mac Donald blamed the British Political Resident in Bushehr and the British consul in Ahvaz for their treatment and view. He instructed them not to encourage the rebels in Khuzestan and sent the British Minister to Khuzestan for a peaceful settlement.

The successor of MacDonald in Foreign Office, since November 1924, A. Chamberlain, from the Conservative party also reached to conclusion that the

international conditions have changed after the war and the time is over for secret agreement with local tribal chieftains. The new approach in British Foreign Policy in Persia in the years 1924-1925, was an indication that the old colonial policy did not function and did not guarantee British interests after the war in this corner of the world.

After more than a century of struggle the Persian Government succeeded to unify and modernise the Persian army and after almost three decades disruptions since 1896, the Persian Government succeeded to re-establish its authority throughout the country. The Persian Government enjoyed of national support and was under pressure of the Persian parliament, press and the public to finish this process. From Persian Government view point, Khaz'al was a Persian subject or citizen similar to other tribal chieftains without special rights. The southern part of Khuzestan, where he was appointed as the ruler had the same political statue as the other parts of the country. In the weakness of the Central Government, he endeavoured to consolidate his position with the support of British authority in the Persian Gulf.

The Persian Government proved that a strong Central Government would secure the tranquillity in the country and minimise the Bolshevik menace to the border of Iraq (the new British mandate) and British colony of India and safeguarded British interests in Persia. At the same time British would confront with the Persian and international critic if they persisted to retain their local influence and tribal connections.

The authorities in Soviet Russia reached also into conclusion that a strong Persian Government would safeguard the border with Caucasus and Central Asia and prevent the station of British troops in Persian territory. For the reason, the Soviet Government supported the Persian Army in campaign against southern rebellion.

In the process of the modern nation-state's building in Persia, there was no place for the semi- independent tribal chieftains such as vali of Poshtkuh and Sheikh Khaz'al of Mohammerah. The Persian Army did not tolerate the existence of the tribal unites or any other local forces in the country.

The tribesmen could only challenge the force of the army in guerrilla form in the mountains of their tribal areas, where they were familiar with the location and were ready to fight for their interests against outsider aggression.

The paramilitary nomad tribes were not in a position to use heavy arms. In real terms the nomads were not professional soldiers and their chiefs were not the commanders of the army. The compulsory annual migrations limited the power manoeuvre of tribesmen. The nomad tribes had to migrate twice in a year for fresh

grazing land in winter and summer quarters. There was usually a long distance between the summer and the winter quarters.

If the annual migration postponed for one reason or another, this event caused great losses of animals. This question was known to the both sides (Commanders of the army and the tribal chieftains). Non-tribal unrest could continue for a long time unless the Central Government was not in a strong position and unable to send the military force to suppress the rebellion. This weakness was one of the reasons that the tribal chieftains preferred to come to understanding with the Central Government.

The tribal structure played also an important role in military confrontations. A small tribe was based on affinity relation. The tribe's people of a small tribe had a very close relation to each other and there was a strong solidarity among them against the aggression of outsiders. Formation of a great tribe, however, was based on political relation. There was a loose relation between the branches of the great tribes. The rivalry and enmity existed usually among the chiefs of the branches of the great tribe.

The chiefs of the great tribes confronted with various internal problems and rivalry in the tribes. These problems weakened their position in a struggle with the Persian Army. The Central Government was able to use military force or negotiate and encourage the internal and the outside tribal rivals.

The confederation of Khamseh was a combination of Persian, Arab and Turkish tribes and there was no harmony in the confederation. Qavam al-Molk himself was an outsider. He was an aristocrat and the chief provincial bureaucrat of Fars and the city of Shiraz, who did not enjoy very much sympathy among the tribe's people and the chiefs of the tribes.

The great Qashqa'i tribe was more homogenous than Khamseh and the Ilkhani clan was a part of Qashqa'i. Despite the fact that Sowlat al-Dowleh was a very strong chief of Qashqa'i, but he had great differences with his brothers and certain sub-tribal chiefs of Qashqa'i branches. There was power struggle among the Bakhtiyari ruling families for several decades. Sheikh Khaza'l ruled for more than a quarter of a century. He expanded his territory and power, but those Arab chieftains, who lost their power or suffered under Khaz'al's rule, were ready to retaliate if they get a chance for.

It is true that the south-west Persia had a great tribal population and potentially over 200.000 fighting men including 130.000 men of five great tribes, but they were dispersed in different geographical, political and social conditions throughout the region. It is also a safe guess that the rivalry between the two chieftains in Fars was an

obstacle in their military co-operation. Beside that the chiefs of the five great tribes in the south could not provide sufficient fighting force for a long time.

From five great tribes in the south, the chief of chiefs of Mohaysen, Khamseh and Posht-kuh and most of the senior Bakhtiyari Khans co-operated with the British forces and consulates during the war. British Government supported and equipped the Governors of Bakhtiyari and the other chieftains against their oppositions.

Despite the fact that the modern Persian army was not so efficient and well-equipped as the army in developed states, but still it had more military capability than the nomad tribes. First of all it was a professional and permanent army and was equipped with various modern arms. The use of heavy arms and artillery as well as modern transport and telecommunication developed in the Persian Army.

The uniform army received various trainings including military training and the use of modern arms. The army put aeroplane in circulation for the military and telecommunication purposes. For the reason, the Persian army had the military superiority to pastoral nomad tribes in the country. Additionally, the modern army had an arsenal and produced itself a part of necessary arms and ammunition.

The army had the political support of Parliament, Press and the public particularly the settlers, who expected the army to guarantee the internal security of the country. The Persian particularly the settlers suffered from foreign forces and the internal and tribal unrest. For almost three decades disorders and highway robbery prevailed in the country. Security found priority in the eyes of the citizens. With the victory of the army in suppression the tribal unrest the Commander of the Persian Army gained a stronger position against his rivals in the army and in his oppositions in the Persian Parliament.

Beside that the Central Government and the Commander of the Army came into negotiation with the tribal chieftains to settle the questions. In the south, the chief of the Qashqa'i had a cordial relation with the Persian Cabinets and Parliament. The Minister of War also assured him of his support as long as the Persian Army as not in a strong position. Sowlat al-Dowleh and his son contributed a few number of Qashqa'i horsemen as a gesture in support of the Persian Army's campaign to Khuzestan. In Majles 1925, he voted in favour of new Pahlavi dynasty.

The chief of the Khamseh confederation did not take the question of the army very seriously, but very soon he realised that the time of his supremacy in Fars is over. Qavam al-Molk came from an aristocrat-merchant Shirazi family and he was a city

dweller. He was rather anxious about his vast estates in Fars than the Khamseh tribe. The behaviour of the new comers made him nervous on his wealth.

He remained neutral until the arrival of Reza Khan to Shiraz on his way to Khuzestan in 1924. He accompanied Reza Khan, the Prime Minister and the Minister of War. Qavam al-Molk was very active in the following year in favour of Reza Khan's kingship. As one of the representatives of Fars Qavam al-Molk did his best in support of Reza Khan and with a lavish expenditure banquet he showed his enthusiasm to new Monarch.

The case of Bakhtiyari Khans was more complicated. After Shalil incident Reza Khan realised that there is a close relation between the British and the Bakhtiyari Khans especially in the oil fields. The Bakhtiari Khans lost their prestige in the public due to their participation in the Shalil incident. Now Reza Khan intended to show the power of the Persian Army by breaking the power of Bakhtiyari Khans. He stationed Persian detachments near the Bakhtiyari land.

He sent Persian detachments through Bakhtiyari to Khuzestan in 1923 and 1924. He appointed Bakhtiyari Khans, who were loyal to him against the others. Reza Khan also let the Char Lang branch of Bakhtiyari to revolt against the authority of the Ruling families. As a result when he urged the Ilkhani and Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari to co-operate with the Persian Army in autumn 1924, the majority of Bakhtiyari khans did not join the rebel in Khuzestan.

Sheikh Khaz'al, Vali of Poshtkuh, Qavam al-Molk and the Bakhtiyari Khans gained more power than their real capacity due to their friendly relation with the British authorities. They were also supported in various forms and equipped with arms the years after the war. The mentioned tribal chieftains realised that the British Legation follows a new approach in Persia in the years 1923-1925. For the reason, they were psychologically broken and easily surrendered without a real confrontation. The chiefs of the tribes had the experience of the World War I. They knew the potential power of a modern army and simultaneously the limitations of the tribe in a long term fighting especially when they receive no foreign or national support.

The fall of the other tribal chieftains from power and the fall of the Qajar dynasty, the symbol nomad tribe's power of in Persia, and the rise of Commander of the Army to power and the emergence of the new power groups were the indications of a new era in the Persian history.

The way that Reza Khan and the army dealt with the tribal question in those years was rather military than political. The military and the army officers dealt with the nomad tribes question mostly from the position of strength. They were sometimes even ruthless in their treatment with the tribesmen and tribal chieftains. The army commanders had the upper hand in the country and they imposed their view and method on this subject.

Persia dealt with the question of tribes, disarmament and settlement, earlier than many other countries. The reasons return to the policy of great powers in opening relation with the tribal chieftains. They expanded their relations and even concluded agreement with them. The tribal chieftains were financially supported and equipped with arms. In the south the production of oil caused the tribal chieftains became more important in British policy.

The situation of Persia was affected strongly by Europe and European Powers since the beginning of the 19th century. There was a strong rivalry between Russian and British. They regarded Persia as a buffer state. With regard to the new comers in the international scene, the two major powers negotiated on Asia affairs. They concluded the agreements of 1907 and 1915 and divided Persia into Zone of influence. Russian and British took steps to implement the agreements namely the station of their troops in the Persian territory in 1909-1914.

British organised a force in the south under British command in 1916. The two colonial powers intended to bring the Persian administration under their supervision in which it would lead to the partition of Persia. British authorities in the south developed the Anglo-tribal relation in southern Persia especially during the Great War. British Government equipped and financed the allied chieftains. These actions weakened the position of the Persian Government. The revolution in Russia 1917 and the new foreign policy of the Bolshevik and the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Persian soil changed the political state in Persia.

The situation of Persia after the war was affected strongly by the new international relations. This time, the new international factors were in harmony with the national questions and reforms process in Persia. The political changes in these years shaped the history of Persia in the 20th century. The Revolutions of 1917 in Russia, and a new approach in Russian foreign policy was an important factor on the future of Persia at this juncture. The October Revolution stopped the implementation of Anglo-Russian Agreements as a whole and secured the independence and integrity of Turkey, Persia

and Afghanistan. The foreign policy of Bolshevik Government in Persia was contrary to Tsarist Government.

Great Britain endeavoured to create an advisory system in Persia. The Persian Government intended to organise a uniform army and implement administration and financial reforms with the British advisors to stop the Bolshevik activities. The project of advisory system failed due to internal and international opposition, but formation a modern army was shaped by the Commander of the Persian Cossack in 1922.

The new Post-War condition was an opportunity for the Persian Government to consolidate his position against local disorder, highway robbery and tribal unrest. The new international condition secured the integrity of Persia and on contrary to previous decades Russian and British supported the central Government in Tehran 1924. The Persian Army detachments were stationed throughout the country and the authorities of the Central Government re-established. The tranquillity let the administration and financial reforms implemented the reform process and modernisation of the country continued.

After the War, those tribal chieftains, who had friendly relation and agreement with the British Government and the Oil Company, still enjoyed of British support namely in the tax question. The Persian Government determined to bring the tribes in Persia under his surveillance and the Minister of War brought to an end the political and military power of tribal chieftains. The Central Government secured the tranquillity in the country to the borders of Iraq and India. The oil was under the pastures.

The Commander of the Persian Army guaranteed the current of oil in tribal areas even more efficiently than tribal chieftains. The efforts and the rebellions of certain nomad tribes in the following years did not change the tribal policy of the Persian Government. The tribal chieftains gained rarely a political high ranking position. The Persian Government was, however, very busy with the question of tribal settlement for many years. The new generation of tribesmen and their children have been residing in the cities and rural areas. Each year some families prefer to settle permanently. It was the end of military and political supremacy of nomad tribes and the sunset of nomadic way of life in Persia.

With the new administration under Reza Shah as the head of state, the ruling clans of the tribes lost their political and military power. The Commanders of the Army and the high ranking officers became the real authority in the provinces and the cities. The

Army Officers were employed also in civil administration and tribal administration. They were in origin from different social groups of cities and rural communities.

The bureaucrats were the second important group in the Persian politics in the following years due to the social and administration reforms. With the centralisation policy of the Persian Government and the expansion of the army and the civil administration the modern middle class grew fast in Tehran and the great cities. The process of modernisation and transformation found priority and it began to perform under Reza Shah, the first Pahlavi autocrat Monarch.

XIV. Appendix

14.1. The Persian Cabinets in 1919-1925

Mirza Hassan Khan Vothuq al-Dowleh	26.07.1918 - 24.06.1920
Mirza Hassan Khan Moshir al-Dowleh	28.06.1920 - 24.10.1920
Fath Allah Khan Sepahdar Rashti	25.10.1920 - 21.02.1921
Seyyed Zia al-Din Tabataba'i	23.02.1921 - 28.05.1921
Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh	03.06.1921 - 21.01.1921
Mirza Hassan Khan Moshir al-Dowleh	22.01.1922 - 04.06.1922
Ahmad Qavam al-Saltaneh	06.06.1922 - 26.01.1923
M.H. Mostowfi al-Mamalek	14.02.1923 -14.06.1923
M.H.Moshir al-Dowleh Prime Minister	15.06.1923 – 25.10.1923
Reza Khan	27.10.1923- 30.10.1925

14.2. The Governor-General of Fars 1919-1925

Prince Abdol Hodeyn Mirza Farmanfarma	1916-1920
Dr.Mohammad Mossadeq al-Saltaneh	1920-1921
Prince Hossein Qoli Mirza Nosrat al-Saltaneh	1921-1922
Prince Akbar Mirza Sarem al-Dowleh	1922-1923
Prince Firuz Mirza Nosrat al-Saltaneh	1923-1924
Mehdi Khan Dadvar(Vothuq al-Saltaneh)	1924-1925
Haj Nassir al-Din Nuri	1925-1926

14.3. The Ilkhani and the Ilbegi of Qashqa'i Tribe 1919-1925

Ismail Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh	1904-1918
Ahmad Khan Seygam Al-Dowleh	1918-1920
Ali Khan Salar Heshmat	1918-1920
Mohammad Nasser Khan	1920-1925
Military Governor	1925-1926

14.3.1. The de facto Ilkhani

Ismail Khan Sowlat al-Dowleh	1920-1925
------------------------------	-----------

14.3.2. The Chief of Khamseh Confederation 1919-1925

Ibrahim Khan Qavam al-Molk	1916-1926
----------------------------	-----------

14.4. The Governor-General of Khuzestan 1919-1925

Eyn al-Molk	1916-1917
Vaqar al-Molk	1917-1919
Prince Mo'yed al-Dowleh	1919-1920
Vaqar al-Molk	1920-1921
Zahir al-Molk	1921-1922
Moshar al-Dowleh	1922-1923
Theqat al-Molk	1923-1924
Brigadiere General Fazl Allah Zahedi	1924-1925

14.4.1. The Commander of Shushtar Detachment

Colonel Baqer Khan	1923-1924
Major Reza Qoli Khan	1924
Brigader General Abd al-Ali Khan (governor)	1924-1926

14.4.2. The Chief of Mohaysen-Ka'ab Tribes 1919-1925

Sardar Aqdas Sheikh Khaz'al	1897-1924
-----------------------------	-----------

14.5. The Governor-General of Isfahan 1919-1925

Nassir Khan Sardar Jang	1918-1920
Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham	1920-1921
Major General Mahmud Aqa Anssari	1922-1924
Gholam Reza Khan	1924-1925
Hassan Ali Khan Hedayat (Nasr al-Molk)	1925-1926

14.5.1. The Ilkhani and the Ilbegi of Bakhtiyari Tribe 1919-1925

Ilkhani	Ilbegi	1917-1925
Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar	Soltan Mohammad Khan Sardar Ashja'	1917-1919
Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar	Soltan Mohammad Khan Sardar Ashja'	1919-1920
Lotf Ali Khan Amir Mofakham	Morteza Qoli Khan	1920-1921
Lotf Ali Khan Amir Mofakham	Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar	1921-1922
Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham	MohammadTaqi Khan Amir Jang	1922-1923
Gholam Hossein Khan Sardar Mohtasham	MohammadTaqi Khan Amir Jang	1923-1924
Khosro Khan Sardar Zafar	Nassir Khan Sardar Jang	1924-1925
Khosro Khan Sardar Zafar	Nassir Khan Sardar Jang	1925-1926

XV. References

Introduction

- 1 Allen Zagarell, the role of highland pastoralism in the development of Iranian civilization, Ph D. dissertation an der Frei Universität Berlin :1978 ; Abd -allah Shahbazi, Moqadameh-i dar Shenakht-e Ilat wa Ashayer (An introduction to the cognition of nomad tribes), Tehran :1990, pp 39-85, 87-118 ; Ibn Balkhi, Farsnameh, eds : G. Le strange & R.A. Nicholson, London : 1921, reprint Tehran :1984; Ibrahim Estakhri, Mamalek va Masalek, trans into Pers by Mohammad ibn Abd-allah ed: Iraj Afshar, Tehran : 1994.
- 2 Bert Fagner, Social and internal Economic Affairs in in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.VI, ed: Laurence Lockhart, Cambridge: 1991, pp. 491-568; Shapour, Shahbazi & the others, "Army" in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol.II. 1987, ed: Ehsan Yarshater, pp 489-508; See an example: George Stöber, Die Afshar Nomadismus im Raum Kerman (Zentraliran), Marburg: 1978, chapter II.
- 3 George Cameron, History of early Iran, Chicago: 1936; I.M. Diakonov, History of Medes, trans from Russian into Pers by K.Keshavarz, Tehran: 1998. Alfred von Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer, von Alexander dem Grossen bis Untergang der Arsiciden, Tübingen :1888 ; Ann Lambton, "Ilat" in Encyclopedia of Islam vol III., Leiden, 1971, new eds, pp 1095-1110.
- 4 Mahmoud Ibn Mohammad Aqssara'i, Tarikh-e Salajeqe, ed: Othman Turan, Tehran:1962; Khaje Abu Ali Hassan Ibn Ali (Nezam al-Molk), Siyasat-Nameh, ed: Ja'far Shear, Tehran:1985; Berthold Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350, Leipzig: 1939; Walter Hinz, Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat, Berlin: 1936.
- 5 Marina Kinked, Nomamadenstämme in Persian im 18. und 19. jahrhundert, Berlin :1991; Richard Tapper, The tribes in 18th-and 19th century Iran, in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.VII, Cambridge: 1991, pp. 506-542 ; Mas'ud Keyhan, Goghrafiya-ya Mofassal-e Iran(A detailed geography of Persia), 3 vols., Tehran: 1931-1938 ;Haj Ali Razmara, Goghrafiya-ye Nezami-ye Iran (A military geography of Persia), Tehran 1946 ; Persia, a hand book of geography, Cambridge 1945, pp. 337-344 ; The Organization of Planning and Budget, Proceedings of the

- seminar on study the questions of nomad tribe society of Iran, 3 vols, Kermanshah 1976 ; Eckhart Ehlers, Iran : ein Grundzüge einer iranischen Landkunde.Darmstadt 1980.
- 6 Mostafa Fateh, Panjah Sal Naft-e Iran (fifty years of the Persian oil), Tehran: 1979, pp 261, 272; Laurence Elwell-Sutton, Persian Oil, London: 1955, p17; R.W. Ferrier, The History of the British Petroleum Company, Cambridge: 1982, vol. I, pp 74.
 - 7 James Moberly, Operations in Persia 1914-1919, London: 1987, Wipert von Blücher, Zeitenwende in Iran, Biberach: 1949; Sir Percy Sykes, the history of Persia, 2 vols. London: 1951.
 - 8 Hassan Arfa, Under Five Shahs, London: 1964, pp 114-142; Stephanie Cronin, the Army and the Creation of the Pahlavi State in Iran, 1910-1926, London: 1997.
 - 9 Gordon Waterfield, Professional Diplomat, and London: 1973; Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan (A travel account to Khuzestan), Tehran: 1925.
 - 10 Abd-allah Mostowfi, Sharh-e Zendegani-ye Man (the description of my life), vol. III. : Tehran: 1981; General Ahmad Amir Ahmadi, Khaterat-e Nakhostin Sepahbod-e Iran (the memoirs of the first lieutenant General of Iran) eds: Gh. Zargar& S.Sa'advandian, Tehran: 1994; General Mohammad Shahbakhti, Amaliyat-e Lorestan (Operations in Lorestan), ed: Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: 1995; For more information about the years 1919-1925.
 - 11 See : M.T. Bahar, Tarikh-e, Mokhtassar-e Ahzab-e Siyasi-ye Iran (A short history of political parties of Iran), 2 vols, Tehran :1992 ; Nicholson, the last phase, London :1930 ; Emile Lesueur, Les Anglaise en Perse, Paris :1922 ; Javad Sheykholeslami, Sima-ye Ahmad Shah (the visage of Ahmad Shah), 2 vols.Tehran : 1989-92 ; Mahrad, Ahmad, Iran auf dem Weg zur Diktatur, Hannover :1976 ; Syrus, Ghani, the rise of Reza Shah, London :1998, H. Katouzian, The Political Economy of Modern Iran. Despotism: and Pseudo Modernism, 1926-1979, London: 1981.
 - 12 Ann Lambton, Land Lord and Peasant, London: 1953.
 - 13 Mohammad Golbon, Ressaleh Khuzestan (treatise of Khuzestan) in I.C.H. vol. 2, no 7, 1999
 - 14 Herbert Busse, History of Persia under Qajar Rule (an English translation from a section of Farsnameh-e Nasserri written by M.H.Fassa'i, Farsnameh-e Nasserri), New York, Colombia University Press: 1972.

- 15 Roger Olson, Persian Gulf Trade and the Agricultural Economy of Southern Iran in the nineteenth Century in continuity and change in Modern Iran, eds : Michael Bonine & Nikki Keddie, State University of New York, 1981. Ahmad Ashraf, Fars IV, History in the 19th and 20th centuries, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol. IX, California , 1999, p 345.
- 16 William Haas, Iran, New York:1949, p 57.
- 17 Eckhart Ehlers and Georg Stöber, Entwicklungstendenzen des Nomadismus in Iran in Nomadismus ein Entwicklungsproblem, Berlin:1982.
- 18 N.S.Fatemi, the Oil Diplomacy, New York: 1954, pp38-39.

I. Nomads Tribes in Persia

- 1 Gholam Reza Kuros, & the others, Ab va fan-e Abyari dar Iran-e Bastan (water and irrigation system in old Persia), Tehran: 1971, p 24.
- 2 Dewan& M.L. J. Famuri, Soils, in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.I, Cambridge: 1968, p 250.
- 3 Rene Grose, la civilisation Iranienne, traduit en Perse, I. Behnam, Tehran: 1959, p9.
- 4 M.H.Ganji, in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.I, Cambridge: 1968, p 238.
- 5 Eckhard Ehlers, Iran, Grundzüge einer geographischen Landeskunde, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft:1980, pp 68-73.
- 6 Gholam Reza Kuros, op,cit, p 45.
- 7 General census of population 1986 (in Persian), Tehran 1987; The census of nomad and settled tribes 1986, Tehran: 1987; General Census of population and residence 1996(in Persian), Tehran :1997; Bernard Hourcade, Demography, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol. VII, USA, 1998, pp 258-268.; Jamshid Behnam, Population, in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.I. ed: W.B. Fisher: The Land of Iran, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, London, 1968.
- 8 Sir Denis Wright, The English among the Persians, London, 1987, pp 84-85.
- 9 Allen Zagarell, the role of highland pastoralism op.cit, 1978, P12.
- 10 Nader Afshar Naderi, The settlement of nomads and it's social and economic implications, Tehran, 1971, pp 2-3.
- 11 Dieter Ehmann, Bahtiyaren-persische Nomaden im Wandel der Zeit, Wiesbaden 1975 translated into Persian by S.M. Mohssenian, Mashad: 1988, p78 ; Ibn Khaldun, Moqaddameh, trans into Persian M.P, Gonabadi. Tehran: 1995, vol. I.

