



TAQIZADEH, SAYYED ḤASAN I. TO THE END OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION

TAQIZADEH (Taqizāda), **SAYYED ḤASAN** (b. Tabriz, 30 Ramazān 1295/27 September 1878; d. Tehran, 8 Bahman 1348/28 January 1970), distinguished statesman, constitutionalist, and scholar.

i. To the end of the Constitutional Revolution

The present entry traces the intellectual development and political career of Sayyed Hasan Taqizadeh up to early 1911. It is divided into the following sections: (1) Youth and Education, (2) Taqizadeh in the First Majles, (3) Taqizadeh and Moḥammad-ʿAli Shah, (4) Taqizadeh and the Second Majles.

YOUTH AND EDUCATION

Taqizadeh's father, Sayyed Taqī Ordubādi (b. ca. 1251/1835), a Ḥosayni *sayyed* (a descendant of the 3rd Shi'ite *Imam*), was a noted cleric of his time and, for years, worked as a prayer leader at Tabriz. After his elementary education, Sayyed Taqī went to *Najaf* to pursue his religious studies, which he mostly did studying with Shaikh *Mortazā Anṣāri*. After seventeen years in Najaf, he



returned home and settled in [Tabriz](#) permanently. He died there in 1314/1896, and the bazaar was closed in honor of his passing (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 15-21; Afzal-al-Molk, p. 105).

Taqizadeh states that he finished reading the Qur'ān at the age of five (Taqizadeh, 1993, p. 24). He then spent time studying the basic elements of Persian and Arabic, before making enough progress in formal courses taught in traditional religious schools to feel that he no longer needed to submit (*taqlid*) to religious authorities (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 24-25, 421). At this time he turned to the rational sciences (*'olum-e 'aqli*), reading the medieval books on astronomy and mathematics. From 1893 to 1901, he studied classical as well as modern medicine. It was during this period that he, together with Moḥammad-'Ali Tarbiat, studied physics, anatomy, physiology, and pathology under the tutelage of [Moḥammad Khan Kofri](#) of [Kermanshah](#), who was the private physician of [Amir Neẓām Garrusi](#). In several of his writings (e.g., 1993, pp. 30-31), Taqizadeh admits that he was influenced by Kofri's ideas. Meanwhile, he began to learn French without his father's knowledge and also studied [Shaikh Ahmad Aḥsā'i](#)'s books under the supervision of a Shaikhi scholar. But the more his knowledge increased, the more inclined he became toward the European sciences taught at Moẓaffari Dār-al-Fonun school in Tabriz. Familiarizing himself with the modernist thoughts of the Young Ottoman Turks, Taqizadeh took an interest in reading Arabic books and newspapers coming from Egypt and the Ottoman empire, which contained news and information regarding European civilization and thought (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 26-27; also see [EGYPT viii. Egyptian cultural influence in Persia, modern times](#)).

In 1898, Taqizadeh began to teach physics at Moẓaffari Dār-al-Fonun. He taught the same subject at Loqmāniya School, which had been founded in 1899 by Zayn-al-'Ābedin Khan Loqmān-al-Mamālek (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 29-30). During this time, he translated part of the astronomer Camille Flammarion's (1842-1925) *Le merveilles celestes*, which was unpublished but used as a text at Loqmāniya School. Having gained a command of French, Taqizadeh now set out to learn English. He studied English at the American school in Tabriz for two years and read scientific and philosophical books with an American teacher. While engaged in teaching Arabic at the Tabriz schools, he wrote a short book for teaching Arabic conjugation and also contributed the geography section to Moḥammad-'Ali Tarbiat's *Zād-o bum*, which was lithographed at Tabriz in 1901. He also set up a pharmacy, together with



Moḥammad-ʿAli Tarbiat, and imported medicine from Germany (Taghizadeh, 1993, pp. 30-32).

As new ideas and interest in modernism began to flourish in Tabriz at the close of the 19th century, various groups of progressive young men acquainted with modern learning formed friendly circles. From 1898, Taqizadeh joined a circle that included such individuals as Sayyed Abu'l-Žiā' Moḥammad Šabestari, managing editor of the newspaper *Irān-e now*; Sayyed Ḥosayn ʿAdālat, managing editor of the papers *al-Ḥadid* and *ʿAdālat*; Mirzā Āqā, known as “Nāla-ye mellat,” which was the title of the weekly founded by him; Yusof *Eʿtešām-al-Molk* (later the founder-editor of the monthly *Bahār*); and Moḥammad-ʿAli Tarbiat. The members of this group were all interested in books coming from Ottoman Turkey, Egypt, and the American University of Beirut. Since 1897, Taqizadeh had started reading French books and avant-garde Persian publications, including the writings of the modernist Perso-Armenian author, Mirzā Malkom Khan (1833-1908), which he transcribed for himself from the collection owned by a friend in Nakhichevan, as well as Zayn-al-ʿĀbedin Marāġaʿi's *Siāḥat-nāma-ye Ebrāhim Beg*. He also read the newspapers *Aktar* (Istanbul), *Torayyā*, *Ḥekmat* and *Parvareš* (Cairo), the weekly *Habl-al-matin* (Calcutta), and *Šūrā-ye ommat*, the Young Turks' organ published in Paris and brought to Persia clandestinely. During this period Taqizadeh established a lithographical printing house to generate income, but it proved to be a failure (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 26-27, 38, 423).

In 1901 Taqizadeh, together with Tarbiat and Abu'l-Žiā' Šabestari, founded a school in Tabriz for teaching new sciences and foreign languages, and issued a printed announcement for enrollment. This initiative was met with howls of protest from reactionaries and a number of clerics, who regarded the import of typography equipment as heretical, despite the fact that the same sort of equipment had already brought to the country by Manučehr Khan Moʿtamed-al-Dawla Gorji and used for the printing of a number of religious books. Given the serious threat of the populace storming the school at the instigation of clerics and reactionaries, the founders gave up the idea altogether. One of the instigators of the plot to close down the school was Sayyed Moḥammad Yazdi, known as Ṭāleb-al-Ḥaqq and son of Sayyed Bāqer Yazdi, the uncle of the prime minister-to-be, Sayyed Žiā'-al-Din Ṭabāṭbā'i. As is stated by himself, Taqizadeh was in a safer position because of his family's status, but Šabestari, who was the school principal and signer of the announcement, was forced into hiding for a few months. In a letter to the newspaper *Ḥekmat*, Taqizadeh gave an



account of the incident. *Torayyā* also published a report about the school's shutdown (Taghizadeh, 1993, pp. 26-29, 423).

Despite this setback, the group's intense interest in the spread of knowledge and culture was not extinguished. Their next endeavor, together with Šabestari, 'Adālat, E'tešām-al-Molk, and Tarbiat, was the establishment of a bookshop with the intention to import new European, Egyptian, and Ottoman books. Known as Ketāb-kāna-ye Tarbiat, the bookshop became a rendezvous point for those interested in modernism and modern European sciences. For some time, Taqizadeh's brother, Sayyed Jawād, and then Mirzā Reżā (Tarbiat's brother), were in charge of the library. When the Majles (parliament) was bombarded and Tabriz was exposed to the rampage of Raḥim Khan Čalbiānlu, a tribal leader against the [Constitutional Revolution](#), the library was ransacked and set ablaze. Among the circle's other efforts was the publication, for one year (1903-04), of a bi-weekly magazine, *Ganjina-ye fonūn*. The magazine was designed to disseminate scientific information and to provide translations of European sources. Its organizers were E'tešām-al-Molk, Tarbiat, 'Adālat, and Taqizadeh (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 29, 35-36; Šadr Hāšemi, IV, pp. 167-70).