- 12 Firuz Towfiq, "Ashayer" in Encyclopedia Iranica, vol. II, USA, 1987, p 707
- 13 Dieter Ehmann, Bakhtiyaren-persische Nomaden im Wandel der Zeit, op.cit, pp 20-27.
- 14 Nader Afshar Naderi, The settlement of nomads and it's social and economic implications, op.cit, p 4.
- 15 Fred Scholz, Einführung, in Nomadismus-ein Entwicklungsproblem?, Berlin: 1982 , pp 2-8.
- 16 Firuz Towfiq, "Ashayer" , in Encyclopaedia Iranica, op.cit, p 717.
- 17 Nader Afshar Naderi, The settlement of nomads and it's social and economic implications, op.cit, pp 4-5.
- 18 Persia, A Hand Book of Geography, Oxford: 1945, op.cit, p 336.
- 19 William Haas: Iran, 1946, New York, pp 50-56.
- 20 Gene Garthwaite, Tribes, Confederation and the State in The Conflict of Tribes and State in Iran and Afghanistan ed: Richard Tapper, London, 1983, p 318.
- 21 Persia, A Hand Book of Geography, op.cit, p 340.
- 22 Habib-allah Peyman, Towsif va Tahlili az Sakhteman-e Eqtesadi, Ejtemai va Farhangi il-e Qashqa'i (A description and analysis of economic, social and cultural structure of Qashqa'i nomad tribe), Tehran: 1968, pp 200-271; Gerhard Kortum, Entwicklungskonzepte für den nomadischen Lebensraum der Qashqa'i in Fars, in Nomadismus-ein Entwicklungsproblem? ed : Fred Scholz Berlin: 1982, p 207 ; Louis Beck, The Qashqa'i of Iran, Yale University 1986, pp 204-205.
- 23 Haj Mirza Hassan-e Fassai, Farsnameh, ed: Mansur Rastegar Fassa'i, Tehran: 1988, vol.II pp 967-968; Fridrik Barth, Nomads of the south Persia, Oslo University Press, 1961, op.cit, pp86-87.
- 24 Jean Pierre Digard, "Bakhtiari", in Encyclopedia Iranica, vol. III, pp. 553-559.
- 25 Asghar Karimi, safar be diyar-e Bakhtiyari (A journey to Bakhtiyari Land), Tehran: 1989, pp 163, 259, 265.
- 26 Theodore.M.Oberlander, 1.The Zagros Streams, Syracuse, 1965; 2. Hydrography, "the Origin of the Zagros Defiles." in Cambridge History of Iran, vol. I., ed: W.B.Fisher, London: 1968.
- 27 Pierre Oberling, the Nomads of Fars, The Hague, 1974 ; Elvia Restrepo, Nazari Be Ilat-e Iran wa Masale-ye eskan, Tehran (an overview on nomad tribes in

- Persia and the question of settlement, 1979 ; Javad Safinezhad, Ashayer-e Markazi-ye Iran (The nomad tribes of central Persia), Tehran : 1989.
- 28 Parviz Varjavand & the others, Bamdi tayefe'i az Bakhtiyari (Bamdi a sub-tribe of the Bakhtiyari), Tehran: 1967; Dieter Ehmann, Bakhtiyaren-persische Nomaden im Wandel der Zeit, op.cit, p 82; Javad Safinezhad, Ashayer-e Markazi-ye Iran, ibid.
- 29 Parviz Varjavand, & the others, Bamdi tayefe'i az Bakhtiyari, op.cit, pp 27-62; Asghar Karimi, safar be diyar-e Bakhtiyari 1989, op.cit, pp 24-27; Jean Pierre, Digard, Techniques des nomades baxtyari d'Iran, Cambridge, 1981, pp. 13-17.
- 30 David Brooks, The enemy within: limitations on leadership in the Bakhtiari, in The Conflict of Tribes and State in Iran and Afghanistan, ed: Richard Tapper, London, 1983, pp 353-354.
- 31 Arnold Wilson, The Bakhtiaris, J.R.C.A.S, No XIII, 1926, pp 205-225; V. Minorsky, The tribes of western Iran, J.R.A.I, vol 175, 1945, pp73-80
- 32 Gene Garthwaite, khans and Shahs, Cambridge, op.cit, p 35.
- 33 Gene Garthwaite, khans and Shahs, ibid. p 97.
- 34 Ali Qoli Khan Sardar Ass'ad Bakhtiyari, Tarikh-e Bakhtiyari (the history of Bakhtiyari), Tehran, 1982, P 568.
- 35 Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar Bakhtiyari, Yaddasht-ha wa Khaterat (Memoranda and Memoirs), Tehran, 1983, pp 200-262.
- 36 Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar Bakhtiyari, Yaddasht-ha wa Khaterat ibid. P 264.
- 37 Gene Garthwaite, khans and Shahs, op.cit, pp 104-107.
- 38 Laurence Ellwell-Sutton, Persian Oil, op.cit,pp 19, 29 ; Mostafa Fateh, Panjah Sal Naft-e Iran, Tehran, 1979, p 261.
- 39 Nur -allah Daneshvar Alavi, Jonbesh-e vatan parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari, Tehran 1998; Esfandiyar Ahanjideh, Il-e Bakhtiyari va Mashrutiyat, Arak, 1995; N. S. Fatemi, London, Ayine-ye 'Ebrat (Reflection on the time of illusion) 1989, vol.I, p 14; Yahya Dowlatabadi, Hayat-e Yahya, op.cit, pp 213-217.
- 40 Abd -allah Mostowfi, Sharh-e Zendegani-ye Man, op.cit, vol. III, p 368-369.
- 41 FO 371 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, A note on Bakhtiari, P.E .Peel, 22 July 1922.
- 42 Oberling 1960, op.cit, pp 10-18; Eckard Ehlers, Traditionelle und moderne Formen der Landwirtschaft in Iran im nördlichen Khuzistan, Marburg 1975, P27;

- George Stöber, *Die Afshar Nomadismus im Raum Kerman (Zentraliran)*, Marburg, op.cit, pp18-20.
- 43 Ann Lambton, "Ilat" in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* vol III, pp 1095-1110, new eds ; Firuz Towfiq, "Ashayer", in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. II., 1987,p 707 ; Arab tribes of Iran, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. II., pp 215-220.
- 44 John .G. Lorimer, *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf*, pp 1768-1769.
- 45 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e pansad saleh-e- Khuzestan (five hundred years history of Khuzestan)*, Tehran 1983, p209.
- 46 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e pansad saleh-e- Khuzestan*, ibid., 237.
- 47 Ahmad Kasravi, *Dah sal dar Adliyah*, Köln: 1990, p193; Mostafa Ansari, *The history of Khuzestan, 1878-1925*, Ph.D. dissertation, University Chicago: 1974, pp 207-209.
- 48 Mostafa Ansari, *The history of Khuzestan, 1878-1925* , ibid.
- 49 Ahmad Kasravi, 1983, op.cit, p 207.
- 50 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Pansad Sale-ye Khuzestan (five hundred years history of Khuzestan)*, Tehran, op.cit, p 230.
- 51 Arnold Wilson, *A Precise of the Relations of the British Government with the Tribes and Shaikhs of Arabistan*, Calcutta, 1912, pp 69-77.
- 52 Reader Bullard, *Britain and the Middle East*, London , 1951, p 123 ; Nasr-allah Saifpour Fatami, *Oil Diplomacy*, New York, 1954, pp 53-55.
- 53 Arnold Wilson, *A Precise*, op.cit, p 78.
- 54 Sirus Parham, *Dastbafha-ye Ashayeri wa Rustai*, Tehran, 1986, pp 64-74; Mirza Hassan Fassai, *Farsnameh Nasser*, ed: Mansour Rastegar, op.cit, vol. II, pp 1580-1581.
- 55 Oliver Garrod, *The Tribe of Fars* in R.C.A.J.1946,p 296 ; Habib -allah Peyman, *A description and analyze of economy, social and cultural structure of the Qashqa'i nomad tribe*, Tehran 1968 pp4-7 ; Gerhard Kortum, *Entwicklungsprobleme und -projekte im bäuerlich-nomadischen Lebensraum Südpersiens*, München, 1978, pp. 30-31; Gerhard Kortum *Entwicklungskonzepte für den nomadischen Lebensraum der Qashqa'i in Fars/Iran*, in *Nomadismus-ein Entwicklungsproblem?*, eds : Scolz, Janzen, Berlin 1982, p 207.
- 56 Oliver Garrod, *the Nomad Tribes of Persia Today*, R.C.A.J. 1946, p 39.
- 57 Mirza Hassan Fassai, *Farsnameh Nasser*, op.cit., vol. II, pp 967-968.

- 58 Pierre Oberling, Arab. IV. Arab Tribes of Iran, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol. I, pp. 215-219.
- 59 Pierre Oberling, the Turkish People of southern Iran, Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960, p124
- 60 Fredrik Barth, Nomads of south Persia, op.cit, p 87 ; Mirza Hassan Fassai, Farsnameh Nasserri, op.cit, vol. II, pp. 1573-1579.
- 61 Fredrik Barth, Nomads of south Persia ibid. p 91.
- 62 George Curzon, Persia and Persian Question, London:1892, pp. 559-561; Fredrik Barth, Nomads of south Persia, op.cit, p 87 ; Lois Beck, The Qashqa'i of Iran, op.cit, pp. 87-89.
- 63 Pierre Oberling(1970), British Tribal Policy in southern Persia, 1906-1911, Journal of Asian History, IV :No 1, pp. 50-79 ; Lois Beck, The Qashqa'i of Iran, op.cit, pp. 100-113.
- 64 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, Khaterat wa Khatarat (Memoirs and Jeopardises), op.cit, pp. 242-248.
- 65 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, Khaterat wa Khatarat ibid. pp. 264-265.
- 66 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat , Ibid.
- 67 Sir Austin Layard, Early adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia.
- 68 Gene Garthwaite, The Bakhtiyari khans : Tribal Disunity in Iran 1880-1915, University of California, Los Angles, Ph.D. dissertation, 1969, PP 175-184.
- 69 Sir Denis Wright , The English among the Persians, op.cit, pp. 85-86, 101-102.
- 70 R. Elwell-sutton, the Persian Oil, op.cit, ; R.W. Ferrier, The History of British Petroleum Company, op.cit ; M. Fateh, Fifty years of Persian Oil, Tehran:1979, p261,op.cit.
- 71 See the following chapters, The Poshtkuh and Kashkuli agreements.
- 72 Pierre Oberling (1970), British Tribal Policy in southern Persia, 1906-1911, Journal of Asian History, IV: No 1, pp. 50-79.
- 73 Percy Sykes, A History of Persia, London 1951, vol.II ; Florida Safiri, The S.P.R. , Ph.D., dissertation, University, of, Edinburgh, 1977.
- 74 Ahmad Ali Sepehr, Iran dar Jang-e- Bozorg (Persia in the Great War), Tehran, 1956; Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, Deliran-e Tangestan, Tehran (the braves of Tangestan) ; Nur-allah Daneshvar Alavi, Jonbesh-e Vatan Parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari (the movement of Isfahan and Bakhtiyari patriots), Florida Safiri, Ibid..

- 75 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, eds E.L. Woodward & R. Butler, London, 1963, No 616, Memorandum by G. Churchill, 20 December 1920 ; DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, *ibid.*, No 640, Norman to Curzon, 8 January 1921.
- 76 Arnold Wilson, *A precise of Relations of the British Government with the Tribes and Shaikhs of Arabistan*, Calcutta, 1912 ; Mostafa, Ansari, *The history of Khuzestan 1878-1925*, unpublished Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1974, Appendix.
- 77 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Pasad Saleh Khuzestan*, Tehran, 1983, pp 208-210.
- 78 W. Strunk, *The Reign of Shaykh Khaz'l*, U.S.A 1977, pp. 304-311.
- 79 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Pasad Saleh Khuzestan*, Tehran, 1983, *op.cit*, pp 211.
- 80 James Moberly, *Operations in Persia 1914-1919*, P 100.
- 81 Denis Wright, *The English among the Persians*, *op.cit*, p 72, 172 ; Ahmad Kasravi, 1983, *op.cit*, pp. 216-217.
- 82 FO 371, 6422, Wilson to Trevor, 3 January 1921.
- 83 Ahmad Kasravi, 1983, *op.cit*, PP 219-220.
- 84 FO371/ 6422, Wilson to Trevor, *op.cit*.
- 85 Of 371/ *Ibid.*
- 86 Gene Garthwaite, *The Bakhtiyari khans: Tribal Disunity in Iran 1880-1915*, University of California, Los Angles, Ph.D. dissertation, 1969, PP 205-220.
- 87 Dagubert von Mikusch, *Wassmuss, der deutsche Lawrence*, Lepzig: 1937, PP 84-87.
- 88 Gene Garthwaite, *Khans and Shahs*, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 136-137.
- 89 Daneshvar Alavi, *Nur-allah: Jonbesh-e vatan parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari*, Tehran, 1988, p175.
- 90 Gene Garthwaite , *Khans and Shahs*, Cambridge, *op.cit*, p138.
- 91 A.H. Sheybani, *Khaterat-e Mohajerat (the memoirs of exodos)*, eds: Iraj Afshar and Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: 1999; P22.
- 92 Noorallah Daneshvar Alavi, *Jonbesh-e Vatan Parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari*, Tehran: 1998, P 161-162.
- 93 Noorallah Daneshvar Alavi, *Jonbesh-e Vatan Parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari*, Tehran: 1998, *Ibid...* P179.
- 94 Noorallah Daneshvar Alavi, 1998, *Ibid.* pp. 175-178.
- 95 James Moberly, *Operation in Persia 1914-1919*, 1990, p 265.
- 96 James Moberly, 1990, *Ibid.* P 292.

- 97 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel, 22, July 1921.
- 98 FO 371, 6406, Ibid.
- 99 FO 371, 6422, Wilson to Trevor, 3 January 1921.
- 100 FO 371, 6422, ibid.
- 101 FO 371/ 6406, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel.1921op.cit.
- 102 FO 371, 6406, ibid.
- 103 N.S.Fatemi, Reflection on the time of Illusion, London: 1989, vol.I. PP 8-13.
- 104 Hassan Arfa , Under Five Shahs, London, 1964, p 57.
- 105 Mohammad Hossein Roknzadeh Adamiyat, Deliran-e Tangestani, Tehran 1975, PP 224-232; Annual Report of the British Political Resident of the Persian Gulf in Bushehr in the year 1915, trans into Persian by Kaveh Bayat in Jang-e Jahani-ye awal dar Janub-e Iran, Bushehr, 1994, pp. 29-49; Kaveh Bayat, ed: Iran and the First World War, Documents of the Ministry of Interior, Tehran: 1990, pp. 136-141.
- 106 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, Khaterat wa Khatarat (Memoirs and Hazards), Tehran: 1982, p 282; Sir Fredrick O' Connor, on the Frontier and Beyond, London: 1931, p115.
- 107 F.J.Moberly, Operations in Persia, 1914-1919, London: 1990, P 186; Florida Safiri, The S.P.R., Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1976, pp. 59-100.
- 108 Annual report of the British Political Resident of the Persian Gulf in Bushehr in the year 1916 by Major. E. P. Trevor, op.cit, pp. 51-71.
- 109 Sir Percy Sykes, A History of Persia, London: 1951, vol II. P 479.
- 110 Percy Sykes, 1951, ibid. pp. 477-478.
- 111 Nasser Iraj, Il-e Qashqa'i dar jang-e jahani-ye aval (Persia in the First World War), Tehran: 1999, p 79.
- 112 Mansoureh Ettehadieh, ed: Gozide'i az Majmu'e Asnad-e Abd al-Hossein Mirza Farmanfarma (LDAFF), Tehran: 1987, vol. II P 405; Mehrmah, Farmanfarma, Zendeginameh A.H.Farmanfarma, Tehran: 1998, pp233-242.
- 113 Kaveh Bayat, ed: IFWW, Documents of the Ministry of Interior, op.cit, Tehran: 1990, pp. 164-167; Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, 1978, op.cit, pp. 400-402.
- 114 Kaveh Bayat, ed:IFWW, Ibid., p 168; RoknzadehAdamiyat, 1978, ibid., pp. 464-467; Florida Safiri, the South Persia Rifles, Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh : 1976, pp. 247-249.

- 115 Moberly, 1990, op.cit, p; M.Farmanfarma, op.cit, pp. 249-255.
- 116 Florida Safiri, 1976, op.cit, chapter 6. ; Moberly, 1990, Ibid. pp. 514-518.

II. Persia in Modern History

- 1 Richard Tapper, "The tribes in 18th and 19th centuries of Iran in Cambridge History of Iran, vol. VII, eds: Peter Avery & the others, Cambridge: 1991, p 540. Tapper points out „that geographical location, national and international politics were major factors in the rise of the three confederations“Qashqa’i, Bakhtiyari and Khamseh. I am rather convince that those factors are more visible in their settlement.
- 2 For more information see: Rouhollah Ramazani, The Foreign Policy of Iran. 1500-1941, Virginia: 1966; J.C.Hurwitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record, 1535-1914, vol.I, Princeton: 1956.
- 3 George Curzon, Persia and Persian Question, London 1892; Mahmoud Afshar Yazdi, Les politique European en Perse (Berlin :1921), transl into Persian, Tehran : 1979 ;Denis Wright, The English among the Persians, London :1977 ; Rose Lois Greaves, Persia and the Defence of India, 1884-1892, London :1959 ; Ali Asghar Shamim, Iran dar dour-eye Saltanat-e-Qajar, Tehran: 1996, pp. 59-104, Mostafa Edjtehadi, Zerfall der Staatsmacht Persiens unter Nasir al-Din Schah Qajar (1848-1896) Berlin :1992.
- 4 Rose Greaves, Iranian Relations with Great Britain and British India, 1798-1921, chapter II, and Firuz Kazemzadeh, Iranian Relations with Russia and the Soviet Union to 1921, chapter IX, in Cambridge History of Iran, vol. IIV, op.cit ; Mojtahedi ; Abd al-Reza Hushang Mahdavi, A history of the foreign relation,of,Iran,1500-1945 (in Persian), Tehran :1990. J.B.Kelly, Britain and the Persian Gulf: 1795-880, Oxford: 1968.
- 5 Willhelm Litten, Persien. Von der penetration pacifique zum "Protektorat" in Persien 1860-1919, Berlin: 1920 ; Firuz Kazemzadeh, Russia and Britain in Persia 1864-1914, New Haven: 1968, Donald Wilber, Iran: Past and Present, Princeton, New Jersey: 1976, p 67 ; Chales Issawi, ed :Economic History of Persia 1800 - 1914, London, 1978 ; Mohammad Ali Jamalzadeh,Ganj-e- Shayegan(the worthy treasure), Tehran: 1983.

- 6 Edward Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, London, 1966, chapter six ; A. A. Shamim, *op.cit*, pp. 477-485 ; Ishtiaq, Ahmad, *Anglo-Iranian Relation : 1905-1919*, London 1974 ; B G.Martin, *German Persian Diplomatic Relations, 1873-1912*, Hagg: 1959 ;Ramazani, 1966, *op.cit* , chap V, pp. 81-113 ; Mahdavi, 1990, *op.cit*, chap, seven, pp. 281-328.
- 7 Nikkie Keddie, *the routes of revolution*, U.S.A.: 1980, pp. 78-79.
- 8 Mehrdad jawanbakht, *Irani az Negah-e Anirani*, Isfahan (the Persians from the view of non-Persians): 2000; Behrouz Taherniya, *Mashad az Negah-e Sayyahan (Mashad from the eyes of the passengers)*, Mashad: 1997.
- 9 Bert Fragner, *persische Memoiren Literatur als Quelle zur neuren Geschichte*, Freiburge *Habil-schr* 1978 ; Sigrid Schubart, *Das Reisebuch des Mirza Salih Shirazi (M.A.)* Am Institut für Iranistik, Berlin : 1993.
- 10 Keramat Rasekh, *Das politische Denken der Reformisten im Iran 1811-1906*, Ph.D dissertation, BFU 1999, Hamburg 2000; Edmond Bosworth an Carola Hillenbrand eds: *Qajar Iran 1800-1925*, Edinburgh 1983.
- 11 Shaul Bakhash, *Iran : Monarchy, Bureaucracy and Reform under the Qajars : 1858-1896*, London 1978 ; Mostafa Edjtehadi, *Zerfall der Staatsmacht Persiens unter Nasir al-Din Schah Qajar (1848-1896)* Berlin :1992 ; Ahmad Ashraf, *Mavane'a Rosht-e Borzhuvazi dar Iran*, Tehran: 1980 : Firuz Kazemzadeh, *Russia and Britain in Persia 1864-1914*, *op.cit*; Hamid Algar, *Mirza Malkum Khan, A study in the Iranian Modernism* Berkeley University Press :1973.
- 12 Nikki Keddie, *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Tobacco Protest of 1891-892*, London: 1966; David Fraser, *Persia and Turkey in Revolt*, Edinburgh 1910. Edward Browne, London: 1966, *op.cit*; Morgan Shuster, *The Strangling of Persia*, New York: 1912, Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Mashrute-ye Iran (The history of the Persian constitution)*, Tehran 1999.
- 13 Ahmad Kasravi , *Tarikh-e Hezhdah Saleh Azarbaijan (The eighteen years history of Azarbaijan)*, Tehran, 1977, Mohammad Taqi Bahar, *Tarikh-e Mokhtasar-e Ahzab-e Siyassi-ye Iran (A short history of the Persian political parties)*, Tehran, 1992, vol. I, pp12-23.
- 14 Oskar von Niedermayer, *Unter der Glutsonne Irans*, dachau, 1925. second ed: *Im Weltkrieg vor Indiens Toren: Der Wüstenzug der deutschen Expedition nach Persien und Afghanistan*, Hamburg 1936.Wipert von Blücher, *Zeitenwende im Iran*, Biberbach: 1949, *op.cit*. In addition to official correspondences, there are

- many printed memoirs and biographies of German diplomats and military officers who participated in the war in Persia. Ahmad Ali Sepehr, *Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg* (Iran in the Great), Tehran:1957; F.J.Moberly, *Operations in Persia, 1914-1919*, London: 1987; Sir Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia*, London: 1951; Ulrich Gehrke, *Persien in der Deutschen Orienpolitik während des ersten Weltkrieges*, 2 vols. Stuttgart,1960; William Olson, *Anglo-Iranian Relations During World I*, London, 1984 ; Florida Safiri, *The S.P.R. , Ph.D.*, dissertation, University of Edinburgh , Edinburgh :1977.
- 15 Sir Denis Wright, *the English among the Persian*, London: 1977, p 171.
 - 16 Nikkie Keddie, *the rout of revolution*, U.S.A.: 1980, pp. 78-79.
 - 17 Sir Reader Bullard, *Britain and the Middle East*, London: 1951, p 76.
 - 18 Sir Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis*, London, 1923. ; Mostafa Elm, *Power*, U.S.A.: 1992, trans into Persian Gholam Hossein Salehyar, Tehran: 1998, p 41.
 - 19 Sir Reader Bullard , *Britain and the Middle East*, op.cit, p 78.
 - 20 Rouhollah Ramazani, *The Foreign Policy of Iran. 1500-1941*, U.S.A. 1966 , op.cit, chapters VI &VII; Lenczowski. George (1984): “Foreign powers’ intervention in Iran during World War I. “in Bosworth Edmond & Hillenbrand, Carolin eds: *Qajar Iran 1800-1925*, Edinburgh, p 78. Ulrich Gehrke, *Persien in der Deutschen Orienpolitik während des ersten Weltkrieges*, 2vols. : Stuttgart,1960/1961.
 - 21 Oskar von Niedermayer, *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren. Der Wüstenzug der deutschen Expedition nach Persien und Afghanistan*, Hamburg 1936.
 - 22 Lenczowski. George (1984): “Foreign powers’ intervention in Iran during World War I. “in Bosworth Edmond & Hillenbrand, Carolin eds: *Qajar Iran 1800-1925*, Edinburgh, p 78.
 - 23 Ahmad Kasravi, *The eighteen years history of Azarbaijan*, Tehran: 1977, pp. 601-622; Hushang-Mahdavi, ‘Abd-al Reza: *Tarikh-e Ravabet-e Khareji-ye Iran* (the History of Iran’s Foreign Relations), Tehran: 1990, pp. 241-245.
 - 24 Oskar von Niedermayer, *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren*. op.cit, p; A.H. Sheybani, *Khaterat-e Mohajerat*, eds: Iraj Afshar and Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: 1999; Seyyed Hassan Taqizadeh, *Zendegi-ye Tufani*, ed: Iraj Afshar, Tehran: 1993.
 - 25 Gene Garthwaite, *khans and Shahs*, op.cit, p? Florida Safiri , *the South Persia Rifles*, op.cit, pp21-28.