In 1904, Taqizadeh wrote a letter to Zayn-al-'Ābedin Taqiof, a wealthy Caucasian philanthropist, informing him of his plans to study abroad (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 421-26). Taqizadeh stated that, while his father had wanted him to continue his conventional education in Najaf, his great desire for studying the modern sciences and social sciences (*'olum-e madani*) had pushed him in a different direction. His decision was also influenced by "the threat of excommunication and the ignorant populace" (*ta'n wa takfir-e kalāyeq wa mardom-e jāhel*; p. 423), and his plan was to save some money so that he would be able to pay for his studies abroad. In the letter, Taqizadeh asked Taqiof to provide an annual stipend of 60 Liras to be put towards his living expenses and tuition fees at the American University of Beirut, explaining in detail the importance of attending this institution of higher learning (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 425-26). There is no record of Taqiof ever responding to this letter and, in any event, Taqizadeh did not get the opportunity to study abroad.

Having gained an awareness of the political and cultural conditions in Cairo, Istanbul, and the Caucasus, Taqizadeh was encouraged to travel to these territories. Beginning in 1904, he and Tarbiat spent over a year in [Baku](#), [Erevan](#), Tbilisi, Batumi, Istanbul, and Cairo. During this trip they met with a number of individuals who were engaged in writing about modernity and



involved in propagating the importance of freedom. These individuals included the pioneering literary critic ‘Abd-al-Raḥim Ṭālebuf, the manager of the Tbilisi-based newspaper *Šarq-e ruz*; Moḥammad Āqā Šāh Taḳtinski, the founder of the daily Turkish paper *Šarq-e Rus*; and the latter’s colleague, Mirzā Jalil Moḥammad Qolizāda Naḳjavāni, who later on published the well-known satirical newspaper *Mollā Naṣr-al-Din* in Tabriz. Taqizadeh also became associated with Ḥāji Rezā-qoli Ḳorāsāni, one of the contributors to *Ḥab-al-matin*, and Ḥāji Zayn-al-‘Ābedin Marāḡa’i, who at the time was writing for the weekly *Aḳtar*. In Cairo, he met with Mahdi Za‘im-al-Dawla Tabrizi, the managers of *Ḥekmat*, and in Alexandria with ‘Abd-al-Moḥammad Eṣfahāni, the founder and editor-in-chief of the illustrated newspaper *Čehranemā* (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 36-45). Taqizadeh states that the main purpose of traveling to Cairo was to set up a newspaper there (Taqizadeh, 1993, p. 44). Among the papers left by Taqizadeh, there is a note about campaigns against the importation of foreign goods, apparently written during his stay in Istanbul and following similar campaigns in Iran (Afšar, ed., p. 61).

In October 1905, Taqizadeh returned to Tabriz and remained there for 10 months. A major outcome of Taqizadeh’s journey was an essay entitled “Taḥḳiq-e aḥwāl-e konuni-e Irān yā moḥākamāt-e tāriḳi,” which was first published serially in several issues of *Ḥekmat* and then in *Ḥabl al-matin* before finally appearing as a lithographed booklet in 1905 in Tabriz. In this treatise, Taqizadeh expressed progressive political and historical views that attracted public attention, and he warned both the supporters of modernism and the traditionalists that “... without accepting the new principles and contemporary sciences, there is utter ruin; the end is nothing but decline, destruction and obliteration” (*Maqālāt* IV, p. 33). He continued this line of thought in his later publications in the journal *Kāva*. The essay represented Taqizadeh’s views well and helped increase his prominence, leading to his election to the first National Assembly (Majles) as the representative of the merchants of Tabriz with 56 votes (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 59-60; idem, *Maqālāt* IX, pp. 282-83). His election was partly due to his father’s good name as well as to the effective support of merchants. His presence in Tehran and his support for the constitutionalists were other contributing factors.