- 26 Oskar von Niedermayer, *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren*. op.cit, p; M.H. Roknzadeh Adamiyat, *Deliran-e Tangestani (The braves of Tangestan)*, Tehran: 1975.
- 27 Moberly, 1986, pp. ; Fatemi 1952, op.cit, p; Bahar, ibid. pp 23-27.
- 28 Sir Denis Wright, *The English among the Persians*, London, 1977, pp 94-112.
- 29 Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia*, London 1951, vol.II . ; Ahmad Ali Sepehr, *Iran dar Jang-e- Bozorg*, Tehran, 1956.
- 30 Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, op.cit; Sepehr, 1956, ibid.
- 31 A.H.Sheybani, *Khaterat-e Mohajerat*, Tehran, 1999, P157-164; Seyyed Hassan Taqizadeh, *Zehdegi-ye Tufani*, Tehran: 1993, P 181-186.
- 32 William Olson, *Anglo-Iranian Relations During World I*, London, 1984 ; Florida Safiri, *The S.P.R. , Ph.D.*, dissertation, University of Edinburgh ,1977 ; Ahmad Ali Sepehr *Movarekh al-Dowleh, Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg*, Tehran : 1956.
- 33 Lenczowski. George (1984): "Foreign powers' intervention in Iran during World I" in Bosworth Edmond & Hillenbrand, Caroline eds: *Qajar Iran 1800-1925*, Edinburgh, p 78. Oskar von Niedermayer, *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren*. op.cit, p 39.
- 34 Sir Reader Bullard , *Britain and the Middle East*, op.cit, p 78.
- 35 F.J.Moberly, *Operations in Persia, 1914-1919*, London: 1987/1990, p 172.
- 36 Mikusch-Sykes, *Wassmuss der deutsche Lawrence*, Leipzig: 1937, pp 84-92; F.J.Moberly, *Ibid.*, pp 87-88.
- 37 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, *Khaterat va Khatarat (Memoirs and Dangers)*.Tehran: 1992, p 270; Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, *Mohammad-Hossein: Fars va Jang-e Beyn al -Melal (Fars and the World War)*, Tehran: 1978, pp 98-100.
- 38 Oskar von Niedermayer, *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren*. op.cit, pp 71-72
- 39 Fredrick O'Connor, *On the Frontier and Beyound*, London: 1931; Margaret Ferguson, *Bid Time Return*, London: 1941; Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, *Mohammad-Hossein: Fars va Jang-e Beyn al -Melal*, Tehran: 1978, pp188-194; A.H.Sheybani, *Khaterat-e Mohajerat*, Tehran, 1999, pp29-30.
- 40 Lenczowski. George (1984): "Foreign powers' intervention in Iran during World I" in Bosworth Edmond & Hillenbrand, Carolin eds: *Qajar Iran 1800-1925*, Edinburgh, p 80.
- 41 F.J.Moberly, *Operations in Persia, 1914-1919*, London: 1987/1990, PP 102-103.

- 42 A.H.Sheybani, *Khaterat-e Mohajerat*, Tehran, 1999,pp 23-24 *Gozide'i az Majmu'e Asnad-e Abd al-Hossein Mirza Farmanfarma (A selected of Documents Collection of A.H. Farmanfarma)*, Tehran 1987 vol. II ; Mehrmah, Farmanfarma, *Zendeginameh A.H.Farmanfarma*, Tehran, 1998, pp 179-283.
- 43 See the Anglo-Russian Agreement 1915.
- 44 Florida Safiri, *The S.P.R. , Ph.D., dissertation, University, of, Edinburgh, 1977, op.cit ; Percy Sykes, A History of Persia, London 1951, vol.II.*
- 45 Sir Reader Bullard, *Britain and the Middle East*, op.cit, pp 66-86
- 46 William Olson, *Anglo-Iranian Relations During World I*, London, 1984;
- 47 Sepehr, Ahmad 'Ali, *Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg, 1914-1918(Iran in the Great War)* Tehran: 1957.
- 48 Sheybani, *Khaterat*, Tehran, 1999, op.cit.
- 49 Nur -allah Daneshvar Alavi: *Jonbesh-e vatan parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiyari*, Tehran: 1998.
- 50 N.S.Fatemi, *Diplomatic History of Persia: 1917-1923*, New York: 1952, PP16-18.
- 51 Ahmad Ali Sepehr, *Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg, 1914-1918*, Tehran:1957, pp 409-410.
- 52 Ivar Spector , *the Soviet Union and the Muslem World*, University of Washington, 1958, pp20.
- 53 Sheybani, *Khaterat*, Tehran, 1999, op.cit, pp 478-497; Seyyed Hassan Taqizadeh, *Zehdegi-ye Tufani*, Tehran: 1993, p 188.
- 54 Ivar Spector , *the Soviet Union and the Muslem World*, University of Washington, 1958, op.cit, pp21-23.
- 55 Degars, Jane, ed: *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy*, London: 1951, vol.I. pp 28-29.
- 56 Xenia .J. Eudin and Robert .C.North *Soviet Russia and East: 1917-1927*, Stanford: 1957, pp 92-93.
- 57 Dowlatabadi, Mirza Yahya, *Hayat-e Yahya*, Tehran:1992, vol. IV, p 229.
- 58 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Hezhdah Saleh Azarbaijan*, Tehran,1977, op.cit, pp 705-707.
- 59 Yahya Dowlatabadi, *Hayat-e Yahya*, Tehran, 1992, vol IV, P 96;Hushang-Mahdavi, 'Abd-al Reza, *Tarikh-e Ravabet-e Khareji-ye Iran*, Tehran: 1990, pp 351-352.
- 60 Iraj Zowghi, *The History of Diplomatic Relations of Iran and the Great Powers 1900- 1925*, Tehran: 1989, (in Persian) PP170-184.

- 61 Arnold Wilson, *Persia*, London: 1932, PP 136-137; L.C.Dunsterville, *The Adventures of Dunsterforce*. London: 1932.
- 62 Ibrahim Safa'i, *Wothuq al-Dowleh, 1875-1951*, Tehran: 1996, P 77-112; William Olson, *Anglo Persian Relations during World I.*, London: 1984.
- 63 L.C.Dunsterville, *The Adventures of Dunsterforce*. London: 1932, op.cit; George Lenczowski, *Russia and the West in Iran 1918-1948*, USA: 1949, p13.
- 64 N.S.Fatemi, *Diplomatic History of Persia: 1917-1923*, New York 1952: PP 16-18; Iraj Zowghi, *The History of Diplomatic Relations of Iran and the Great Powers 1900-1925*, Tehran: 1989, PP262-273.
- 65 A.H. Mass'ud Anssari, *Zendegani-ye man*, Tehran, 1972, vol I, P 229.
- 66 Harold Nicolson, *Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919-1925*, London: 1934, P 121.
- 67 William Olson, *The Genesis of the Anglo-Persian Agreement 1919*; Javad Sheykh al-Islami, *Sima-ye Ahmad Shah*, Tehran: 1989, vol I.
- 68 DBFP, First Series, vol IV, eds E.L. Woodward & R.Butler, London, 1952, No 710, Memorandum by Curzon on the Persian Agreement, 9 August 1919.
- 69 Lawrence Ellwell-Sutton, *Iran Modern*, London, 1942.
- 70 Papers Relating to Foreign Relations of the United States, Washington, D.C.,1942, 1919 , vol. II, P 700 and 1920, vol. III. PP 353-355 ; DBFP, First Series, vol IV, op.cit, No 770, Cox to Curzon, 10 September 1919 ; DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, Ibid., No 778, Davis to Curzon, 12 September 1920 and No 808, Davis to Curzon, 7 October 1920. ; N.S.Fatemi, *Diplomatic History of Persia: 1917-1923*, New York: 1952, PP 27-53.
- 71 Harish Kapur, *Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927*, Geneva: 1966, PP 162-163.
- 72 Xenia .J. Eudin and Robert .C.North *Soviet Russia and East: 1917-1927*, Stanford: 1957, p 95.
- 73 Jane Degras, *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy 1917-1924*, vol.I. London: 1951 P 163.
- 74 Ibrahim Fakhra'i, *Sardar Jangle*, Tehran: 1975, PP 233-238.
- 75 Ibrahim Fakhra'i, *Ibid.*, PP246-250 ; Shapour Ravasani, *Sowietrepublik Gilan*, Berlin: 1972, PP 283-292.
- 76 Houshang Sabahi, *British Policy in Persia, 1919-1925*, London: 1990, PP 83-89.
- 77 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, op.cit, No 450, Curzon to Cox personal, 3 June 1920.

- 78 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, *ibid.*, No 492, Norman to Curzon, 26 June 1920; DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, No, 503, Norman to Curzon, 7 July 1920; Abd Allah Mostowfi, *sharh-e Zendegani-ye Man*, Tehran: 1981, vol. III. P 133.
- 79 A.H.Mass'ud Anssari, *Zendegani-ye Man*, Tehran: 1975, vol. II. PP 186-187.
- 80 *Ibid.*, P 66; Yahya Dowlatabadi, *Hayat-e Yahya*, Tehran: 1992, vol IV, P 210.
- Bahram Navazeni, *Ahdname-ye Mawaddat-e Iran wa Showravi* (the Friendship treaty of Iran and Soviet Union), Tehran: 1990, PP148-161.
- 81 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, *op.cit*, No 414, Cox to Curzon, 21 April 1920, No 415, Curzon to Derby, 24 April 1920 and No 418, Allenby to Curzon, 7 May 1920.
- 82 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, *Ibid.*, Nos, 566 and 567, Norman to Curzon, 25, October, 1920. No 570, Norman to Curzon, 27 October 1920.
- 83 Sir Edmund Ironside, *High Road to Command*, ed: Lord Ironside, London 1972, PP143-146.
- 84 General Hassan Arfa', *Under the Five Shah*, London: 1965.
- 85 General Ironside, *High Road to Command*, London: 1972; Seyyed Mohammad 'Ali Jamalzadeh, *Memories* (in Persian) eds: Iraj Afshar & Ali Dehbashi, Tehran: 1999, PP 252-266.
- 86 DBFP, First Series , vol XIII, *opcit*, No 681, Norman to Curzon, 21 February 1921.
- 87 DBFP, First Series, vol XIII, *Ibid.*, No 686, Norman to Curzon, 28, February 1920.
- 88 FO 371/ 4911, Military Report, 16 July 1920; H.Maki, *Sendegani-ye Soltan Ahmad Shah*, Tehran: 1998, Appendix 369-530.
- 89 Seyyed Mo'ez al-Din Mahdavi, *Dastanha'i Az Panjah Sal*, Tehran: 1969, PP 48-51,
- 90 Mohammad Taqi Bahar, *Tarikh-e Mokhtasar-e Ahzab-e Siyassi-ye Iran*, Tehran, 1992, vol. I., pp 121-123
- 91 Arthur, Millspaugh, *The American Task in Persia*, New York: 1973.
- 92 Arthur, Millspaugh, *Ibid.* P13.
- 93 Mohammad Taqi Bahar , *Tarikh-e Mokhtasar-e Ahzab-e Siyassi-ye Iran*, Tehran, 1992, 2 vols; Yahya Dowlatabadi, *Hayat-e Yahya*, Tehran, 1992, vol IV.
- 94 Kaveh Bayat, *Qarardad-e-1919 wa Tashkil-e- Qoshun-e- Motahed al-shek dar Iran* (The agreement of 1919 and the formation of a uniform army in Iran) in

- Tarikh-e Moaser-e Iran, Tehran: 1990. ; Baqer Aqeli, Reza Shah wa Qoshun-e Mottahed al-Shekl, Tehran: 1993.
- 95 Reza Khan, Safar nameh Khuzestan, Tehran: 1925.
- 96 Ahmad Mahrads, Iran auf dem Weg zur Diktatur, Hannover: 1976, pp 113; Stephanie Cronin, The army and the creation of the Pahlavi state in Iran 1910-1926, London: 1996.
- 97 General Hassan Arfa' , under five Shahs, London, 1965, PP 126-127.
- 98 Amir Ahmadi, Khaterat-e Nakhostin Sepahbod, ed Tehran: Arfa', Ibid.
- 99 Gordon Waterfield, Professional Diplomat, London, 1973.
- 100 Gordon Waterfield , Ibid. the correspondences of Loraine's and Havard's.
- 101 M.T.Bahar, 1992, op.cit, pp 31-33.
- 102 H. Maki, Tarikh-e Bist Saleh, vol. II, pp 364-382.
- 103 FO 371/9029, No 336, Loraine to FO, 22 October 1923.
- 104 FO 371/ 9043, no 484, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.
- 105 FO 371/ 9025, No 530, Loraine to Curzon 20 November 1923.
- 106 Richard Cottam, Nationalism in Iran, USA,1979, P 146.
- 107 FO 371/ 9025 No 530, M.T. Bahar, op.cit.
- 108 Reza Khan Safarnameh Khuzestan, Tehran :1925.
- 109 Yahya Dowlatabadi, Hayat-e Yahya, Tehran, 1992, vol IV, p 243.
- 110 Hossein Maki, Tarikh-e Bist Saleh, Tehran 198, vol III, PP 493-586.

III: The Great Tribes in Fars 1919-1921

- 1 Mohammad Hossein Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, Fars wa Jang-e-Beyn al- Melal, Tehran 1978, pp. 454-455.
- 2 Sir Percy Sykes, the History of Persia, 2vols. London: 1951, vol. II. P 479.
- 3 F.J. Moberly, Operations in Persia, 1914-1919, London 1987, translated into Persian by Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: 1990, p 569.
- 4 Mehrmah Farman Farmaian, Zendeginameh Abd al-Hossein Mirza Farman Farma, Tehran:1998, vol II. p 263.
- 5 F.J. Moberly, Operations in Persia, 1914-1919, London: 1987 op.cit, p 567.
- 6 F.J. Moberly, ibid. p 568.

- 7 Annual Reports 1914-1921 of the Persian Gulf Residency, translated into Persian by Kaveh Bayat, Bushehr: 1994.
- 8 BBFP, vol. IV, No 710 memorandum by Curzon, 9 August 1919.
- 9 F O 371/ 6426, Annual Report of the Persian Gulf Political Residency to the Government of India, by Lieutenant .Colonel E. P. Trevor, for the year 1919, 30 May 1920.
- 10 F O 371/ 6426, Annual Report of P.G.P.R., *ibid.*
- 11 Mohammad Hossein Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, *Fars wa Jang-e-Beyn al-Melal*, Tehran 1978, pp. 366-367.
- 12 F O 371/ 6426, Annual Report of P.G.P.R., *op.cit.*
- 13 F O 371/ 4910, No C 130, Summary of Monthly Report by Walter Smart, Oriental Secretary, September 1920.
- 14 M.H.R.Adamiyat, *op.cit* p 461.
- 15 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon, Monthly Report of August, 11 September 1920.
- 16 F O 371/ 4910, Monthly Report of Oriental Secretary, *op.cit.*
- 17 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon, *op.cit.*
- 18 FO 371/ 4910, Monthly Report of Oriental Secretary, *op.cit.*
- 19 FO 371/ 4910, Monthly Reports of Oriental Secretary, *Ibid.*
- 20 F O 371/ 4923, Persian Gulf Political Residency, 10 August 1920.
- 21 F O 371/ 4919, Norman to Curzon, 9 July 1920.
- 22 D B F P vol IIIX, No 486, Norman to Curzon, 25 June 1920.
- 23 The Collected Documents, Correspondence and Memoires of Firuz Mirza Firuz, ed: Mansoureh Ettihadieh, Sirous Sa' dvandian, Tehran 1990, vol I, No 25, 13 September 1920.
- 24 F O 371/ 4919, Norman-Curzon, 9 July 1920, *op.cit.*
- 25 F. M. Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 11, Farman Farma to Firuz Mirza Firuz, 23 July 1920.
- 26 F. M. Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 19, Farman Farma to Firuz Mirza Firuz, 15 August 1920.
- 27 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon 11 September 1920, *op.cit.*
- 28 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon 11 September 1920, *ibid.*
- 29 F. M. Firuz , the Collected Documents, No 21, Fetan al-Dowleh to Farman Farma, 22 August 1920.

- 30 F O 371/4930, Norman to Curzon 11September 1920, op.cit.
- 31 F.M. Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 25, Farman Farma to Sheykh Khaz'al, 12 September 1920.
- 32 F .M .Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 26, Farman Farma to Firuz Mirza Firuz,13 September 1920.
- 33 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon 11 September 1920, op.cit.
- 34 F.M.Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 34, Farman Farma to Firuz Mirza Firuz, 22 September 1920.
- 35 F.M.Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 34, ibid.
- 36 F.M.Firuz, the Collected Documents, No11, op.cit.
- 37 F.M.Firuz, the Collected Documents ,No 25, ibid.
- 38 F O 371/ 4930, Norman to Curzon, 11September 1920.
- 39 F.M.Firuz, the Collected Documents, No 33, Farman Farma to Firuz, 23 September 1920.
- 40 F O 371/ 4910, Norman to Curzon, op.cit.
- 41 F O 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31 January 1922.
- 42 F O 371/ 7805, Loraine to Curzon, 22 March 1922.
- 43 Jalil Bozorgmehr, Ranjha-ye Siyasi-ye Dr. M. Mossaddeq ed:Abdollah Borhan, Tehran 1998.
- 44 M. Mossadeq, Khaterat wa Ta'allomat, ed : Iraj Afshar,Tehran : 1985, P 120.
- 45 FO 371/ 4929, Norman-Curzon 2 November 1920.
- 46 FO 371/ 4929, Ibid.
- 47 Diba, M . Mossadeq , a biography, London 198 p 24.
- 48 DBFP, vol IIIX ,No 572,Norman-Curzon 29 October 1920.
- 49 Jalil Bojorgmehr Ranjha-ye siyasi, op.cit p19.
- 50 DBFP, vol IIIX No 607, Norman-Curzon , 10 December 1920.
- 51 Mohammad Mossadeq, Khaterat,1985, op.cit pp. 123-125.
- 52 Mossadeq, 1985, Ibid.
- 53 Mossadeq, 1985, Ibid.
- 54 FO 371/ 4930, 11September 1920, op.cit.
- 55 F.M.Firuz, Collected Documents, No 26, 15 August 1920.
- 56 FO 371/ 4910, September 1920, op.cit.
- 57 DBFP vol IIIX, Nos 601, 607, 612 on the South Persia Rifles.
- 58 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31January 1922.

- 59 FO 371/ 6441, Trevor to Bray 7 January 1921.
- 60 FO 371/ 6418, Norman-Chick , 29 September 1921,378-s7807.
- 61 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 62 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 63 FO 371/ 6441, Trevor to Bray 7 January 1921, op.cit.
- 64 FO 371/ 7818, Loraine to Balfour, 8 July 1922.
- 65 Mohammad Mossadeq, Khaterat,1985, op.cit P 138.
- 66 Mossadeq, 1985, Ibid., 125.
- 67 Iraj Afshar, ed: Ayandeh, vol IVX, p 80.
- 68 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31 January 1922, op.cit.
- 69 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, ibid.
- 70 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, ibid.
- 71 FO 248/ 1335, Chick to Norman, 3 April 1921.
- 72 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Lorain, op.cit.
- 73 FO 248/ 1335, Chick to Qawam al-Molk, 15 April 1921.
- 74 FO 248/ 1335, a letter from Qawam al-Molk to Chick, 4 May 1921.
- 75 FO 248/ 1335, Chick to Norman 5 May 1921.
- 76 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31 January 1922.
- 77 FO 371/ 1335, translation of a letter from Qawam al-Molk to Chick, 5 May 1921.

IV: The Political Events in Fars 1921- 1922

- 1 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 2 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, ibid.
- 3 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31 January 1922.
- 4 FO 371/ 6399, Memorandum ,11 January 1921.
- 5 FO 371/ 6409, Churchill to Curzon, 18 February 1921.
- 6 FO 371/ 6409, Montaque to Curzon, 23 February 1921.
- 7 DBFP vol IIIX, Curzon to Norman, 22 January 1921.
- 8 DBFP vol IIIX, Curzon to Norman, 16 March 1921.
- 9 Khaterat va Ta' amolat, M.Mossadeq, 1985, op.cit 128.
- 10 FO 371/ 6409, Norman to Curzon 23 March 1921; Also Safiri, 111976, p295.

- 11 FO 371/ 6412, Political Residency Bushehr to the Government of India, 15 December 1921.
- 12 DBFP, vol III, No 675 Norman-Curzon 20 January 1921.
- 13 FO 371/ 6410, Churchill to Curzon, 14 July 1921.
- 14 FO 371/ 6410, Memorandum on South Persia Rifles November 1921.
- 15 FO 371/ 6410, Curzon to Norman, 2 September 1921.
- 16 FO 371/ 6411, Curzon to Norman, 2 September 1921, *ibid.*
- 17 M. T. Bahar, *a Short History of the Parties in Iran*, Tehran 1984, p168.
- 18 FO 371/ 6450, Chick to Norman 22 January 1922.
- 19 FO 371/ 7805, Chick to Loraine, 31 January 1922.
- 20 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 19 October 1921.
- 21 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 October 1921.
- 22 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 23 October 1921.
- 23 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bray, 30 November 1921.
- 24 FO 371/ 6418, Norman to Chick, 29 September 1921.
- 25 FO 371/ 6418, Trevor to Norman, 2 October 1921.
- 26 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 10 October 1921.
- 27 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, *Ibid.*
- 28 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 29 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 30 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, *Ibid.*
- 31 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, *Ibid.*
- 32 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 October 1921.
- 33 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 19 October 1921.
- 34 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, *Ibid.*
- 35 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 23 October 1921.
- 36 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, *Ibid.*
- 37 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 30 October 1921.
- 38 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, *Ibid.*
- 39 FO 371/ 6418, Trevor to Bray, Bushehr, 19 October 1921.
- 40 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 4 November 1921.
- 41 FO 371/ 6418, Norman to Chick, 29 September 1921.
- 42 FO 371/ 6418, Trevor to Norman, 2 October 1921.
- 43 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 4 November 1921.

- 44 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Norman, 6 October 1921.
- 45 FO 248/ 1365, Chick to Loraine, 3 April 1922.
- 46 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 10 October 1921.
- 47 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 14 November 1921.
- 48 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Curzon, 12 December 1921.
- 49 FO 371/ 6418, Trevor to Bray, 19 October 1921, op.cit.
- 50 FO 371/ 6418, Wilson to Trevor, 8 October 1921.
- 51 FO 371/ 6418, Trevor to Bray, 19 October 1921, op.cit.
- 52 FO 371/ 6418, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 October 1921.
- 53 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bray, 30 November 1921.
- 54 FO 371/ 6418, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 October 1921.
- 55 FO 317/ 6418, Wilson to Sowlat al-Dowleh, 18 October 1921.
- 56 FO 371/ 7814, Demi-official, Chick to Wilson, 7 November 1921.
- 57 FO 371/ 7814, Sowlat al-Dowleh to the governor-general of Fars, 31 October.
- 58 FO 371/ 7814, Nosrat al-Saltaneh to Chick, 6 November 1921.
- 59 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Nosrat al-Saltaneh, 7 November 1921.
- 60 FO 371/ 7814, Demi-official, Chick to Wilson, 7 November 1921, op.cit.
- 61 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bray, 30 November 1921; FO 371/ 7814, Demi-official, Chick to Wilson, 7 November 1921.
- 62 FO 371/ 7814, Kargozar in Fars to the British Consul in Shiraz, 8 November, 1921.
- 63 FO 371/ 7814, British Consul Shiraz to Kargozar in Fars, 8 November 1921.
- 64 FO 371/ 7805, Persian Foreign Minister to the British Charge d ' Affaires, 8 November 1921.
- 65 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Chick, 11 November 1921.
- 66 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 11 November 1921.
- 67 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, Ibid.
- 68 FO 371/ 7805, Loraine to Curzon, 15 May 1922.
- 69 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 14 November 1921.
- 70 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 11 November 1921.
- 71 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 November 1921.
- 72 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 16 November 1921.
- 73 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, op.cit.
- 74 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Chick, 14 November 1921.

- 75 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Chick, Ibid.
- 76 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, op.cit.
- 77 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bridgeman, 17 November 1921.
- 78 FO 371/ 7814, Political Mohammareh to Charge d' Affaires, 14 November 1921.
- 79 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 16 November 1921, op.cit.
- 80 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 November 1921, op.cit.
- 81 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, Ibid.
- 82 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 14 November 1921.
- 83 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 15 November, 1921op.cit.
- 84 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 14 November 1921,op.cit.
- 85 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 16 November 1921.
- 86 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, Ibid.
- 87 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 14 November 1921op.cit.
- 88 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 16 November 1921, p.cit.
- 89 FO 371/ 7814, No 14 November 1921, op.cit .
- 90 FO 371/ 7814, No 337, Kargozar to Chick, 17 November 1921.
- 91 FO 371/ 7814, No 29, Chick to Brigeman, 18 November 1921.
- 92 FO 371/ 7815, Persian Foreign Minister to British Charge d' Affaires, 8 November 1921.
- 93 FO 371/ 7815, British Charge d' Affaires to Persian Foreign Minister, 17 November 1921.
- 94 FO 371 7814, British Charge d'Affaires to High Commissioner Baghdad, 18 November 1921.
- 95 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 19 November 1921.
- 96 FO 371/ 6412, Urgent, a note by Oliphant, 1November 1921.
- 97 FO 371/ 6412, Charge d' Affaires to Foreign Office, 13 November 1921.
- 98 F.Safiri, the South Persia Rifles, Ph.D., Dissertation, Edinburgh University, 1976, p297.
- 99 FO 371/ 7814, governor general of Fars to British Consul Shiraz, 28 November 1921.
- 100 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 27 November 1921.
- 101 FO 371/ 7814, Chick to Bridgeman, 2 December 1921.
- 102 FO 371/ 7814, Political Mohammareh to British Legation Tehran, 9 December 1921.

- 103 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bridgeman, 11 December 1921.
- 104 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Curzon, 12 December, 1921.
- 105 FO 371/ 7814, British Charge d' Affaires to Political Mohammareh, 15 December 1921.
- 106 FO 371/ 7815, British Consulate Ahwaz to British Minister Tehran, 4 January 1922.
- 107 FO 371/7815, Peel to Loraine, 4 January 1922.
- 108 FO 371/ 7815, Trevor to Loraine, 7 January 1922.
- 109 FO 371/ 7816, Moshar to Loraine, 19 January 1922.
- 110 FO 371/ 7816, Loraine to Curzon, 16 February 1922.
- 111 FO 371/ 7816, Peel to Loraine, 4 January, 1922.
- 112 FO 371/ 7815, Chick to Loraine, 10 February 1922.
- 113 FO 371/ 7815, Lincoln to Chick, 12 February 1922.
- 114 FO 248/ 365, Chick to Loraine, 3 April 1922.
- 115 FO 248/ 365, Anson to Loraine, 15 1922.
- 116 FO 248/ 1365, Chick to Loraine, 3 April 1922.
- 117 FO 248/ 1365, Ibid., minute.
- 118 FO 371/ 7808, Loraine to Balfour, 6 June 1922.
- 119 FO 371/ 7807, Chick to Loraine, 15 May 1922.
- 120 FO 371/ 7807, Trevor to Bray, 25 May 1922.
- 121 FO 371/ 7807, Prime Minister, Moshir al-Dowleh to Sowlat al-Dowleh, 23 April 1922.
- 122 FO 371/ 7807, Minister of War, Reza Khan to Sowlat al-Dowleh, no dated.
- 123 FO 378/ 7807 , Speaker of Majless, Mo' tamen al-Doleh to Sowlat al-Dowleh, no dated.
- 124 FO 371/ 7807, Chick to Loraine, 15 May 1922, op.cit.
- 125 FO 371/ 7818, Lorain to Balfour, 8 July 1922.
- 126 FO 371/ 7808, Loraine to Balfour, 6 June 1922, op.cit.
- 127 FO 371/ 7808, Loraine to Balfour, ibid.
- 128 FO 248/ 1365, minute by Loraine 1 May 1922.
- 129 FO 248/ 1365, minute by Loraine, Ibid.
- 130 FO 371/ 7808, Loraine to Balfour, 6 June, op.cit.
- 131 FO 371/ 7818, Loraine to Balfour, 8 July, op.cit.
- 132 FO 371/ 7817, Trevor to Bray, 6 June, 1922.

- 133 FO 371/ 7817, Trevor to Bray, Ibid.
- 134 FO 371/ 7818, Loraine to Balfour, 8 July, op.cit.
- 135 FO 371/ 7817, Trevor to Bray, op.cit.
- 136 FO 371/ 7817, Trevor to Bray, 6 June 1922.
- 137 FO 371/ 7817, ibid.
- 138 FO 371/ 7818, op.cit.
- 139 FO 371/ 7818, Ibid.
- 140 FO 371/ 7807, Trevor to Bray, 15 May 1922.
- 141 FO 371/ 7808, op.cit.
- 142 FO 371/ 7808, Chick to Trevor, 7 June 1922.
- 143 FO 371/ 7808, Chick to Trevor, 14 June 1922.
- 144 FO 371/ 7808, Trevor to Wilson, 20 June 1922.
- 145 FO 371/ 7808, Ibid.

V. Khuzestan in 1919-1921

- 1 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to Trevor, 3 January 1921
- 2 FO 371/ 6422, Ibid.
- 3 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Pansad saleh-e Khuzestan*, Tehran, 1983, pp 219-220.
- 4 FO 371/ 7837, Peel to Trover, 25 November 1921.
- 5 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to Trevor, op.cit.
- 6 Ahmad Kasravi, *Tarikh-e Pansad saleh-e Khuzestan*, Tehran, 1983, pp 227.
- 7 William Strunk , *the reign of Shaykh Khazal*, Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1977, pp268-291.
- 8 Ibid., pp. 309-336.
- 9 Gordon Waterfield, *Provisional, Diplomat*, London 1973, p31.
- 10 ‘Abd -allah Mostowfi, (1981) : *Tarihk-e Ejtema‘i va Edari-ye Dowre-ye Qajari-ye* (The Social and Admimistrative History of the Qajar,s period).Tehran: 1981, vol. III, p 636.
- 11 John Marlow, *the Late Victorian*, London, 1967, p147.
- 12 FO, 371, 5778, Montague to Wilson, 26 December 1918 quoted by William Strunk, *the reign of Shaykh Khazal* pp. 314-316.
- 13 FO 371/ 4919, Norman to Curzon, 9 July 1920.
- 14 FO 371/ 4919, Norman to Curzon, ibid.

- 15 F. M . Firuz, Collected Documents, vol I, No 25, , Farman Farma to Khaz'al, 12 September 1920.
- 16 William Strunk , the reign of Shaykh Khazal, op.cit, pp316-330.
- 17 FO 371/ 6422, Peel a note administration and revenue Arabistan, 16 August 1921.
- 18 FO 371/ 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 19 FO 371/ 7837, Peel to Trevor, 25 November 1921.
- 20 FO 371/ 7837, Peel to Trevor, ibid.
- 21 FO 371/ 6422, op.cit, Wilson,
- 22 FO 371/ 4927, W. Meade, Administration Report for the month January 1920.
- 23 FO 371/ 4927, W. Meade, Administration Report for the months February and March 1920.
- 24 FO 371/ 4927, W. Meade, Administration Report for the months April and May 1920.
- 25 FO 371/ 4919, Norman- Curzon, 9 July 1920.
- 26 FO 371/ 4927, W. Meade, Administration Report for the month June 1920.
- 27 Mostafa Ansari, the history of Khuzestan, Ph.D. dissertation , University of Chicago, 1975, p308.
- 28 FO 371/ 4910, Oriental Secretary, Smart, Monthly Report, September 1920.
- 29 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to the Government of India, 20 October 1920.
- 30 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to the Government of India, ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 FO 371/ 6422, Norman to the Acting Political Resident, Persian Gulf, 27 November 1920 ; Mostafa Ansari, op.cit, pp. 317-319.
- 34 FO 371/ 7837, Peel to Trevor, 25 November 1921.
- 35 FO 371/ 6422, Viceroy to India Office, 6 June 1921.
- 36 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson, op.cit.
- 37 FO 371/ 6423, Peel to Trevor, 25 November 1921.
- 38 FO 371/ 6423, Peel to Trevor, ibid.
- 39 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson, op.cit.
- 40 FO 371/ 6422, Norman to Curzon, 1August 1921.
- 41 FO 371/ 6422, Secretary of State for India to Viceroy 14 October 1921.
- 42 FO 371/ 6422, Foreign Office to India Office, 15 October 1921.

- 43 FO 371/ 4910, summary of monthly report by Oriental Secretary, M. Smart, 20 September 1920.

VI : Bakhtiyaris in 1919-1921

- 1 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to the Persian Gulf Residency , 3 January 1921.
- 2 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel.
- 3 N.S.Fatemi, Reflection on the time of Illusion, London 1989,vol I, pp. 8-13.
- 4 Eskandar Khan Akasheh, Tarikh-e il-e Bakhtiyari(the history of the nomad tribe Bakhtiyari) ed: Farid Moradi, Tehran : 1986, pp. 667-681:Yahya Dowlatabadi, Hayat-e Yahya, and Tehran: 1992 vol. IV. p 112 ; F.O. 371/ 6426, annual report of the Persian Gulf Residency for year 1919.
- 5 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, P.E.Peel, op.cit.
- 6 FO 371/ 6422, Wilson to the Persian Gulf Residency , op.cit .
- 7 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel, op.cit.
- 8 F.O. 248/1279, Crow to Cox, 7 January 1920.
- 9 FO 248/1279, Crow to Ashja' 17 April 1920.
- 10 FO 248/ 1279, Ashja' to Crow, 6 May 1920.
- 11 FO 248 / 1279 , Crow to Ashja' , 17 April 1920, op.cit.
- 12 FO 248/ 1279, Grey to Cox, 14 June 1920.
- 13 DBFP, No483, Norman to Curzon, 23 June 1920.
- 14 FO 371/ 4910, summary of the monthly report of Oriental Secretary, September 1920.
- 15 FO 371/ 4930, monthly report of British Minister, 11 September 1920.
- 16 FO 371/ 4910, op.cit.
- 17 FO 371/ 4930, op,cit.
- 18 FO 371/ 4910, op.cit.
- 19 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel, op.cit.
- 20 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, enclosur, ibid.
- 21 F.O.248/1279, Crow to Norman, 23 September 1920.

- 22 FO 371/ 6406, India Office to Foreign Office, a note on Bakhtiyari by P.E.Peel, op.cit.
- 23 Sardar Zafar Bakhtiyari, Yaddashtha, Tehran, 1983, pp. 62-63 and 99.
- 24 Gene Garthwaite, Khans and Shahs, Cambridge 1983, pp. 75-80.
- 25 Gh.H.Mirza Saleh,ed:Reza Shah, Khaterat-e- Soleyman Behbudi &: a military report, Tehran 1993, pp. 514.
- 26 Gh.H.Mirza Saleh, Ibid., pp. 515-516.
- 27 Gh.H.Mirza Saleh, Ibid., pp. 515-516.
- 28 FO 248/ 1279, Crow to Cox, 7 January 1920.
- 29 FO 248/ 1279, Crow to Cox, ibid.
- 30 FO 371/ 6406, Peel to Norman, 2 July 1921.
- 31 Gh.H.Mirza Saleh, op.cit , pp. 516-519.
- 32 FO 371/ 6406, Peel to Norman, 2 July 1921, op.cit.
- 33 FO 248/ 1279, Crow to Norman, 23 September 1920.
- 34 N.S.Fatemi, op.cit. pp. 9-14.
- 35 FO 371/ 4910, op.cit.
- 36 FO 371/ 4910, ibid.
- 37 FO 371/ 7809, Fitzpatrik to Loraine, 20 July 1922.
- 38 FO 371/ 7809, ibid.
- 39 Khosrow Shakeri, in Ketab-e Jom'e, No 12 ed : Ahmad Shamlu.
- 40 FO 371/ 7823, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1922.
- 41 FO 371/ 7809, Fitzpatrik to Loraine, op.cit.
- 42 FO 371/ 9051, No , annual report, 16 July 1923.
- 43 FO 371/ 4907= DBFP, No 616, memorandum by George Churchill, 20 December 1920.
- 44 DBFP, No 616, memorandum by George Churchill, ibid.
- 45 FO 371/ 4907, minute by Oliphant, 22 December 1920.
- 46 FO 371/ 4907, minute by Curzon, 24 December 1920.
- 47 FO 371/ 4907, Foreign Office to Norman, 25 December 1920.
- 48 DBFP, No 621, Norman to Curzon, 27 December 1920.
- 49 DBFP, No 638, Norman to Curzon, 7 January 1921.
- 50 DBFP, No 640, Norman to Curzon, 8 January 1921.
- 51 DBFP, No 644, Norman to Curzon, 12 January 1921.
- 52 DBFP, No 654, Curzon to Norman, 18 January 1921.

- 53 DBFP, No 657, Norman to Curzon, 20 January 1921.
- 54 FO371/ 6400, Viceroy of India, 22 January 1921.
- 55 DBFP, No 640, Norman to Curzon, 8 January 1921.
- 56 DBFP, No 660, Curzon to Norman, 21 January 1921.
- 57 DBFP, No 667, Norman to Curzon, 8 January 1921.
- 58 DBFP, No 668, Cox to Montague, 29 January 1921.
- 59 F.O. 371/ 6400, minute by George Churchill.
- 60 DBFP, No 673, Curzon to Norman, 8 February 1921.

VII: Bakhtiyaris and Southern Confederation

- 1 FO 371/ 6403, Peel to Norman, 31 January 1921.
- 2 FO 371/ 6403, Trevor to Denys, 17 February 1921.
- 3 FO 371/ 6403, Peel to Norman, 2 February 1921.
- 4 FO 371/ 6403, Peel to Norman, 15 February 1921.
- 5 FO 371/ 6403, Norman to Curzon, 27 February 1921.
- 6 FO 371/ 6405, Trevor to Bray 17 May 1921.
- 7 FO 371/ 6405, Peel to Norman, 27 April 1921.
- 8 FO 371/ 6405, op.cit.
- 9 FO 371/ 6405, Ibid.
- 10 Louis Rabino, the British and Persian Diplomats and Consulates, translated into Persian by Gh. H. Mirza Saleh, Tehran : 1984.
- 11 FO 371/ 6422, Norman to Foreign Office, 20 July 1921.
- 12 FO 371/ 6405, Norman to Peel, 20 April 1921.
- 13 FO 371/ 6405, Trevor to Bray, 17 May 1921.
- 14 FO 371/ 6405, Peel to Norman, 27 April 1921.
- 15 FO 371/ 6405, op.cit.
- 16 FO 371/ 6405, Peel to Norman, 27 April 1921.
- 17 FO 371/ 6405, Crow to Peel, 29 April 1921.
- 18 FO 371/ 6405, Crow to Norman, 29 April 1921.
- 19 FO 371/ 6405, op.cit.
- 20 FO 371/ 6405, Ibid.
- 21 FO 371/ 6405, Ibid.
- 22 M.Mossadeq, 1987, pp137-138.

- 23 Blue Book, vol III, No 981, Government of India to Marx Crew.
- 24 Ahmad Ali Sepehr, *Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg*, Tehran: 1957.
- 25 Moberly, *Operations in Persia, 1914-1919*, London 1987, p 204.
- 26 Moberly, *Operations in Persia*, *ibid.*, pp. 226-227 and 233.
- 27 Ibrahim Fakhra'i, *Jonbesh-e Jangal*, Tehran, 1975, p289.
- 28 William Olson, PP 200-201.
- 29 FO 371/ 6400, India Office to Foreign Office, 28 January 1921.
- 30 Sara Reguer, *Winston Churchill, and the shaping of the Middle East 1919-1922*, Columbia University, 19 p19; Elie Kedourie, *England and the Middle East, the destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921*, London 1956, p136.
- 31 FO 371/ 7823, Trevor to Bray, 8 November 1921.
- 32 FO 371/ 7824, Noel to Greenway, 3 July 1921.
- 33 FO 371/ 6408, Noel to Peel, 12 May 1921.
- 34 Fo 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 35 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 36 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 37 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 38 FO 371/ 6408, Noel to Peel, 15 June 1921.
- 39 FO 371/ 6408, Norman to Curzon, 2 July 1921.
- 40 FO 371/ 6405, *Ibid.*
- 41 FO 371/ 6408, *op.cit.*
- 42 FO 371/ 6405, memorandum by Smart, 21 June 1921.
- 43 FO 371/ 6408, *op.cit.*
- 44 FO 371/ 6405, *opc.id.*
- 45 FO 371/ 6405, *Ibid.*
- 46 FO 371/ 6405, Foreign Office, 20 August 1921.
- 47 FO 371/ 6405, Noel to Peel, *op.cit.*
- 48 FO 371/ 6408, Peel to Norman, 27 June 1921.
- 49 FO 371/ 6408, *Ibid.*
- 50 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 51 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 52 FO 371/ 6406, Peel's note, 2July 1921.
- 53 FO 371/ 6406, *Ibid.*
- 54 FO 371/ 6415, Greenway to Noel, 21 August 1921.

- 55 FO 371/ 7823, Trevor to Bray, 8 November 1921.
- 56 L. Elwell-sutton, *Persian Oil*, London 1955, : Gene Garthwaite, *Khans and Shahs*, op.cit 108.
- 57 FO 371/ 6408, memorandum by Major Noel, 12 May 1921.
- 58 FO 371/ 6408, memorandum, *ibid.*
- 59 FO 371/ 6408, memorandum, *ibid.*
- 60 FO 371/ 6408, memorandum, *ibid.*
- 61 FO 371/ 6415, second memorandum by Major Noel 15 June 1921.
- 62 FO 371, 6415, *ibid.*
- 63 FO 371/ 7823, memorandum by Dr.Young, June 1921.
- 64 FO 371/ 7823, *ibid.*
- 65 FO 371/ 7823, *ibid.*
- 66 FO 371/ 7824, Noel to Greenway 3 July 1921.
- 67 FO 371/ 7824, *ibid.*
- 68 FO 371/ 7824, Greenway to Noel, 31 August 1921.
- 69 FO 371/ 7824, *ibid.*
- 70 FO 371/ 7824, *ibid.*
- 71 FO 371/ 7824, *ibid.*
- 72 FO 371/ 7824, *ibid.*
- 73 FO 371/ 6405, Foreign Office to Norman, 20 August 1921.
- 74 FO 371/ 6405, *ibid.*
- 75 FO 371/ 6415, Greenway to Churchill, 31 August 1921.
- 76 FO 371/ 6415, Curzon to Norman, 14 September 1921.
- 77 FO 371/ 6408, Trevor to Bray, 29 October 1921.
- 78 FO 371/ 6408, Trevor to Bray, 26 October 1921.
- 79 FO 371/ 6408, *op.cit.*
- 80 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 81 FO 371/ 6408, Crow to British Minister, 30 October 1921.
- 82 FO 371/ 6408, *ibid.*
- 83 FO 371/ 7805, Viceroy to Secretary of India, 5 January 1922.
- 84 FO 371/ 7805, Loraine to Foreign Office, January 22
- 85 FO 371/7805, minute by Oliphant.
- 86 FO 371/ 6406, Note on Bakhtiari by Peel, 2 July 1921.
- 87 FO 371/ 7823, Trevor to Bray, 8 November 1921.

- 88 FO 371/ 6415, Bakhtiari Khans to English Company, 8 May 1921.
- 89 FO 371/ 6415, *ibid.*
- 90 FO 371/ 6415, *ibid.*
- 91 FO 371/ 6427, Anglo Persian Oil Company to Foreign Office, 29 September 1921.
- 92 FO 371/ 4927, *ibid.*
- 93 FO 371/ 7823, Bakhtiari Khans to Armitage Smith, 15 September 1921.
- 94 FO 371/ 7823, Khans to Armitage Smith, 15 September 1921.
- 95 FO 371/ 7823, *Ibid.*
- 96 FO 371/ 7823, Armitage Smith to Samsam al-Saltaneh, 1922.
- 97 FO 371/ 7823, Trevor to Bray, 8 November 1921.
- 98 FO 371/ 7814, Under Secretary of Political Resident of the Persian Gulf to the Government of India, 23 December 1921.
- 99 FO 371/ 7814, Peel to Bakhtiari Khans, 2 December 1921.
- 100 FO 371/ 7814, Wilson to Bakhtiari Khans, 10 December 1921.
- 101 FO 371/ 7814, British Charge d' Affaires to British Consul Kerman, 5 November 1921.
- 102 FO 371/ 7814, Crow to Bridgeman, 27 November 1921.
- 103 FO 371/ 7814, Crow to Peel, 2 December 1921.
- 104 FO 371/ 7814, Bridgeman to Peel, 6 December 1921.
- 105 FO 371/ 7814, Crow to Peel, 8 December 1921.
- 106 FO 371/ 7814, Peel to Bridgeman, 10 December 1921.
- 107 FO 371/ 7814, Trevor to Bray, 24 December 1921.
- 108 FO 371/ 7823, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1922.
- 109 FO 371/ 7823, *ibid.*
- 110 FO 371/ 7823, *ibid.*

VIII: Central Government and the South

- 1 Hassan Arfa' under five Shahs, London, 1964: p 48.
- 2 Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, p 242-255.
- 3 Reza Khan Pahlavi, a travelling account of Khuzestan, Tehran, 1925.
- 4 Soleyman Behbudi, Tehran: 1993.

- 5 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, annual report, 4 March 1924.
- 6 FO 371, 7802, Loraine to Curzon, 31 December, 1921.
- 7 FO 371, 7802, Curzon to Loraine, 3 January 1922.
- 8 FO 371, 7802, Curzon to Loraine, *ibid.*
- 9 FO 371, 7802, Loraine to Curzon, 4 January 1922.
- 10 FO 248, 1365, Terover to Curzon, 7 January 1922.
- 11 FO 371, 7802, Curzon to Loraine, 12 January 1922.
- 12 FO 371, 9051, Loraine to Curzon, 16 January 1922.
- 13 FO 371, 9051, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 14 FO 371, 7806, Chick to Loraine, 11 January 1922.
- 15 FO 371, 7806, Trevor to Loraine, 13 March 1922.
- 16 FO 371, 7806, Loraine to Chick, 21 March 1922.
- 17 FO 371, 7806, Crow to Loraine, 22 March 1922.
- 18 FO 371, 7806, Crow to Loraine, *ibid.*
- 19 FO 371, 7806, Trevor to Bray, 29 March 1922.
- 20 FO 371, 7806, Trevor to Bray, 29 March 1922.
- 21 FO 371, 7806, Loraine to Crow, 13 April 1922.
- 22 FO 371, 9051, Loraine to Curzon, 16 January 1922.
- 23 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 24 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 25 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 26 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 27 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 28 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 29 FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, 18 April 1922.
- 30 FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, enclosure Fitzpatrick to Loraine, 17 April 1922, *ibid.*
- 31 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, enclosure Fitzpatrick to, Loraine, 17 April 1922, *ibid.*
- 32 FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, 18 April 1922.
- 33 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, 18 April 1922.
- 34 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, 18 April 1922.
- 35 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7805, Trevor to Bray, 18 April 1922.
- 36 FO 371, 7805, Loraine to Bray, 21 April 1922.

- 37 Ibid., F O 371, 7805, Loraine to Bray, 21 April 1922.
- 38 F O 371, 7805, The first assistant to the Political Resident to Government of India, 24 April 1922.
- 39 F O 371, 7804, Loraine to Curzon, 25 April 1922.
- 40 Ibid., F O 371, 7804, Loraine to Curzon, 25 April 1922.
- 41 F O 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 42 Ibid., F O 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 43 F O 371, 7805, Loraine to Trevor, 21 April 1922.
- 44 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Trevor, 2 July 1922.
- 45 F O 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 8 July 1922.
- 46 op.cit, F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Trevor, 2 July 1922
- 47 Ibid., F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Trevor, 2 July 1922.
- 48 F O 371, 7807, Trevor to Loraine , 3 July 1922.
- 49 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Trevor, 3 July 1922.
- 50 F O 371, 7807, Trevor to Wallis, 5 July 1922.
- 51 F O 371, 7807, Trevor to Sowlat al-Dowleh, 5 July 1922.
- 52 F O 371, 7807, Trevor to Bray, 7 July 1922.
- 53 F O 371, 7809, Fitzpatrick to Loraine , 20 July 1922.
- 54 F O 371, 7809, Fitzpatrick to Loraine , 20 July 1922, *ibid.*
- 55 F O 371, 7808, Loraine to Balfour , 8 July 1922.
- 56 Ibid., F O 371, 7808, Loraine to Balfour, 8 July 1922.
- 57 Ibid., F O 371, 7808, Loraine to Balfour, 8 July 1922.
- 58 F O 371, 9051, annual report , 16 July 1923
- 59 Ibid., F O 371, 9051, annual report, 16 July 1923.
- 60 Ibid., F O 371, 9051, annual report, 16 July 1923.
- 61 F O 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 62 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 9 July 1922.
- 63 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 20 July 1922.
- 64 Ibid., F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 20 July 1922.
- 65 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 22 July 1922.
- 66 Ibid., F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 22 July 1922.
- 67 Ibid., F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 22 July 1922.
- 68 F O 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 69 F O 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 22 July 1922.

- 70 F O 371, 7807, *ibid.*
- 71 F O 371, 7808, Trevor to Bray, 24 July 1922.
- 72 F O 371, 7808, Loraine to Trevor, 22 July 1922.
- 73 F O 371, 7808, Trevor to Wallis, 23 April 1922.
- 74 F O 371, No 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 75 F O 371, No 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 76 Gordon Waterfield, *Professional diplomat*, London, 1973, p?.
- 77 F O 371, 7808, Trevor to Loraine, 25 July 1922.
- 78 F O 371, 7808, Wallis to Trevor, 25 July 1922.
- 79 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Wallis to Trevor, 25 July 1922.
- 80 FO 371, 7808, Wallis to Trevor, 25 July 1922.
- 81 FO 371, 7807, Trevor to Loraine , 26 July 1922.
- 82 FO 371, 7807, Trevor to Loraine , 25 July 1922.
- 83 FO 371, 7807, minute, 24 July 1922.
- 84 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7807, minute, 24 July 1922.
- 85 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7807, minute, 24 July 1922.
- 86 FO 371, 7807, Curzon to Loraine, 27 July 1922.
- 87 *Ibid.*, F O 371, 7807, Curzon to Loraine, 27 July 1922.
- 88 *Ibid.*, F O 371, 7807, Curzon to Loraine, 27 July 1922.
- 89 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Wallis, 30 July 1922.
- 90 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to, 30 July 1922.
- 91 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 92 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 93 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 94 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 95 FO 371, 7810, enclosure Dr. Young to Fitzpatrick, 8 August 1922.
- 96 FO 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 13 August 1922.
- 97 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7807, Loraine to Curzon, 13 August 1922.
- 98 FO 371, 7608, British Military Attaché to War Office, 13 August 1922.
- 99 FO 371, 7636, Persian Gulf Summary, 16 August 1922.
- 100 FO 371, 7810, Anglo-Persian Oil Company to Foreign Office, 10 August 1922.
- 101 FO 371, 7810, Anglo-Persian Oil Company to Foreign Office, *ibid.*
- 102 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Trevor, 6 August 1922.
- 103 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 1 September 1922.

- 104 FO 371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, *ibid.*
- 105 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Trevor, 19 August 1922.
- 106 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Trevor.
- 107 FO371, 7808, Minute by Mallet, 21 August 1922.
- 108 *Ibid.*, FO371, 7808, Minute by Mallet, 21 August 1922.
- 109 FO 371, 7808, Curzon to Loraine, 23 August 1922.
- 110 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 111 FO 371, 7808, *ibid.*, enclosure, Fitzpatrick to Loraine, 19 August 1922.
- 112 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 22 August 1922.
- 113 FO 371, 7808, Minutes, 23 August 1922.
- 114 FO 371, 7808, A.P.O.C. to F.O. , 1 August 1922.
- 115 FO 371, 7808, A.P.O.C. to F.O., 24 August 1922.
- 116 FO 371, 7808, minutes FO, 30 August 1922.
- 117 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, minute by F.O.
- 118 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 119 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 31 August 1922.
- 120 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 4 September 1922.
- 121 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 122 FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 123 *Op.cid*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 124 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 125 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 126 Kasravi, 1990, p192, Kasravi; Kasravi1983, p 226.
- 127 *Opc.id*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 128 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7808, Loraine to Curzon, 30 August 1922.
- 129 FO 371, 7830, Loraine to Curzon, 4 September 1922.
- 130 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7830, Loraine to Curzon, 4September 1922.
- 131 *Ibid.*, FO 371, 7830, Loraine to Curzon, 4September 1922.
- 132 FO 371, 7830, Loraine to Curzon, 4September 1922.
- 133 *Ibid.* FO 371, 7830, Loraine to Curzon, 4 September 1922.
- 134 *Ibid.*
- 135 *Ibid.*
- 136 *Ibid.*

- 137 FO371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, enclosure No 1 British Consul in Ahvaz, 21 September 1922.
- 138 Ibid. FO371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 139 Ibid. FO371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 140 Ibid. FO371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 141 Ibid., FO371, 7810, Loraine to Curzon, 21 September 1922.
- 142 FO371, 7830, Curzon to Loraine, 10 October 1922.
- 143 FO371, 7811, Loraine to Trevor, 14 October 1922.

IX: The Minister of War in the South

- 1 FO 371, 7809, Trevor to Bray, 15 August 1922.
- 2 FO 371, 7809, Chick to Loraine, 15 August 1922.
- 3 Opc.it, FO 371, 7809, Trevor to Bray, 15 August 1922.
- 4 FO 371, 9051, annual report 1922, 16 July 1923.
- 5 FO 371, 9043, Knock to Bray, enclosure Chick's report No 41, 22 July 1922.
- 6 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Knock to Bray, enclosure Chick's report No 41, 22 July 1922.
- 7 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Knock to Bray, enclosure Chick's report No 41, 22 July 1922.
- 8 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 9 Mirza Saleh ed : The Memoirs of S.Behbudi, S Pahlavi & A zadi), Tehran: 1993, enclosure a military report on southern and Bakhtiyari tribes, p 514-524.
- 10 FO 371, 7809, Fitzpatrick to Loraine, 19 August 1922.
- 11 Opc.it, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 12 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 13 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 14 FO 371, 7310, Loraine to Curzon, 11 October 1922.
- 15 Ibid., FO 371, 7310, Loraine to Curzon, 11 October 1922.
- 16 Ibid., FO 371, 7310, Loraine to Curzon, 11 October 1922.
- 17 Opc.it, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 18 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 19 FO 371, 7811, Wallis to Loraine, 12 November 1922.
- 20 FO 371, 7811, Trevor to Loraine, 13 November 1922.

- 21 FO 371, 7811, Loraine to Wallis, 14 November 1922.
- 22 Ibid., FO 371, 7811, Loraine to Wallis, 14 November 1922.
- 23 FO 371, 7811, Trevor to Bray, 7 November 1922.
- 24 FO 371, 7811, Loraine to Wallis, 14 October 1922.
- 25 FO 371, 7811, Loraine to Wallis, 14 October 1922.
- 26 FO 371, 7811, Wallis to Loraine, 19 November 1922.
- 27 FO 371, 9043, Crow to Loraine, 19 November 1922.
- 28 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Crow to Loraine, 19 November 1922.
- 29 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Crow to Loraine, 19 November 1922.
- 30 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Crow to Loraine, 19 November 1922.
- 31 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 32 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 33 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, enclosure 5 in No 1 a note on the visit of Shah, 29 November 1922.
- 34 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 4 February 1923, enclosure on a visit to Bushehr.
- 35 Opc.it, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 36 Opc.it, 33. FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, enclosure a note on the visit of Shah, 29 November 1922.
- 37 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, enclosure 5 in No 1 a note on the visit of Shah, 29 November 1922.
- 38 FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 10 December 1922.
- 39 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 10 December 1922.
- 40 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 10 December 1922.
- 41 Opc.id, FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 4 February 1923.
- 42 FO 371, 9042, 10 December 1922, enclosure note by the Director Resident of the A.P.O.C to Bushehr.
- 43 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, 10 December 1922, enclosure note by the Director Resident of the A.P.O.C to Bushehr.
- 44 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, 10 December 1922, enclosure note by the Director Resident of the A.P.O.C to Bushehr.
- 45 FO 371, 9024, Trevor to Bray, 8 December 1922.
- 46 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 4 February 1923, enclosure
- 47 FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 10 December 1922.

48 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 10 December 1922.
49 Op.cit, FO 371, 9042, a note on the visit to Bushehr, 8 December 1922.
50 Ibid. FO 371, 9042, a note on the visit to Bushehr, 8 December 1922.
51 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
52 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
53 FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922.
54 Ibid., FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922.
55 Ibid., FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922.
56 Ibid., FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922.
57 Ibid., FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922.
58 Ibid., FO 371, 9045, Chick to Loraine, 21 December, 1922
59 FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 14 January 1922.
60 Ibid., FO 371, 9042, Trevor to Bray, 14 January 1922.
61 FO 371, 9024, Trevor to Bray, 21 January 1923.
62 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 31 December 1922.
63 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
64 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
65 FO 416/ 72, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
66 Ibid., FO 416/ 72, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
67 Ibid., FO 416/ 72, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
68 Ibid., FO 416/ 72, Loraine to Curzon, 10 January 1923.
69 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 4 February 1923.
70 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 4 February 1923.
71 FO 371, 9045, minute by George Churchill, 17 February 1923.
72 FO 371, 9045, minute by R.C.L., 19 February 1923.
73 FO 371, 9024, Coy to Duke, 9 April 1923.
74 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Coy to Duke, 9 April 1923.
75 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 1 May 1923.
76 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 1 May 1923.
77 FO 371, 10153, annual report 4 March 1924.
78 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
79 Op.cit, FO 371, 10153, annual report 4 March 1924.
80 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
81 FO 371, 9042, Loraine to Curzon, 2 April 1923.

- 82 FO 371, 9042, minute by George Churchill, 3 April 1923.
- 83 F.O 371, 9042, minutes by Curzon and R.C.L., 4 April 1923.
- 84 FO 371, 9042, Curzon to Loraine, 7 April 1923.
- 85 FO 371, 9042, Loraine to Curzon, 10 April 1923.
- 86 FO 371, 9042, Curzon to Loraine, 16 April 1923.
- 87 FO 371, 9042, Qavam al-Saltaneh to Sardar Jang, 7 April 1923.
- 88 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 April 1923.
- 89 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 24 April 1923.
- 90 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to FO, 24 April 1923.
- 91 FO 371, 9043, Curzon to Loraine, 26 April 1923.
- 92 FO 371, 9021, secret, Loraine to Curzon, 2 May 1923.
- 93 FO 371, 9021, Loraine to Curzon, 8 May 1923.
- 94 Ibid., FO 371, 9021, Loraine to Curzon, 8 May 1923.
- 95 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 April 1923.
- 96 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 April 1923.
- 97 FO 371, 9021, Saunders interview with Reza Khan , 29 April 1923.
- 98 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Reza Khan, 1May1923.
- 99 FO 371, 9043, Reza Khan to, Loraine, 1 May 1923.
- 100 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 2 May 1923.
- 101 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Reza Khan, 2 May 1923.
- 102 FO 371, 9043, Reza Khan to, Loraine, 3 May 1923.
- 103 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Samsam al-Saltaneh, 3 May 1923.
- 104 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 105 FO 416, 72, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 106 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 107 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 108 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 109 FO 371, 9043, Viceroy to Secretary for India, 5 May 1923.
- 110 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Viceroy to Secretary for India 5 May 1923.
- 111 FO 416, 72 , F.O. to Loraine, 5 May 1923.
- 112 FO 371, 9043, Nichols to Oliphant, 7 May 1923.
- 113 FO 371, 9043, Under Secretary for Foreign Office to Under Secretary of India Office 7 May 1923.

- 114 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Under Secretary for Foreign Office to Under Secretary of India Office 7 May 1923.
- 115 FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 116 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Reza Khan, 9 May 1923.
- 117 FO 371, 9024, minute by George Churchill, 9 May 1923.
- 118 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, minute by George Churchill, 9 May 1923.
- 119 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, minute by George Churchill, 9 May 1923.
- 120 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, minute by George Churchill, 9 May 1923.
- 121 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Loraine, summer 1923.
- 122 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Peel to Loraine, summer 1923.
- 123 Reza Khan Pahlavi, Safarnameh-e Khuzestan, p 135.
- 124 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 125 FO 371, 10153, annual report 1923, 4 March 1924.
- 126 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 127 Arthur Millspaugh, the American Task in Persia, New York, 1973, PP 186-187.
- 128 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 129 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 130 Op.cit, FO 371, 10153, annual report 1923, 4 March 1924.
- 131 Khosrow Khan Sardar Zafar, p198.
- 132 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 133 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 134 FO 371, 9043, Nichols to Oliphant, 25 May 1923, also see FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 25 May 1923.
- 135 Op.cit, FO 371,9043 , Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 136 Op.cit, FO 371, 9043, Nichols to Oliphant, 25 May 1923, also see FO 416 / 72, Loraine to Curzon, 25 May 1923.
- 137 FO 416/72, Curzon to Loraine, 29 May 1923.

X: The Question of Security

- 1 FO 371, 9033, memorandum by Lancelot Oliphant, 16 March 1923.
- 2 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 1 May 1923.
- 3 FO 371, 9024, personal, Loraine to Curzon, 5 May 1923.
- 4 FO 371, 9043, urgent, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.

- 5 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, urgent, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 6 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, urgent, Loraine to Curzon, 10 May 1923.
- 7 FO 371, 9021, Military Attaché : Colonel Saunders to War Office, 16 May 1923.
- 8 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 21 May 1923.
- 9 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 21 May 1923.
- 10 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 21 May 1923.
- 11 FO 371, 9018, Loraine to Curzon, 22 May 1923.
- 12 Ibid., FO 371, 9018, enclosure Loraine to Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, 22 May 1923.
- 13 Ibid., FO 371, 9018, enclosure Loraine to Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, 22 May 1923.
- 14 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 23 May 1923.
- 15 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 28 May 1923.
- 16 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 28 May 1923.
- 17 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 28 May 1923.
- 18 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 28 May 1923.
- 19 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 28 May 1923.
- 20 Op.cit, FO 371, 9024 Loraine to Curzon, 23 May 1923.
- 21 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 23 June 1923 enclosure interview between Loraine, Mostowfi al-Mamalek and Reza Khan, 31 May 1923.
- 22 Ibid., FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 23 June 1923 enclosure interview between Loraine, Mostowfi al-Mamalek and Reza Khan, 31 May 1923.
- 23 FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 4 June 1923.
- 24 Ibid., FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 4 June 1923.
- 25 FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 5 June 1923.
- 26 FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 8 June 1923.
- 27 FO 416/76, Loraine to Curzon, 13 June 1923.
- 28 FO 371, 9043, Oliphant to the Secretary of the Admiralty, 30 May 1923.
- 29 FO 416/72, Loraine to Curzon, 1 June 1923.
- 30 FO 416/72, Curzon to Loraine, 10 June 1923.
- 31 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 7 July 1923.
- 32 FO 371, 9024, secret, Loraine to Curzon, 18 September 1923.
- 33 FO 371, 9043, Monson to Curzon, 16 October 1923.
- 34 FO 371, 9043, enclosure Saunders to Reza Khan 24 September 1923.

- 35 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, enclosure Saunders to Reza Khan 24 September 1923.
- 36 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 16 October 1923.
- 37 FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Government of India, 22 September 1923.
- 38 Ibid., FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Government of India, 22 September 1923.
- 39 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1924.
- 40 Op.cit, FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Government of India, 22 September 1923.
- 41 Ibid., FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Government of India, 22 September 1923.
- 42 Ibid., FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Government of India, 22 September 1923.
- 43 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1924. He wrote : the company obtained some twenty five guards from Heydar Khan Hayat Dawud “an old and trusted friend of the British“.
- 44 Ibid., FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1924.
- 45 FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure
- 46 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 24 September 1923.
- 47 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 26 September 1923.
- 48 FO 371, 9029, Nichols to Oliphant, 25 September 1923.
- 49 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 25 September 1923.
- 50 FO 371, 9024, Loraine to Curzon, 25 September 1923.
- 51 FO 371, 9029, Kedding (Eh-Oliphant) , 26 September 1923.
- 52 FO 371, 9029, Curzon to Loraine, 27 September 1923.
- 53 FO 416/73, A.S.Fields Manager for Anglo-Persian Oil Company, 26 September 1923.
- 54 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 30 September 1923.
- 55 Ibid., FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 30 September 1923.
- 56 Ibid., FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 30 September 1923.
- 57 FO 371, 9029, minute by Oliphant, 1 October 1923.
- 58 FO 416/73, Loraine to Curzon, 2 October 1923.
- 59 Ibid., FO 416/73, Loraine to Curzon, 2 October 1923.

60 FO 371, 9029, Under Secretary for Foreign Office to Manager Director of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, 3 October 1923.

61 FO 371, 9029, Nichols to Oliphant, 5 October 1923.

62 Ibid., FO 371, 9029, Nichols to Oliphant, 5 October 1923.

63 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 8 October 1923.

64 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1923.

65 Ibid., FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1923.

66 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 2 October 1923.

67 FO 371, 9029, Curzon to Loraine, 4 October 1923.

68 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

69 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

70 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

71 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 September 1923.

72 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 September 1923.

73 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 September 1923.

74 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 10 October 1923.

75 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 11 October 1923.

76 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Prodrom, 13 October 1923.

77 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Prodrom, 13 October 1923.

78 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 13 October 1923.

79 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 15 October 1923.

80 FO 371, 9043, Monson to Peel, 15 October 1923.

81 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Prodrom, 18 October 1923.

82 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Loraine, 21 October 1923.

83 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

84 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 22 October 1923.

85 Opc.it, FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

86 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

87 Ibid., FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.

88 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 16 October 1923.

89 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 22 October 1923.

90 Ibid., FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 22 October 1923.

91 Ibid., FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 22 October 1923.

92 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1923.

- 93 Ibid., FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1923.
- 94 FO 371, 10124, secret, a note by the Air Staff, 10 January 1924.
- 95 Ibid., FO 371, 10124, a note by the Air Staff.
- 96 Ibid, FO 371, 10124, a note by the Air Staff.
- 97 FO 371, 10124, Manson to Curzon, 15 October 1923.
- 98 Ibid., FO 371, 10124, Manson to Curzon, 15 October 1923.
- 99 Ibid., FO 371, 10124, Manson to Curzon, 15 October 1923.
- 100 Ibid., FO 371, 10124, Manson to Curzon, 15 October 1923.
- 101 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 8 October 1923.
- 102 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 22 October 1923.
- 103 FO 371, 9030, Loraine to Curzon, 31 October 1923, enclosure Knox to Loraine, 25 September 1923.
- 104 Ibid., FO 371, 9030, *ibid.*
- 105 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.
- 106 Ibid., FO 371, 9030.

XI: The South between Two Autumn

- 1 Ahmad Kasravi, *Sendegani-ye man(my life)* : Köln : 1990, pp. 185-287.
- 2 Ahmad Kasravi , (1990), *ibid.*
- 3 FO371/, 10137, Ovey to MacDonald, 25 October 1924, enclosure memorandum by Peel 2 September 1924.
- 4 *Ibid.*
- 5 *Ibid.*
- 6 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 29 May 1923.
- 7 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1924.
- 8 FO 371, 10134, Loraine to Curzon, 4 December 1923.
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 FO 371, 10134, D. W. to MacDonald, 25 November 1924; Arthur Millspaugh, *the American task in Persia, USA: 1925*, p216
- 11 FO 371, 10134, D.W. to MacDonald, *op.cit.*
- 12 FO 371, 10134, Peel to Loraine, 1 December 1923.
- 13 FO 371, 10134, Loraine to Curzon, 4 December 1923; Arthur Millspaugh, *the American task in Persia, op.cit*, p216

14. FO 371, 10134, Loraine to Curzon, 4 December 1923, *op.cit.*
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 September 1923.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 6 September 1923.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 20 October 1923.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 10 October 1923.
- 23 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 11 October 1923.
- 24 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Prodrome, 13 October 1923.
- 25 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Prodrome, 13 October 1923.
- 26 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 13 October 1923.
- 27 FO 371, 9043, Bristow to Peel, 16 October 1923.
- 28 FO 371, 9043, Monson to Peel, 16 October 1923.
- 29 FO 371, 9043, Prodrome, 18 October 1923
- 30 FO 371, 9043, Peel to Loraine, 21 October 1923
- 31 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923,
- 32 FO 371, 9029, Loraine to Curzon, 12 November 1923,
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 13 November 1923.
- 35 FO 371, 10153, Loraine to Curzon, 4 March 1924.
- 36 FO 371, 9045, Loraine to Curzon.
- 37 FO 371, 9043, Knox to the Government of India, 30 June 1923 enclosure Chick to Loraine, 22 May 1923.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 FO 371, 9024, Monson to Curzon, 18 August 1923, enclosure memorandum on the situation in Bushehr hinterland.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 FO 371, 9043, Chick to Loraine, 25 September 1923.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 FO 371, 9024 No 370, Monson to Curzon, enclosure Chick to Loraine 26 June 1923.
- 44 FO 371, 10154, Chick to Ovey, 15 March 1924.

- 45 FO 371, 10154, minute by F.O.
- 46 FO 371, 9043, Chick to Loraine, op.cit.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 FO 371 /10144, Loraine to F.O., 13 February 1924.
- 49 FO 416/74, Ovey to MacDonald, 26 February 1924.
- 50 FO 371/10124, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 April 1924.
- 51 FO 416/74, Ovey to MacDonald, 28 May 1924; FO 371/10134, Ovey to MacDonald, 30 July 1924.
- 52 FO 371/10134, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 April 1924, enclosure, Trevor to Ovey, 11 March 1924.
- 53 FO 371/10134, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 April 1924.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 FO 371, 9043, Loraine to Curzon, 30 October 1923.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 30 July 1924, enclosure memorandum by E. G. Peel, 28 June 1924.
- 60 FO 416/75, memorandum by E. G. Peel, *ibid.*
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 FO 371 /10124, Loraine to MacDonald, 29 January 1924.
- 64 FO 371 /10124, Loraine to MacDonald. 9 February 1924.
- 65 FO 371 /10124, Loraine to MacDonald. 14 February 1924.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 FO 371 /10124, minute by F.O. 16 February 1924
- 68 FO 371 /10124, MacDonald to Loraine, 9 February 1924
- 69 FO 371 /10124, Loraine to MacDonald. 24 February 1924.
- 70 FO 371 /10848, Loraine to F.O., 22 May 1924.

XII: Rebellion in the South

- 1 See chapters ten and eleven.
- 2 See chapter three: the Anglo-Qavam al-Molk relation; chapter four: A.P.O.C.-Kashkuli Agreement and A.P.O.C. - Hayat Dawudi Agreement
- 3 Iraj Afshar ed: *Zendegi-ye Tufani*, S.H. Taqizadeh, Tehran: 1993, p346; DBFP, Norman to Curzon, No 640, 8 January 1921
- 4 M.T.Bahar, Tehran:1992, vol. II. p135
- 5 M.T.Bahar, *ibid.* pp 122-143.
- 6 FO 371/ 10134, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 April 1921 enclosure Trevor to Ovey, 11 March 1924.
- 7 Hossein Makki, *Tarikh-e bist saleh*, vol. III. pp 158-176.
- 8 *Chronology of fifty years of Pahlavi dynasty*, 5 vols. Paris: 1985, vol.I. p31: Kaveh Bayat Ed: *Amaliyat-e Lorestan (operations in Lorestan)* by Brigader General Shahbakhti, Tehran: 19 pp 19-20.
- 9 L / P&S/ 10/ 934, Ryan to Peel, 19 July 1924 quoted in Struck p 396?
- 10 M. Anssari, 1974, p 357.
- 11 FO371/10848, 22 May 1325; Ahmad Kasravi, p 235.
- 12 FO 371/ 10134, Anglo-Persian Oil Company in Mohammerah to Directors of the Company in London, 11 August 1924; FO 371/ 10134, minute by George Churchill, 12 August 1924.
- 13 FO371/ 10843 repeated the letter of Sir P.Cox to Sheikh Khaz'al, November 1914) (Ansari, 1974).
- 14 FO371/10134, Minute by G. Churchill, 12 August 1924op.cit.
- 15 FO371/ 10843, assurance letter of Sir P.Cox to Sheikh Khaz'al, November 1914, Op.cit.
- 16 FO 371/ 10134 Jacks to Britannic House in London, 13 August 1924.
- 17 FO 371/10134, F.O. to Ovey, 12 August 1924.
- 18 FO 371/10134, Bray to Ovey, 11 August 1924.
- 19 FO 371/10134, Ovey to FO, 11 August 1924 enclosure Ahvaz consulate to Ovey.
- 20 FO 371/10134, Ovey to Peel, 14 August 1924.
- 21 FO 371/10134, F.O to Ovey, 15 August 1924.
- 22 FO 371/10134, F.O to Ovey, 16 August 1924.
- 23 FO 371/ 10134, Keelings to Undersecretary of Foreign Office, 18 August 1924.

- 24 Ibid. FO 371/ 10134.
- 25 FO 371/ 10134, Cable from Anglo-Persian Oil Company in Mohammerah to London, 119 August 1924.
- 26 FO 371/10848, 22 May 1325.
- 27 Kasravi, Tarikh-e Pansad saleh Khuzestan, p 234-235.
- 28 FO 371/ 10134, A. P. O.C. in Mohammerah to London, 29 August 1924.
- 29 Ibid. FO 371/ 10134, a .P.O.C to London.
- 30 FO 371/ 10135, Nichols to Undersecretary of Foreign Office, 3 September 1924.
- 31 Ahmad Kasravi , Tarikh-e Pansad saleh Khuzestan, op.cit, p 235; Strunk, op.cit. p 404.
- 32 FO371/10146, Ovey to MacDonald, 23 October, 1924.
- 33 FO371/10146, Ovey to MacDonald, 10 September1924.
- 34 Yahya Dowlatabadi, Hayat-e Yahya, Tehran: 1992, vol. IV. pp 28-29
- 35 F.O. 371/ 10135, Peel to Ovey, Ahvaz 11 September 1924, in Anssari, op.cit, p363.
- 36 F.O. 371/ 10135, Peel to Ovey Ahvaz 11September 1924 in William Struck, op.cit, p 405.
- 37 F.O. 371/10135, Prideaux to Ovey, 15 September 1924.
- 38 For the Text Makki, vol. II. : Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan, pp 6-8.
- 39 F.O. 371/ 10132, Intelligence Summary, 20 September 1924.
- 40 Hossein Makki, Tarikh-e Bist saleh, vol. III. Text p178.
- 41 F.O. 371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, 16 September 1924.
- 42 F.O. 371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, 19 September 1924.
- 43 F.O. 371/10135, ibid.
- 44 F.O. 416 / 75, Prideaux to Ovey, 15 September 1924.
- 45 F.O. 416/ 75, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 September 1924.
- 46 F.O. 371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, 17 September 1924.
- 47 F.O 371/10135, ibid.
- 48 F.O 371/10135, ibid.
- 49 F.O 371/10135, ibid.
- 50 F.O 371/10135, memorandum by Oliphant 18 September 1924.
- 51 F.O 371/10135, ibid.
- 52 F.O 371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, 17 September 1924.
- 53 F.O 371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, ibid.

54 FO371/10146, British Moscow mission to MacDonald, 25 September 1924.
55 FO371/10135, minute by Victor Mallet, 30 September 1924.
56 Fatemi, Oil Diplomacy, p 144 quoted of Majles vol 26.
57 FO371/10135, Peel to Ovey, 2 October 1924.
58 FO371/10135, minute by Lancelot Oliphant, 3 October 1924.
59 FO 371/ 10135, Fairely to Britannic House in London, 3 October 1924.
60 FO 371/ 10136, the A.P.O.C. in Mohammerah to London, 6 October 1924.
61 Hossein Makki, Tarikh-e bist saleh, vol. III. pp 166.
62 See the situation of Fars 1922-1923.
63 FO 371/10132, Ovey to MacDonald, 25 October 1924
64 FO 371/10137, memorandum B.M.A 24 October 1924.
65 FO 371/10136, Ovey to MacDonald, 25, October 1924
66 Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan, p 42.
67 FO 416/75, Prideaux to Ovey, 6 October 1924.
68 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 8 October 1924.
69 FO 416/75, MacDonald to Ovey, 9 October 1924.
70 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 9 October 1924.
71 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 9 October 1924.
72 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 9 October 1924.
73 Op.cit, FO 416/75.
74 FO 371/ 10137, memorandum by Military Attaché 24 October 1924.
75 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 16 October 1924.
76 Ibid., FO 416 /75, Ovey to MacDonald 16 October 1924.
77 FO 371/ 10136, the A. P. O. C. in Mohammerah to Directors of the Company in London, 14 October 1924.
78 Op.cit, FO 371/ 10137, memorandum by Military Attaché 24 October 1924.
79 Ahmad Kasravi, Tarikh-e Pansad saleh Khuzestan, pp 235-236. .
80 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald, 8 October 1924.
81 Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan, p 33.
82 Sardar Zafar, the story of rebellion, p132.
83 Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan, p26.
84 Ja'afar Qoli Sardar Ass'ad, Khaterat, p 135.
85 FO416/ 75, Ovey to MacDonald, 4 November 4, 1924.
86 Reza Khan Pahlavi , safarnameh Khuzestan, p 33; Sardar Zafar, Dastan, p64.

- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Reza Khan Pahlavi, Safarnameh Khuzestan, p 11.
- 89 FO 416/75, Ovey to MacDonald 4 November 1924.
- 90 FO 416/75, Ovey to Peel, 5 November 1924.
- 91 FO 416/75, MacDonald to Ovey, 6 November 1924.
- 92 FO371/10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, December 1924.
- 93 FO 416/75, Ovey to Peel, 5 November 1924, Reza Khan Pahlavi safarnameh Khuzestan, pp 21 & 30.
- 94 Reza Khan Pahlavi, safarnameh Khuzestan, p 38.
- 95 Gordon Waterfield, Professional Diplomat, p74
- 96 FO371/10843, Loraine-Chamberlain 22 December 1924.
- 97 FO371/10137, Foreign Office to Dobbs, 11 November 1924.
- 98 FO371/10843, op.cit.
- 99 FO3710848, annual report 22 May 1925
- 100 FO371/10137, Prideaux to Foreign Office, 20 November 1924.
- 101 FO371/10848, annual report 22 May 1925
- 102 Reza Khan Pahlavi, Safarnameh Khuzestan, p38
- 103 FO371/10137, Monson to Foreign Office, 17 November 1924.
- 104 FO371/10137, Monson to Foreign Office, 17 November 1924.
- 105 FO371/10137, Monson to F.O., 18 November 1924.
- 106 FO371/ 10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, December 1924.
- 107 FO371/10137, Monson to Foreign Office, 17 November 1924.
- 108 Reza Khan Pahlavi, Safarnameh Khuzestan, Tehran, P51.
- 109 FO371/ 10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, 22 December 1924.
- 110 FO371/10137, 25 November 1924.
- 111 Gordon Waterfield, Professional Diplomat, pp 78-79.
- 112 FO371/ 10137, 13, Foreign Office to Loraine, 25 November 1924.
- 113 FO371/ 10137, Foreign Office to Loraine, ibid.
- 114 FO371/ 10137, 14 Foreign Office to Loraine, 25 November 1924.
- 115 Reza Khan Pahlavi , Safarnameh Khuzestan, PP 79-82; Taqizadeh, Zendegi-ye Tufani, p 346.
- 116 FO 371/10841, Intelligence Summary No 48, 29 November 1924.
- 117 FO416/75, Loraine to Foreign Office, 26 November 1924; Gordon Waterfield, Professional Diplomat P 79.

- 118 FO 371/10843, Loraine-Chamberlain, 22 December 1924. : FO371/10136, Prideaux for Havard-Lorraine, 25 November 1924 ; The reign of Sheikh Khaz'al, P 449 ; Professional Diplomat, P 80.
- 119 FO 416/75, Loraine to consul-general Bushehr, 27 November 1924.
- 120 Reza Khan Pahlavi, Safarnameh Khuzestan, P86.
- 121 FO 371/10138, Loraine to F.O., 30 November 1924.
- 122 FO371/10841, Intelligence Summary, December 6, 1924.
- 123 FO 371/10138, minute by V. Mallet, 3 December 1924.
- 124 FO 371/10138, minute by D.G. Osborne, 3 December 1924.
- 125 Op.cit, Safarnameh, PP103-120; op.cit, Taqizadeh, P 347.
- 126 FO 416/75, Loraine to Chamberlain 6 December 1924;
- 127 Professional Diplomat, p 80.
- 128 FO371/10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, 22 December 1924.
- 129 FO371/10848, annual report 22 May 1925
- 130 The reign of Khaz'al, p 456.
- 131 FO371/10840, Loraine to Foreign Office, 31 December 1924.
- 132 FO 371/ 10841, Intelligence Summary, 20 December 1924.
- 133 FO 371/ 10841, Intelligence Summary, 10 January 1925; Khaterat Soleyman Behbudi, pp 206-207/ 215-230.
- 134 FO 242/1372, Loraine to Foreign Office, November 1925.
- 135 FO371/10849, Loraine to Foreign Office, 28 October 1925.
- 136 FO 371/11500 annual report, 22 May 1926.
- 137 F.O 371/10848, annual report 22 May 1925.
- 138 FO 371/11500 annual report, 22 May 1926.
- 139 FO 416/ 76, Summary Intelligence, May 16, 1925.
- 140 FO 371/11842, Military report by Major Fraser military attaché, 18 April, 25.
- 141 Ibid., FO37111842, 18 April, 25.
- 142 FO 416 76, Summary intelligence, Major Fraser, 2 May 1925.
- 143 FO 416/ 76, Summary Intelligence, 16 May 1925.
- 144 FO 416/ 76, Summary Intelligence, 13 June 1925.
- 145 FO416/ 77, Summary Intelligence, 27 June 1925.
- 146 FO371/10842, Summary Intelligence 22 August 1925.
- 147 FO 371/11502, Nicolson to Chamberlain, 2 July 1926.
- 148 FO371/10849, Nichols to Foreign Office, 25 September 1925.

- 149 FO371/11500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 150 FO 416/ 78, Loraine to Chamberlain, 31December 25.
- 151 FO 416/77, Summary Intelligence, 11 July 1925.
- 152 1925.FO 416/78 , Loraine to Chamberlain, 31December 1925.
- 153 FO371/10843, Smart to Foreign Office, 27 February 1925.
- 154 FO371/10843, Ahvaz Diary, 14 February 1925.
- 155 FO371/10848 annual report, April 8, 1926.
- 156 FO 416 / 76, Summary Intelligence, May 30, 1925.
- 157 FO 371/11500, annual report, April 8, 1926.
- 158 FO 371/10842, Summary Intelligence, 19, March 1925.
- 159 FO 371/10843, Ahvaz Diary, 24 January 1925; Kasravi, Tarikh Pansad Saleh, P 248.
- 160 FO 371/10840, Chamberlain to Loraine, 10 January 1925.
- 161 FO 371/ 10841, Loraine to Chamberlain, 13 February 1925, enclosure.
- 162 FO 371/10843, No 123, Loraine to Chamberlain, 12 March 1925.
- 163 FO 416 / 76, No 14 Summary Intelligence, Major Fraser, 2 May 1925;
- 164 FO371/10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, 7 May1925.
- 165 FO371/11500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 166 FO371/10843, Loraine to Chamberlain, 7 May 1925; Professional Diplomat, pp 94-96.
- 167 FO371/11500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 168 Professional Diplomat, pp98-101.
- 169 FO371/10849, Nichols to Foreign Office, 25 September 1925.
- 170 FO371/ 10849, Loraine to Chamberlain, 2 October 1925.
- 171 FO371/10849, No1, Monypenny to Loraine, 18 August 1925.
- 172 FO371/11500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 173 FO371/ 10841, Sir P. Loraine to FO 3 February 1925.
- 174 FO37111500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 175 FO371/ 10 841, Chamberlain to Loraine, February, 17, 1925; FO371/ 11500, annual report, 8 April 1926.
- 176 FO416 / 78, Loraine to Chamberlain, 31 December 1925.

XVI. A Selected Bibliography

I. Unpublished British Documents

1. Public Record Office, London

1.1 Cabinet Papers

CAB16/54 , Committee of Imperial Defence, Sub-Committee on the Protection of the south Persian oil-fields, Proceedings and Memoranda, 1924.

1. 2. Foreign Office files

1.2.1. Persia Series: Political. { F.O.371.Post1905, General.
Correspondence
F.O.248. Embassy and consular
Archives.
F.O.416. Confidential Prints.

1.2.2. Foreign Office, Historical Section Handbooks: Persia, June 1919.

1.2.3. Mesopotamia Series: F O 371. General Correspondence.

2. India Office Library and Records (London)

2.1. Political and Secret Department Library { L/P &.S/10, Political and Secret Files.
L/P & S/11, Political and Secret Files.
L/P & S/12, Political external Files and Collections.
L/P & S/18, Political and Secret Memoranda.
L/P & S/20, Miscellaneous Lists, Printed military reports,.etc.
R/15 British Residency and Agency in the Persian Gulf.
L/MIL/5 Military Department. Library.
L/MIL/7 Military Department. Library.
L/MIL/17 Military Department. Library.

3. Admiralty

Persia (1945) : Naval Intelligence Division, Geographical Handbook Series. Oxford : Oxford University Press for H.M.S.O.

4. British Museum Library, London

- 4.1. Major Noel's Letters.
- 4.2. Sir Arnold Wilson's Paper.

5. University of London

- 5.1. Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies. Lorimer Papers, MS 181247.

II. Published Documents

- Butler, R & E.L.Woodward Eds: (1952-63) : Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939 First Series, vols:IV and XIII, London, His Majesty's Stationary Office.
- William, N & M.E.Lambert.eds: (1966-75) : Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939. Series IA, vols: I,II,III,VI,VII, London, His Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Annual Report of the British General-Consulate 1914-1919 (1994): Trans into Persian by Kaveh Bayat, Bushehr,
- Great Britain Parliamentary Debates. House of Commons,1919-1925.London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Great Britain Parliamentary Debates. House of Lords, 1919-1925, London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Moberly, Brig.-Gen.F.J. (1987) : Operation in Persia, 1914-1919, London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- (1990): Operations in Persia, 1914-1919, transl into Persian by Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: Rassa Publishing
- Lorimer, John G (1908-15) : Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia 4 parts Calcutta: Government Printing Office. Reprinted in 6 vols 1970,London.
- Wilson, Arnold (1912): A precise of Relations of the British Government with the Tribes and Shaikhs of Arabistan, Calcutta.
- Degars, Jane (1952) Ed :Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy, 3 vols. London
- United States (1942-1947): Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917-1925, Washington, D.C.
- Hurewitz, J.C. (1956): Diplomacy in the Middle East: A Documentary Record. Princeton, 2 vols.
- Bayat, Kaveh (1990) Ed : Iran va Jang-e Jahani-ye aval (Iran and the First World), Documents of the Ministry of Interior, Tehran, Iran National Archives.
- Ettihadieh, Mansoureh ,Sirous Sadvandian: eds (1990) : The Collected Documents, Correspondence and Memoires of Firuz Mirza Firuz, vols I &II.Tehran: Publishing :Nashr-e Tarikh-e Iran.(CDCMF).
- (1987): Letters and Documents of Abd al-Hosseini Mirza Farmanfarma, 3 volumes, Tehran: Publishing: Nashr-e Tarikh-e Iran.(LDAFF).
- Jalali, Nadereh (2000) ed : British Policy in the Persian Gulf , Persian Documents on Khaz'al question, Tehran.

- Morssalvand, Hassan (1995) ed : Asnad-e Kabine-ye Kudeta-ye sevom-e Esfand 1299 (Documents of the coup cabinet 21 February 1921), Tehran Tarikh-e Iran publishing.
- The Census of Nomad and Settled tribes 1986 (in Persian), 1987: Tehran.
- The General Census of Population 1986 (in Persian), 1987: Tehran.
- The General Census of Population and Residence 1996(in Persian), 1997: Tehran.

III. Memoirs and travel books

- Afshar, Iraj, (1994)ed : Mamalek va Masalek Ibrahim Estakhri, Mamalek va Masalek, trans into Pers by Mohammad ibn Abd-allah : Tehran.
- Amir Ahmadi, Ahmad (1994): Khaterat-e Nakhostin Sepahbod-e Iran(The Memoirs of the First Iranian Lieutenant General), 2 vols, Tehran: The Institute of Culture Research & Studies Tehran.
- Arfa, Hassan (1965) : Under Five Shahs. New York: William Morrom.
- Bahar, Mohammad Taqi (1992) : Tarikh-e Mokhtasar-e Ahzab-e Siyasi-ye Iran (A Short History of Political Parties in Iran). 2 vols. Tehran: Amir Kabir.Press.
- Balfour,James.M. (1922) : Recent Happening in Persia. London: William Blackwood.
- Behbudi Soleyman & the others (1993) : Reza Shah, Khaterat-e ed:Gholam Hossein Mirza Saleh (The Memoirs of S.Behbudi,S Pahlavi, A zadi), Tehran: Tarh-e Now Press.
- Blücher, Wipert Carl Wilhelm von (1949) :Zeitenwende in Iran: Erlebnisse und Beobachtungen, Ravensburg: Biberbach an der Riss.
- Bullard, Sir Reader (1960) : The Camel Must Go, an autobiography, London: Faber and Faber University of California Press.
- Daneshvar Alavi, Nur -allah (1998) :Jonbesh-e vatan parastan-e Isfahan va Bakhtiari, Tehran.
- Dowlatabadi, Mirza Yahya (1992) : Hayat-e Yahya (The Life of Yahya), 4.vols Tehran:‘Attar.Press.
- Dunesterville, L.C. (1932) : The Adventures of Dunsterforce, London.
- Edmonds, C. J. (1922): “Luristan: Pish-i Kuh and Bala Garivah“ G.J.,LIX pp335-56.
- Fassa’i, Mirza Hassan (1988):Farsnameh-e Nasserī , ed:Mansur Rastegar ed: Tehran, Amir Kabir Publishing.
- Fatemi, Nasrollah.S. (1989-91):Ayene-ye Ebrat (Reflection on the time of Illusion),vol&2.London: Book Distribution Centre.
- Harrison,J.V. (1932) : the Bakhtiari Country, south-western Persia, G.J. LXXX :193-210.
- Herzfeld, Ernst (1907) Reise durch Luristan, Arabistan, Fars, Peterm Mitt 53,
- Hedayat, Mehdi Qoli (1992): Khaterat va Khatarat (Memoirsand Dangers).Tehran: Zavar Press.
- Ironside, Sir Edmund.(1972) : Lord Ironside, ed: High Road to Command, the Diaries of Major General Sir Edmund Ironside London.
- Kasravi, Ahmad (1991):Sharh-e Zendegani-ye man Description of My Life), Köln
- Layard Astin (1887) Early adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia, including a residence among the Bakhtiari and other wild tribes. London 1887 ;

- Leseur, Emile (1922): *Les Anglais en Perse*, Paris: Renaissance du Livre.
- Le strange. G. & R.A. Nicholson (1921) eds : *Farsnameh*, Ibn Balkhi, London. Reprinted : Tehran, 1984 .
- Mahdavi, Seyyed Mo'ez al-Din (1969) : *Dastanha'i Az Panjah Sal*, Tehran.
- Millspaugh, Arthur .C. (1973) : *The American Task in Persia*, New York: Arno Press.
- (1926): *The Financial and economic situation of Iran*.
- Mossadeq, Mohammad (1986) : *Khaterat va Ta'allomat-e Mossadeq (Memoir and Sufferings)*, ed: Iraj Afshar Tehran: 'Elmi Press.
- Mossadeq Mohammad (1998): *Ranjha-ye Siassi, Memorandums of Jalil Bozorgmehr*, ed : Abdollah Borhan: Tehran Thaleth publishing.
- Mostowfi, 'Abd -allah (1981) : *Tarihk-e Ejtema'i va Edari-ye Dowre-ye Qajari-ye (The Social and Admimistrative History of the Qajar,s period)*. Tehran: Zavar Press.
- O,Connor,Sir Frederick (1931) : *On the Frontier and Beyond*. London: John Murray.
- Pahlavi, Reza (1924) : *Safarname-ye Khuzestan (Dairy of Khuzestan)*, Tehran.
- Qashqa'i, Mohammad Nasser (1987): *Salha-ye Bohran (The Crisis Years)*, Nasrallah Haddadi Tehran : Rassa Press.
- Rahimzadeh-Safavi,S.Ali-Asghar (1983): *Memoires,Asrar-e Soqout-e Ahmad Shah, (The Secrets of the Fall of Ahmad Shah)*, ed: Bahman Dehgan,Tehran: Press.
- Ross, Elizabeth N (1921) : *A Lady Doctor In Bakhtiari Land*. London.
- Sackville-West, Victoria Mary (1926): *Passenger to Tehran*, London: Hogarth press.
- Sa'dvandian,Sirus,ed (1995): *Asnad-e Nokhostin Sepahbod-e Iran (The Documents of the First Lieutenant-general of Iran)*.Tehran: M.P.&M.F.Press.
- Sanjabi,Karim (1989): *Omid-hava Naomidi-ha (Hopes and Despairs) The Political Memoirs*, London: Nashr-e Ketab.
- Sardar Zafar Bakhtiyari Khosrow Khan (1983) : *Yaddasht-ha va Khaterat (Minutes and memoirs)* Tehran, Yassavoli publishing.
- (1983) : *Dastan-e toghyan-e Sheikh Khaz'al;Khaterat va Asnad (The story of Sheikh Khaz'al's rebellion)*, Tehran, Vahid Publishing.
- Sawyer, Major H. A. (1894) : *The Bakhtiyari Mountains and Upper Elam*, G.J., IV.Pp481-505.
- Shahbakhti-Mohammad, The Brigader General (1996) : *Amaliyat-e Lorestan (Lorestan's operations)*, the documents of Brigadier-general Mohammad Shahbakhti in 1924 and 1927,ed:Kaveh Bayat, Tehran: Shirazeh press.
- Shuster, Morgan (1912): *The Strangling of Persia, A Personal Narrative*, New York, The Century.
- Skrine, Sir Clarmont (1962): *World in Iran*,London:Constable.
- Taqizadeh, Seyed Hasan (1989): *Zendegi-ye Tufani, Khaterat, (Stormy life, the Memoirs)*ed: Iraj Afshar,Tehran:'Elmi Press.
- Von Niedermayer, Oskar (1936): *Im Weltkrieg vor Indian Toren. Der Wüstenzug der deutschen Expedition nach Persien und Afghanistan*, Hamburg.
- Wilson, Arnold. T. (1941): *An Officer in South West Persia 1907-1914*, London.

IV. : Researches

- Abrahamian, Ervand (1974) : Oriental Despotism the case of Qajar of Iran, I.J.M.E.S., vol. V.
- (1982): Iran Between Two Revolution,Princeton,New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Abrahamian, Ervand & Kazemi Farhad (1978): The nonrevolutionary Peasantry of Modern Iran, Ir.S., vol XI, 1978.
- Adamiyat, Roknzadeh (1975): Deliran-e Tangestan (The courageous of Tangestan),Tehran:Eqbal Publishing.
- (1978): Fars va Jang-e Beyn al Melal-e Aval,(Fars and the First World) Tehran:Eqbal Publishing.
- Afshar, Iraj (1983): Konye, Laqab, Nesbat-e Ashayer va Zekr-e Anha dar Motun-e Farsi (title, nickname and lineage of tribes in the Persian Texts) in Agah articles' collection on Nomads tribes (Ilal va Ashayer) , Tehran : Agah Publishing.
- Afsar, Parviz (1953): Tarikh-e Gandarmeri-ye Iran (The History of Iranian Gendarmerie), Tehran.
- Afshar-Naderi, Nader (1971): The Settlement of Nomads and Its Social and Economic Implications, Tehran: Institute for Social Studies and Research, Tehran University.
- Afshar-e-Sistani,Iraj (1989): Ilha,Chadorneshinan va tavayef-e-ashayeri-ye Iran (Tribes, Nomads and Nomadic Tribes of Iran).2 vols.Tehran: Nasl-e Danesh Press.
- Afshar-e- Yazdi, Mahmoud (1922): European politic en Perse , Berlin.
- Agheli, Bagher (1997): Rouz Shomar-e Tarikh-e Iran (Chronology of Iran1896-1979) 2vols,Tehran: Goftar Publishing Corp.
- (1998): Reza Shah va Qoshun-e Motahed al-shekl (Reza Shah and the Uniform army) :Tehran Namak Publishing.
- Ahanjideh, Esfandiyar (1995): Il-Bakhtiyari va Mashrutiyat, Arak.
- Ahmad, Ishtiaq (1974): Anglo-Iranian Relations, 1905-1919. Ph.D. dissertation, London.
- Ali Ni'mat al-Hilu (1969): Al-Ahwaz "Arabistan Imirat Ka'ab, Baghdad.
- Ahmad, Ishtiaq (1974): Anglo-Iranian Relation 1905-1919,London: Asian Publishing House.
- Amanolahi, Sekandar (1975): Manzelat-e Zan dar Ejtema-e Ashayeri (The Position of Female in Nomad Tribe Society),Tehran :1989; Kuch Neshini dar Iran (Pastoral nomadism in Iran). Second edition, Tehran : Agah Publisher.
- (1995): Qowm-e Lor(The Lor people) Tehran: Agah Publishing.
- Amirsadeghi, Hossein (1977) : Twentieth Century Iran, London Heinemann.
- Ansari, Mostafa (1974): The history of Khuzestan 1878-1925, unpublished Ph.D., University of Chicago.
- Aqeli, Baqer (1998): Reza Shah wa Qoshun-e Mottahed al-Shekl, Tehran.
- Ashraf, Ahmad (1970): Historical obstacles to the development of a bourgeoisie in Iran in : M.A .Cook ed : studies in the economic history of the Middle East, London, New York.
- Avery, Peter (1965): Modern Iran. New York: Praeger.
- Bacon Elizabeth (1954): Types of Pastoral Nomadism in Central and southwest Asia in : S.J.A .
- Bahmanbeygi, Mohammad (1946): Orf va adat dar ashayer-e Fars (The Customs of the Nomads of Fars) Tehran: Azar publishing Company.

- (2001): *Bokhara-ye Man Il-Man (My Bokhara, My Tribe)* Tehran: Agah Publishing.
- Bahrami, Taqi (1954): *Goghraphi-yaye Keshavarzi-ye Iran (Agricultural Geography of Iran)* Tehran.
- Bakhash, Shaul (1978): *Iran : Monarchy, Bureaucracy and Reform under the Qajars : 1858-1896*, London.
- Bamdad, Mehdi (1967): *Tarihk-e Rejal-e Iran (The History of the Iranian Politicians)*. 6 vols. Tehran: Press.
- Banani, Amin (1961): *The Modernisation of Iran ,1921-1941*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Barker, Paul (1981): *Tent School of the Qashqa'i: A paradox of Local Initiative and State Control*. In *Modern Iran: The Dialectics of Countinuity and Change* Michael Bonine and Nikki Keddie, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Barth, Fredrik (1954): *Father's, Brother's, Daughter Marriage in Kurdistan*, S.J.A, 10.1954.
- (1960): *The land use pattern of Migratory of tribes of south Persia*, Norsk Geograrafisk Tidsskriff, 17,I-II.
- (1961): *Nomads of south Persia: the Basseri Tribe of the Khamseh Confederacy* New York.
- (1962): " *Le nomadisme dans les montagnes et sur les hauts plateaux de l'Asie du Sud-Ouest*", *Les Problemes de la zone aride*, Paris, UNESCO,
- (1966): *Models of Social Organization*, London: Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Bavar, Mahmud (1945): *Kohgiluye va Ilat-e an (Kohgiluye and its tribes)* Gachsaran: Press.
- Bayat, Kaveh (1986): *Shuresh-e-Ashayer-e Fars,1307-1309 (The uprising of the tribes of Fars,1928-1930)*, Tehran: Zarin Publishing.
- Bayat, Kaveh (1990): *Qarardad-e-1919 wa Tashkil-e- Qoshun-e- Motahed al-shekar Iran (The agreement of 1919 and the formation of a uniform army in Iran)* in *Tarikh-e Moaser-e Iran*, Tehran.
- Fakhrai, Ibrahim (1975): *Sardar-e Jungle*, Tehran, 1975.
- Bazin, Louis (1988) : *Les turcophones d'Iran : apercus ethnolinguistiques* in "Le fait ethnique en Iran et en Afghanistan", Ed : du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
- Beck, Lois (1978): *Women Among Qashqa'i Nomadic Pastoralists in Iran*. In *Woman in the Muslim World*. Lois Beck and Nikki Keddie, eds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- (1981a): *Economic Transformations Among Qashqa'i Nomads, 1962-1978*. In *Modern Iran: The Dialectics of Countinuity and Change*. Michael Bonine and Nikki Keddie, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- (1983): *Iran and the Qashqa'i Tribal Confederacy*. in *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*. ed by Richard Tapper, London: Croom Helm
- (1986): *The Qashqa'i of Iran*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (1990): *Tribes and the State in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Iran*. In *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. Philip Khoury and Joseph Kostiner, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1991): *Nomad, A year in the life of a Qashqa'i tribesman in Iran*, Berkeley.
- Bharier, J. (1971): *Economic Development in Iran 1900-1970*, London Oxford University Press.

- Bonab, Yunes (1974): *The Soviet Union and Britain in Iran 1917-1927*, Ph.D. dissertation, the Catholic University of America.
- Bonine, Michael & Keddie Nikki (1981): *Modern Iran, Dialect of Continuity and Change*, Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Bosworth, Edmund & Hillenbrand, Carole eds, (1983): *Qajar Iran*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Brooks, David (1983) : *The Enemy Within : Limitations on Leadership in the Bakhtiari*. In *the Conflict of Tribes and State in Iran and Afghanistan*, ed by Richard Tapper London: Croom Helm.
- Browne, Edward (1990): *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, Cambridge.
- Bullard, Sir Reader (1951): *Britain and the Middle East, from the earliest times to 1950*, London: Hutchinson's University Library.
- Busch, Briton Cooper (1967): *Britain and the Persian Gulf 1894-1914*, Berkeley? -----(1971): *Britain, India and the Arabs 1914-1921*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Busse, Herbert (1972): *History of Persia under Qajar rule transl from Persian Farsnameh-e Nasser*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Cadman, Second Baron (1960): *Ambassador for oil, the life of John First Baron Cadman*. London: Herbert Jenkin.
- Cambridge History of Iran (1968): vol. I , W.B. Fisher ed : *The Land of Iran*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge History of Iran (1974): vol. VI , Laurence Lockhart ed : Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge History of Iran (1991): vol. VII, Peter Avery & Melville Hambly eds : *From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, George (1936): *History of early Iran*, Chicago :1936.
- Chaqueri, Cosroe (1981): *Le Premier Congres des Peuples de L'orient (Bakou-1920)*, Florence.
- Churchill, Winston (1923-29): *The World Crisis*, 5 vols; London: Thornton Butterworth.
- Coon, Carleton.S (1976): *Carevan: the Story of the Middle East*, New York
- Cooper.M.C (1925): *Grass*, New York: Putman.
- Cottam, Richard (1979): *Nationalism in Iran*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Cribb, Roger (1991): *Nomads in archaeology*, Cambridge University press, Cambridge.
- Cronin, Stephanie (1994): *Opposition to Reza Khan Within the Army, 1921-26*, M.E.S., vol. 30. no.4. London.
- (1997): *The Army and the Creation of the Pahlavi State in Iran 1910-1926*, London.
- Cronin, Vincent (1957) : *The Last Migration*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Curzon, George (1892): *Persia and the Persian Question*, 2 vols, London.
- Demorgny, Gustave (1913a): *Les Reformes administratives en Perse: Les tribus du Fars*.R.M.M. 22:85-150.
- (1913b): *Les Reformes administratives en Perse: Les tribus du Fars*: .R.M.M. 23:3-108.
- Dewan, M.L. & J.Famouri (1968): *Soils in The Cambridge History of Iran vol. I. Land of Iran*, ed : W. B Fisher. London, Cambridge University Press.
- Diakonov, I.M. (1998): *History of Media*, trans into Pers by K.Keshavarz, Tehran.
- Diba, Farhad (1986): *Mohammad Mossadeq : A Political Biography*, London.

- Digard, Jean-Pierre (1979a) : “Les nomades et l’Etat central en Iran, quelques enseignements d’un long Passe d’ “ hostilitie reglementee“, P.Me., VII.
- (1979b) : De la necessite et des inconvenients, pour un Baxtyari, d’etre baxtyari, Communaute, territoire et inegalite chez des pasteurs nomades d’Iran. Ed : Sour la direction de l’equipe ecologie et anthropologie des sociétés pastorales. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (1981): Techniques des nomades baxtyari d’Iran. Cambridge University Press.
- (1983b): “Introduction“ In The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan ed by Richard Tapper, London: Croom Helm.
- (1987) : “ Jeux de structure. Segmentarite et pouvoir chez les nomades Baxtyari d’Iran“, L’Homme.
- (1988): sous la direction de : Le fait ethnique en Iran et en Afghanistan, du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
- (1987): Bakhtiati Tribe in E.IR, ed : E. Yarshater, vol.
- Edjtehadi, Mostafa (1992) : Zerfall der Staatsmacht Persiens unter Nasir al-Din Schah Qajar (1848-1896) Berlin.
- Ehlers, Eckart (1975): Traditionelle und moderne Formen der Landwirtschaft in Iran, Marburg: Marburger Geographische Schriften.
- (1980): Iran, Grundzüge einer geographischen Landeskunde, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- (1989) Bakhtiari mountains in E.IR, ed: E. Yarshater, vol. ?
- Ehmann, Dieter (1974): Verkehrsentwicklung und Kultur Landschaft Wandel in Bakhtiyari, Socius, Berlin Nr. 24-2, S 147-1147
- (1975): Bahtiyaren-Persische Bergnomaden in Wandel der Zeit. Wiesbaden: Dr.Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Ehteshamiyan, Ahmad (1944) : Joghrafiya-ye Nezami-ye Iran (Military Geography of Iran), Tehran.
- Elm, M. (1992): Oil, Power and Principle, Iran’s Oil Nationalization and its Aftermath, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press.
- Elwell-Sutton, L.P. (1941): Modern Iran, London: Routledge.
- (1955): Persian Oil: A Study in Power Politics, London: Lawrence and Wishart. .
- (1978): “ Reza Shah the Great, founder of the Pahlavi dynasty“ , in Lenczowski, George, ed : Iran Under the Pahlavis, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press.
- Englehardt, Joseph (1975): The Subjugation of Sheikh Khaz’al of Mohammerah, M.A. in Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University.
- Eudin, Xenia.J. & Robert .C.North (1957): Soviet Russia and East :1917-1927, Stanford, pp 92-93.
- Fakhrai, Ibrahim (1975): Sardar-e Jungle(General of Jungle) , Tehran.
- Farmanfarmaiyan Mehrmah (1998): Zendeginame-ye Abd al-Hossein Mirza Farman Farma(The life of A.H. M.F.F. 2 vols Tehran:Tus Publishing.
- Farhudi, Rahmatollah (1976): Ostan Fars. Eine Entwicklungsstudie als Beitrag zur regionalen Planung im Iran, P.h.Dissertation :Technischen Universität Berlin.
- Fateh, Mostafa Khan (1926): The economic position of Persia, London.
- (1979): Panjah Sal Naft-e Iran(fifty years of the Persian Oil). Tehran: Payam Press.
- Fatemi, Nasrollah.S. (1952) : Diplomatic History of Persia, 1917-1923. New York: R.F.Moore Co.

- (1954): *Oil Diplomacy, Powderkeg in Iran*. New York: Whittier Book.
- Fazel, Gholam Reza (1984): " Tribes and State in Iran, from Pahlavi to Islamic Republic, in Afshar , A, ed : *Iran A Revolution in Turmoil*, London.
- Ferrier, R, W. (1982) : *The History of the British Petroleum Company, vol.1, The Development Years 1901-1932* ,Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Field, Henry (1939): *Contributions to the Anthropology of Iran*.Chicago:Field Museum of Natural History.
- Fischer, Louis (1951): *The Soviet in World Affairs*, U.S.A.
- Fisher, W.B. (1968): Ed: *The Cambridge History of Iran, vol I , The Land of Iran*, London, Cambridge University Press.
- Fleury, A. (1977): *La Pénétration allemande au Moyen-Orient 1919-1939, le cas de la Turquie, de l'Iran et l'Afghanistan*, Leyde, Institut universitaire des hautes études internationales de Genève.
- Floor, William (1984): *Industrialization in Iran (1900-1941)*, Durham, University of Durham.
- Foran, John (1997): *Fragile Resistance: Social Transformation in Iran From 1500 to the Revolution*.
- Fragner, Bert (1978): *persische Memoiren Literatur als Quelle zur neuen Geschichte*, Freiburg Habilitationsschrift.
- Fraser, David (1910): *Persia and Turkey in revolt*, Edinburgh.
- Friedl, Erika (1980): *Women in Contemporary Folktales in Women in the Muslim World* ed : Lois Beck and Nikki Keddie, Harvard University Press, U.S.A.
- Gabriel, Alfons (1952): *Die Erforschung Persiens*, Wien.
- Ganji, M.H. (1968): *Climate in The Cambridge History of Iran vol. I. Land of Iran*, ed : W. B Fisher. London, Cambridge University Press.
- Garrod, Oliver (1946a): *The Nomadic Tribes of Persia Today*, *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, 33(1):32-46.
- (1946b): *The Qashqa'i Tribe of Fars*. *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, 33(2):293-306.
- Garthwaite, Gene (1969): *The Bakhtiyari khans, The Tribal Disunity in Iran*. Ph.D. Dissertation, U.C.L.A.
- (1972): *The Bakhtiyari khans, the Government of Iran, and the British, 1846-1915* *I.J.M.E.S.* 3(1).
- (1977): *The Bakhtiyari Ilkhani : An Illusion of Unity*, *I.J.M.E.S.* 8(2).
- (1981): *Khans and Kings: The Dialectics of Power in Bakhtiyari History. In Modern Iran : The Dialectics of Continuity and Change*. Michael Bonine and Nikki Keddie, eds. Albany : State University of New York Press.
- (1983a): *Tribes, Confederation and the State : In An Historical Overview of the Bakhtiyari and Iran .In the Conflict of tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan* ed by Richard Tapper, London : Croom Helm.
- (1983b): *Khans and Shahs: A Documentary Analysis of the Bakhtiyari in Iran* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gashgai, 'Abdollah (1981): *The Gashgais in Iran*. *Land Reborn* 5(5):6-7.
- Gehrke, Ulrich (1961) *Persien und die Deutsche Orientpolitik, während des ersten Weltkrieges*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
- Geldner, Ernest (1983) : *The Tribal Society and Its Enemies. In The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan* ed by Richard Tapper, London: Croom Helm.
- Ghani, Cyrus (1987): *Iran and the west- A Critical Bibliography*, London.
- (1998): *Iran and the Rise of Reza Shah, From Qajar Collapse to Pahlavi Rule*, London.

- Goldschmidt, Walter(1979): A general model for pastoral social systems, in pastoral production and society, edited sous la direction de la Maison des Sciences de l' Homme : London, Cambridge University Press.
- Golbon Mohhammad (1999): Resaleh Khuzestan, in ICH vol 2, no 8.
- Graves, Philip (1941): The life of Sir Percy Cox, London.
- Graves, R.L. (1959): Persia and the defence of India, 1884-1892, London.
- Grose, Rene (1959) : la civilisation Iranienne, traduit en Perse, I. Behnam, Tehran.
- Haas, William (1946), Iran, New York.
- Helfgott, Leonard (1977): Tribalism as a Socioeconomic Formation in Iranian History.I.S.10(1-2):36-61.
- Hinz, Walter (1936): Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat, Berlin.
- Hirschfeld, Yair, (1980): Deutschland und Iran Spielfeld der Mächte, 1921-1941, Düsseldorf Droste.
- Holt, P.M, Ann K.S.Lambton and Bernard Lewis (1970): eds: The Cambridge History of Islam, the Central Islamic Lands Since 1918 vol. IB., London, Cambridge University Press.
- Hourcade, Bernard (1995): Demography in Persia, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, ed : E. Yarshater, vol. VII, USA, 1996.
- Hushang-Mahdavi, 'Abd-al Reza (1990): Tarikh-e Ravabet-e Khareji-ye Iran (the History of Iran's Foreign Relations), Tehran: Amir Kabir Press.
- Imam-Shushtari, Mohammad 'Ali (1952): Tarikh-e Goghrafiya-ye Khuzestan, Tehran.
- Iraji, Nasser (1999): Il-e Qashqa'i, Teheran . Shiraze Press.
- Irons, William (1972): Variation in economic organization, A comparison of pastoral Yamut and Basserri, London : Brill.
- Issawi, Charles (1971): Ed : The Economic History of Iran 1800-1914, London.
- Ivanov, M(1962): Plemena Farsa: Kashkaskie, Khamsa, Kuhgiluye, Mamasani. Moscow: Institute Etnografii. Akad Nauk U.S.S.R.
- Jamalzadeh, Mohammad Ali (1983): Ganj-e- Shayegan, Tehran,
- Jawanbakht, Mehrdad (2000): Irani az Negah-e Anirani, Isfahan.
- Kapur Harish (1965): Soviet Russia and Asia 1917-1927, a study of Soviet Policy towards Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan. Geneva.
- Karimi, Asghar (1989): Safari be diyar-e- Bakhtiyari (A Journey to the land of Bakhtiyari),Tehran: Farhangsara.
- Kasravi, Ahmad (1983): Tarikh-e Pansad Saleh Khuzestan(Five Hundred Years History of Khuzestan), Tehran:Khowaju Press.
- (1977): Tarikh-e hizhdah saleh Azarbajjan (eighteen years history of Azarbajjan)Tehran: Amir Kabir Press.
- (1990): Sendegani-ye man(my life) : Köln.
- Katouzian, Homayoun (1979): " Nationalist Trend in Iran, 1921-1926", I.J.M.E.S.
- (1981): The Political Economy of Modern Iran: Despotism and Pseudo-Modernism,1926-1979.New York: New York University Press.
- (2000): State and Society in Iran, London.
- Kazemzadeh, Firuz (1968): Russia and Britain in Persia 1964-1914, New Haven.
- Keddie, Nikki (1979): " Class Structure and Political Power in Iran Since 1796" , I.S., vol. XI.
- (1980): Iran, Religion, Politic and Society. Collected Essays, London, Frank Cass.
- (1981): Roots of Revolution: An Interpretive History of Modern Iran. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Kelly J.B. (1968): Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880. London, Oxford University Press.
- Keshavarz, Houshang (1976): "Ashayer va Mas'ale-ye Eskin (Nomads and the Question of Settlement) Tehran, Tehran University.
- Keyhan, Mas'ud (1932-33): Joghrafiya-ye mofassal-e Iran(A Geography of Iran). 3 vols, Tehran: Matba'e Majles.
- Khoury, Philip and Joseph Kostiner, eds (1990): Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kiyani, Manouchehr (1972): Siyah Chadorha (black tents), Tehran.
- Kortum, Gerhard(1976): The Marvdasht Ebene in Fars, Grundlagen und Entwicklung einer alten iranischen Bewässerungslandschaft Kiel: Geographischen Institut der Universität Kiel.
- (1979 a): Entwicklungsprobleme und Projekte im bäuerlichen-nomadischen Lebensraum Persien. Fragenkreise 23523. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- (1979b): Zur Bildung und Entwicklung des Qashqa'i-Stammes 'Amalleh im 20 Jahrhundert In Interdisziplinäre Iran Forschung: Beiträge aus Kulturgeographie Ethnologie Soziologie und Neuen Geschichte, ed : Günter Schweizer. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, series, no. 40. Wiesbaden pp71-100.
- (1980): Zagros(Iran): Bergnomadismus und Ansiedlung der Qashqa'i. Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients Map A, 12.2 Wiesbaden: Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Universität Tübingen.
- (1982): Entwicklungskonzept für den nomadischen Lebensraum der Qashqa'i in Fars/Iran: Ein perspektivischer Rückblick. Nomadismus: Ein Entwicklungsproblem? Edited by Janzen Scholz. Abhandlungen des Geographischen Instituts, Anthropogeographie, vol.33. Berlin.
- Krader, Laurence (1955a): "Ecology of Central Asian Pastoralism" S.W.J. A. 11.
- (1955b): "principles and structures in organization of the Asiatic Steppe Pastoralists", S.W.J. A.
- (1959): "The Ecology of Nomadic Pastoralism", I.S.S.J.
- Kunke, Marina (1992): Nomadenstämme in Persien im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert, Berlin.
- Kuros, Gholam Reza & the others (1971): Ab va fan-e Abyari dar Iran-e Bastan (water and irrigation technology in old Persia), Tehran.
- Lambton, Ann K.S. (1953): Landlord and Peasant in Persia : A Study of Land Tenure and Land Revenue Administration. London Oxford University Press.
- (1961): Persian Society Under the Qajars, R.C.A.J. vol XLVIII part II.
- (1971): Ilat, In Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed, vol. III., pp. 1095-1110.
- (1956): "Quis Custodes : Some Reflection on the Persian Theory of Government, Studia Islamica, 5&6.
- (1975): "Tribal Resurgence and the Decline of Bureaucracy in the Eighteenth century" in Studies in the eighteenth century Islamic history, eds : T.Naff and R. Owen, London.
- Lane, Austin (1923): Haji Mirza Hassan-i Shirazi on the Nomad tribes of Fars in Farsnameh-i Nasserī, J.R.A.S.
- Lenczowski, George (1949): Russia and the west in Iran, 1918-1948. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- (1956): The Middle East in World Affairs New York.
- (1978): ed: Iran Under Pahlavis. Stanford, California, Hoover Institution Press.

- (1984): "Foreign powers' intervention in Iran during World I" in Bosworth Edmond & Hillenbrand, Carolina?eds : Qajar Iran 1800-1925, Edinburgh.
- Lenin, V. (1980): *The National Liberation Movement in the East*, compiled by C. Leiteisen, trans from Russian, Moscow.
- (1979): *On Britain*, compiled by C. Leiteisen, trans from Russian, Moscow
- Litten, Willhelm (1920): *Persien. Von der penetration pacifique zum "Protektorat" in Persien 1860-1919*, Berlin.
- Mahamedi, Hamid (1979): *On the Verbal System in Three Iranian Dialects of Fars*. *Studia Iranica* 8: 277-97.
- Mahrad Ahmad (1972): *Iran auf dem Weg zur Diktatur-Militarisierung und Widerstand 1919-1925*, Hannover: SOAK Verlag.
- (1977): *Iran unter der Herrschaft Reza Schahs*, Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag.
- (1979): *Die deutsch-persischen Beziehung von 1918 bis 1933*, Frankfurt, Peter Lang (Europäische Hochschulschriften, III, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, XXXVII).
- Makki, Hossein (1978): *Zendegani-ye Siyasi-ye Soltan Ahmad Shah (Political Life of Soltan Ahmad Shah)*, Tehran: Amir Kabir Press.
- (1982-84) : *Tarikh-e Bist Sale-ye Iran (Twenty Years history of Iran)* ,8. vols: Tehran: 'Elmi Press.
- Marlowe, John (1967): *Late Victorian: The life of Sir Arnold Talbot Wilson*, London: Crsset.
- Martin, Vanessa (1994): "Mudarris, Republicanism and rise to power of Riza Khan.
- Melikov, I.S. (1979): *Esteqrar-e diktatori-ye Reza Khan dar Iran (The Establishment of Reza Khan's Dictatorship in Iran)* Trans into Persian by Sirous Izadi, Tehran: Amir Kabir Press.
- Mejcher, Helmut (1976): *Imperial Quest for Oil Iraq 1910-1929*, London, Ithaca Press.
- Mikusch, Dagobert von (1938) *Wassmuss der deutsche Laurence*, Berlin.
- Minorsky, Vladimir (1934) : *Lur. Encyclopedia des Islams, Erst Ausgabe, vol. III*.
- (1945): *The tribes of western Iran in J.R.A.I. no 15*, London.
- (1945): *The tribes of Western Iran in J.R.A.S.:* London.
- Monroe, Elizabeth (1963): *Britain's Moment in the Middle East: 1914-1956*. London, Chatto and Windus.
- Monteil, Vincent (1966): *Les Tribus du Fars et la sedentarisation des nomades*. Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Nadjmabadi, Schahnaz (1975): *Siravand in west Lorestan*, Diss Universität Heidelberg.
- Navazeni, Bahram (1990): *Ahdname-ye Mawaddat-e Iran wa Showrawi (the Friendship treaty of Iran and Soviet Union)*, Tehran.
- Niazmand, Reza (1996): *Reza Shah, Az Tavallod ta Saltanat, (Reza Shah, Birth to Kingship)* London: Foundation for Iranian Studies.
- Nicolson, Harold (1934): *Curzon: the Last Phase 1919-1925. A Study in Post Diplomacy*. London, Constable and Co. LTD.
- Oberlander, Theodore.M. (1965): *The Zagros Streams*, Syracuse. U.S.A.
- (1968): *Hydrography, "the Origin of the Zagros Defiles."* in *The Cambridge History of Iran vol. I. Land of Iran*, ed : W. B Fisher. London, Cambridge University Press.
- Oberling, Pierre (1960): *The Turkic Peoples of southern Iran*. Ph.D. dissertation, History Department, Columbia University.

- (1970): "British Tribal Policy in southern Persia 1906-1911", J.A.H. IV, pp. 50-79.
- (1974): *The Qashqa'i Nomads Fars*. The Hague : Mouton.
- (1987): *Arab tribes of Iran in E.IR*, ed : E.Yarshater.
- Olson, William (1984): *Anglo-Iranian Relations during World I*, London, Frank Cass.
- Olson , Roger (1981): *Persian Gulf Trade and the Agricultural Economy of Southern Iran in the Nineteen Century* In *Modern Iran: The Dialectics of Continuity and Change* Michael Bonine and Nikki Keddie, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Parham, Sirus (1983): *Il-e Qashqa'i key va az koja be Fars amadeh ast? (When and from where did the Qashqa'i tribe come to Fars?)* In *Ilat va Ashayer (Tribes and nomads)* Tehran : Agah.Press.
- (1985): *Dastbafha-ye ashayeri va rustai-ye Fars (Hand-weavings of nomads and villagers of Fars province)* vol.1. Tehran : Amir Kabir Press.
- Pery, John (1975): " Forced Migration in Iran during the seventieth and eighteenth centuries" *Iranian Studies*. no 8.
- Petrov, V.M.P.(1957) *The specifications of the natural physical Geography*, trans into Persian by H. Golgolab, Tehran.
- Peyman, Habibollah (1968): *Towsif va tahlili az sakhteman-e eqtesadi va ejtemai va farhangi iye il-e Qashqa'i (A description and analysis of the economic, social and cultural aspects of the Qashqa'i confederation)* Publication no.34. Tehran: Institute of Health, Tehran University.
- Planhol, Xavier de (1968): *Geography of Settlement* In *The Cambridge History of Iran* vol. 1. Land of Iran, ed : W. B Fisher. Cambridge University Press.
- (1968) : *Les Fondaments géographiques de l' histoire de l'islam*, Paris, Flammarion.
- (1979): *Saturation et sécurité : sur l'organisation des sociétés de pasteurs nomades in Production Pastorale et Société* Sous la direction de L'Equipe écologie et anthropologie des sociétés pastorales, London, Cambridge University Press.
- Qaem Maqami, Jahangir (1947) : *Tarikh-e Tahavolat-e Siyasi-ye Nezam-e Iran (The political changes of Persian Military)*, Tehran, A.A.Elmi.
- Rabino, Hyacinth.L (1946) : *Diplomatic and Consular Officers of Great Britain and Iran*, London, trans into Persian by Gholam Hossein Mirza Saleh, Tehran : 1984.
- Ramazani, Ruhollah K (1966) : *The Foreign Policy of Iran, 1500-1941.*, University of Virginia. University Press.
- Rasekh, Keramat (2000): *Das politische Denken der Reformisten im Iran 1811-1906*, Diss, BFU 1999, Hamburg.
- Ravasani, Shapour (1973): *Sowjetrepublik Gilan*, Berlin.
- Razmara, 'Ali (1944): *Joghrafiya-ye Nezami-ye Iran (Military Geography of Iran)*, Tehran.
- Reguer, Sara (1976): *Winston Churchill and the shaping of the Middle East 1919-1922*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.
- Reja, Mahmoud & the others (1985) : *Gahnameh Panjah Sal Shahanshahi-ye Pahlavi (Chronology of fifty years of Pahlavi kingdom)* Paris: Soheil Publishing.
- Restrepo, Elvia (1979) : *Nazari be Ilat-e Iran va Masale-ye eskan (A study on nomad tribes in Iran and the question of settlement)*: Tehran.

- Rezun, M. (1981) : The Soviet Union and Iran, Genève, Institut universitaire de hautes études internationales.
- Richards, Yan (1996) : avec J.P. Digard et B. Hourcade, L'Iran au XX siècle, Fayad, Paris.
- Roknzadeh-Adamiyat, Mohammad-Hossein (1978) : Fars va Jang-e Beyn al-Melal (Fars and the World), Tehran: Eqbal Press.
- (1975) : Deliran-e Tangestan(The Courageous of Tangestan), Tehran
- Ross, E.P. (1932) : Persians, Oxford.
- Sabahi, Houshang (1990) : British Policy in Persia 1918-1925, London.
- Safa'i, Ibrahim (1995) : Vothuq al-Dowleh 1254-1329 (Vothuq al-Dowleh 1875-1950), Tehran : Ketabsara.
- Safi-Nezhad, Javad (1989) : 'Ashayer-e-Markazi-ye Iran(Nomads of central Iran).Tehran: Amir Kabir.Press.
- Safiri, Floreeda (1976): The S.P.R. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Edinbourg.
- Salzer, Richard (1974) : Social Organization of a Nomadic Pastoral Nobility in southern Iran: the Kashkuli Kuchek of the Qashqa'i Ph.D dissertation, Anthropology Department University of California Berkley.
- Salzman, Philip (1983) : Why Tribes Have Chiefs in The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan, ed by Richard Tapper, London : Croom Helm.
- Sauffer, T.R.(1965) : “ The Economics of Nomadism in Iran“ , Middle East Journal, XIX.
- Scholz, Fred (1982) ed :Einführung, in Nomadismus-ein Entwicklungsproblem?, Berlin.
- Schubart, Sigrid (1993) :Das Reisebuch des Mirza Salih Shirazi (M.A.) Am Institut für Iranistik, Berlin.
- Sepehr, Ahmad 'Ali, (1957): Iran dar Jang-e Bozorg, 1914-1918(Iran in the Great) Tehran.
- Shahbazi, Abd-allah (1990) : Moqadameh-i dar Shenakht-e Ilat wa Ashayer (An introduction to the cognition of nomad tribes), Tehran.
- Shahbazi, Shahpour & the others (1985) : “Army“ in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol.
- Shamim, Ali Asghar (1996) : Iran dar dour-eye Saltanat-e-Qajar: Tehran.
- Sheikholeslami, A.R. (1985) : “ The Administration Under the Pahlavis“, in Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol. I.
- Sheikh-al-Islami, Javad (1989) : Sima-ye Ahmad Shah Qajar (Ahmad Shah Kajar, A Political Portrait),Tehran: Goftar Publishing Corp.
- Sklirov, Leo (2001) : The Reasons for the Soviet Failure in Exporting the Bolshevik Revolution to Gilan, transl into Persian by Hamid Mazrajee, in H.F.R. Tehran
- Spector Ivar (1958) : The Soviet Union and the Muslim World 1917-1958. Seattle University Washington.
- Spuler, Bertold (1939) :Die Mongolen in Iran, Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350, Leipzig.
- Stöber, Georg (1978): Die Afshar Nomadismus im Raum Kerman, Marburg: Marburger Geographische Schriften.
- (1988) : The influence of politics on the formation and reduction of “ ethbic boundaries“ of tribal groups : the cases of Sayad and Afshar ib Eastern of Iran in “Le fait ethnique en Iran et en Afghanistan“, ed :du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.

- Strathern, Andrew (1983) : Tribes and State : Some Concluding Remarks, In The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan ed by Richard Tapper, London: Croom Helm.
- Strunk, William Theodore (1977) : The Reign of Shaykh Khaz'al Ibn Jabir of and the Suppression of the Principality of 'Arabistan: A Study of British Imperialism in south western Iran,1897-1925.Ph.D Indiana University.
- Sümer, F. (1978) : Kashkay. the Encyclopaedia of Islam. New edition vol. 4. Leiden :E.J.Brill.pp.705-06.
- Sunderland, E. (1968) : Pastoralism, Nomadism and the Social Anthropology of Iran. In Cambridge History of Iran. Vol I, The Land of Iran. W.B.Fisher, ed Cambridge , Cambridge University Press.
- Sykes, Sir Percy (1951) : “ South Persia and the Great “, Geographical Journal, vol.LVIII, pp.101-119.
- (1922): Persia. London.
- (1951): A History of Persia.2 vols London, Macmillan and Co.
- Tabari, Ehsan (1975) : Forupashi-e Nezam-e Sonnati va Zayesh-e Sarmayedari dar Iran (Desintegration of Traditional Socio-Economic System and the Rise and Development of Capitalism in Iran) Stockholm: Tudeh Publishing Centre.
- (1978) : Jame'-eh-e Iran dar Dowran-e Reza Shah (the Iranian Society during the Reign of Reza Shah, Stockholm: Tudeh Publishing Centre.
- Taherniya, Behrouz (1997) : Mashad az Negah-e Sayyahan, Mashad.
- Tapper, Nancy (1980) : The Woman's subsociety among the Shahsven Nomads of Iran in : Women in the Muslim World ed : Lois Beck and Nikki Keddie, Harvard University Press, U.S.A.
- Tapper, Richard (1979a) : Pasture and Poliotics, London : Academic Press.
- (1979b) : The organization of nomadic communities in pastoral societies of the Middle East, in in Pastoral Production and Society, ed by L'Equipe ecologie et anthropologie des societes pastorales, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- (1979c) : Individuated grazing rights and social organization among the Shahsevan nomads of Azerbaijan, in Pastoral Production and Society, L'Equipe ecologie et anthropologie des societes pastorales, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- (1983a) : “Introduction“ In The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan ed by Richard Tapper, ed.London: Croom Helm.
- (1983b) : Nomads and Commissars in Mughan Steppe : The Shahsevan Tribes in the Great Game in the Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan, ed : Richard Tapper, London: Croom Helm.
- (1988) : Ethnicity, order and meaning in the anthropology of Iran and Afghanistan in “Le fait ethnique en Iran et en Afghanistan“, ed :du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
- (1990) : Anthropologists, Historians, and Tribes people on Tribe and State Formation in the Middle East, in Tribes and State in the Middle East Philip Khoury and Joseph Kostiner, eds Bereckley:University of California Press.
- (1992) : The Tribes in Eighteen and Nineteen Century Iran. In The Cambridge History of Iran.vol.7,Peter Avery and G Hambly eds. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Towfiq, F. (1987) : 'Ashayer(Tribes and nomads).Encyclopaedia Iranica,vol.2, facile 7.707-24.

- Ullens de Schooten, Marie Therese (1956) : Lords of the Mountains: southern Persia and the Kashkai Tribe. Landon: Chatto and Windus.
- Ullman, Richard (1972) : The Anglo-Soviet Relations 1917-1921, 3 vols, vol. III. the Anglo-Soviet Accord. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Upton, Joseph M (1965) : The History of Modern Iran, An Interpretation. Harvard University, Cambridge mass.
- Van Bruinssen, M.(1992) : Agha, Shaikh and State. A Social and Political Structure of Kurdistan, London, Zed Books.
- Varjavand, Parviz (1965) : Ravesh-e Barassi va Shenakht-e kolli-ye Ilat-e `Ashayer (L'introduction a' étude général des Tributs Nomades en Iran), Tehran: Publication Del, institut d'études et de recherches Sociales del , universite de Tehran.
- & the others (1967) : Bamdi tayefe'i az Bakhtiyari (Bamdi à sub-tribe of the Bakhtiyari), Tehran: Publication Del, institut d'études et de recherches Sociales del, universite de Tehran.
- Von Gutschmid, Alfred (1888) : Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer, von Alexander dem Grossen bis Untergang der Arsiciden, Tübingen.
- Von Mikusch, Dagubert (1937) : Wassmuss, der deutsche Lawrence, Lepzig.
- Waterfield, Gordon (1973) : Professional Diplomat: Sir Percy Loraine. London.
- (1984) : Ibid.transl partly into Persian by Mohammad Rafi'i Mehrabadi, Phalsafe Publishing.
- Walther, R (1938) : "Note sur la Tribu des Bakhtiaris en Iran". L. G., LXX (1938): 133-41.
- Wilber, Donald (1975) : Iran: Past and Present. Princeton University Press, Princeton NewJersy.
- (1975): Riza Shah Pahlavi: The Resurrection and Reconstruction of Iran Hicksville, New York.
- Wilson, Sir Arnold (1926) : "The Bakhtiaries". J.R.C.A.S., XIII:205-225
- (1932) : Persia, London: Ernest Benn Limited.
- Wright, Denis (1977) : The English Amongst the Persians, During the Qajar Period 1787- 1921.London,Heinemann Ltd.
- Yekrangiyani, Mir Hossein (1957) : Golgun Kafanan. Tehran.
- Zagarell, Allen (1978) : the role of highland pastoralism in the development of Iranian civilization, Ph. D. dissertation an der Frei Universität Berlin.
- Zargar, 'Ali (1985) : Anglo-Persian Relations: 1925-1941, Universite De Genève, Institut Universitaire De Haute Etudes Internationale Genève.
- Zirinsky, M.P. (1992) : " Imperial Power and Dictatorship, Britain and the Rise of Reza Shah, 1921-1941, I.J.M.E.S., IV.
- Zürrer, Werner(1978): Persien zwischen England und Russland 1918-1925, Bern.

V. Periodicals:

A.G.	= Acta Geographica, France.
A.M.	= American Anthropologist, U.S.A . :A.M.
A.E.S.C.	= Annales ; economics ; societies; civilisations, France.
A.Q.	= Anthropological Quarterly, U.S.A..
A.y.	= Ayandeh, a Journal on Iranian Studies: Tehran 1980-1989.
B.S.O.A.S	= Bulletin of the School of Oriental and Asian Studies, London.
C.A.J.	= Central Asian Journal.
E.I	= Encyclopaedia of Islam 1
E.I 2	= Encyclopaedia of Islam 2
E.IR	= Encyclopaedia Iranica
Erd	= Erdkunde, Wiesbaden.
Ethno	= Ethnology, U.S.A.
F.Ash.	= Faslname-ye 'Ashayeri, A Quarterly Journal : Tehran.
F.T.M.I.	= Faslname-ye Tarikh-e Mo'aser-e Iran, A Quarterly Journal :
Folk	= Folk, Copenhagen:
F.A.	= Foreign Affairs, U.S.A .
H.F.R.	= History of Foreign Relations , A Quarterly Journal Tehran
H.R.	= Harvard review, U.S.A.
I.J.M.E.S.	= International Journal of Middle East Studies, U.S.A .
I.S.S.J.	= International Social Sciences Journal, France.
I.S.	= Iranian Studies, U.S.A.
I.C.	= Islamic Culture, U.S.A..
J.A.H.	= Journal of Asian History, Wiesbaden.
J.I.C.H.	= Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, London.
J.N.E.S.	= Journal of Near Eastern Studies, U.S.A .
J.A.S.	= Journal of Anthropological Society, Oxford.
J.A.A.	= Journal of Asian and African Studies, U.S.A .
J.P.S.	= Journal of Persian Studies, London.
J.E.S.H.O.	= Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient,
U.S.A.	
J.R.A.I.	= Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, London.
J.R.A.S.	= Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
J.R.C.A.S.	= Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society, London.
L.G.	= La Geographie, Paris.
M.E.S.	= Middle East Studies, Great Britain.
N.N.	= Nam-ye Nour, Tehran.
N.G.T.	= Norsk Geographisk Tidsskrift, Oslo.
O.M.	= Objects et mondes, France.
Orient.	= Orient, Hamburg.
Oriente.	= Oriente, U.S.A .
P.P.	= Past & Present, Great Britain.
P.M.	= Peoples Mediterraneens, France.
R.I.S.	= Revue d'Institute de sociologie, France.
R.M.M.	= Revue du Monde Musulman, Paris.
Socu	= Sociologus, Berlin.
S.J.A.	= South West Journal of Anthropology, Albuquerque.
S.Ir.	= Studia Iranica, France.
S.I.	= Studia Islamica, France.
T.M.I.	= Tarikh-e Mo'aser-e Iran, A Quarterly Journal:Tehran.

A.S.E.E.R.	= The American Slavonic and East European Review, U.S.A.
E.H.R.	= The English Historical Review, London.
J.G.	= The Geographical Journal, London.
H.J.	= The Historical Journal, London.
R.G.S.	= The Royal Geographical Society, London.
M.E.J.	= The Middle East Journal, U.S.A.
T.L.	= The Times of London.
Z.G.E.	= Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin.
Z.D.M.G.	= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden.
Z.E.B.	= Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, Branschweig.

XVII. Abbreviation

F.O.	= Foreign Office
I.O.	= India Office
W.O.	= War Office
S.P.R.	= The South Persia Rifles
A.P.O.C.	= The Anglo Persian Oil Company
H. M. G.	= His Majesty's Government
H. M. M.	= His Majesty's Minister
H. M. C.	= His Majesty's Consul
H. B. C.	= His Britannic Consul
T.	= Tuman

Thanksgiving

I would like to express a sense of gratitude I have towards Professor Wolf-Dieter Narr, who helped me with his patient guidance. I would like to thank Professor Friedman Büttner, who offering helpful suggestions and comment; also I would like to thank Dr. Ali Shirazi for his suggestions.

I wish to thank Professor Werner Ende, Professor Helmut Mejcher and Professor Bert Fragner, who supported my study in Germany.

Special thanks go out to Dr Shokoufeh Mahmoudzadeh and my wife Shokouh Mahmoudzadeh, who encouraged and assisted the continuation of this study as well as many friends and relatives.