Once the Constitutional Edict (*Farmān-e mašruṭiyat*) was pronounced in Tehran on 14 Jomādā II 1324/5 August 1906, providing an opening for social and political activity, he traveled to Tehran via Baku and Rasht, arriving there in November of 1906. Upon receiving the telegram bearing the news of his



election, he presented himself to the Majles, where his credentials were ratified and he was congratulated at the session of 21 Šawwāl 1324/8 December 1906 (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005 p. 65).

TAQIZADEH IN THE FIRST MAJLES

The first Majles (6 October 1906-17 July 1908) was composed of representatives of various social classes, with Taqizadeh representing the merchants and guildsmen of Tabriz. Taqizadeh's activities in the arena of education between 1898 and 1905 had prepared him to take on this important political position. His unique perspective, which had evolved out of his experiences in Tabriz, his close observation of the disagreements between the traditionalists and the modernists, and his affinity with Ottoman and Egyptian advocates of freedom made him an influential figure in the Majles (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 28, 34, 38-39, 422). His jurisprudential intuition, his knowledge of the foundations of European democratic institutions, and, in particular, his membership in the Azarbaijan Society (*Jam'iyat-e Āḏarbāyjān*; Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 84-86) further augmented his prestige and power. Because of his close familiarity with the social currents in the Caucasus and Ottoman Turkey and his knowledge of the conditions in European countries, Taqizadeh was elected as a member of several committees, including Finance (of which he was chairman), Foreign Affairs, Codification of the Supplement to the Constitution, Amendment of the Law, Legislative Bills, State's Loan, Borrowing, Relief, Petitions (*arāyez*) and Frontier Affairs committees. Thanks to his courageous and poignant speeches, Taqizadeh quickly made a name for himself, leading to a strong rivalry with Jawād Khan Sa'd-al-Dawla (nicknamed Abu'l-Mella), a famous figure and a reputable speaker well versed in European laws, who was displeased with Taqizadeh's increasing popularity (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 61-63). Taqizadeh writes: "Since in my first speech at the Majles I made mention of the word *mašruṭiyat* (constitution), when I went out, people told me how brave I was to have used such a word" (Taqizadeh, *Maqālāt* I, p. 275). From then on, he would comment on most issues discussed at the Majles. As his words were logically sound and generally in the interest of the nation, he rose to prominence and developed a great reputation as an orator.

According to Taqizadeh, the first Majles was "entirely revolutionary," and its principal task was to firmly establish the Constitution, a proposition that was met with fierce resistance from the Qajar court. When Prime Minister Našr-Allāh Mošir-al-Dawla warned that the shah had only granted the institution of the Majles to assemble and deliberate about the laws and not a constitutional



government, Taqizadeh strongly objected. These types of exchanges inevitably led to conflict between the Majles and the court, and Taqizadeh's comments were often far from agreeable to Moḥammad-ʿAli Shah and his courtiers (*Maqālāt* I, pp. 275, 279).

Two months after the first Majles was convened, Moḥammad-ʿAli Shah summoned [Amin-al Solṭān Atābak-e Aʿzam](#) from abroad and appointed him prime minister on 3 May 1907. Taqizadeh had strongly opposed Amin-al-Solṭān's appointment to this office and made his objections clear at the Majles session of 29 Ṣafar 1325/13 April 1907: "The man who has held back the progress of Iran by borrowing from foreign countries must not be allowed to enter the country" (Mojtahedi, p. 71; Taqizāda, 1993, pp. 47-50). Although the issue has not been mentioned in Taqizadeh's memoirs, in an incomplete essay he appears to be one of those who regarded Amin-al-Solṭān's return as detrimental to the establishment of the Constitution (Mojtahedi, p. 363). In his biographical account of the Amin-al-Solṭān, Dūst-ʿAli Khan Moʿayyer-al-Mamālek (pp. 208-9), one of his advocates, writes that Taqizadeh was not on friendly terms with the prime minister. Given the hostility between the two men, some people suspected Taqizadeh's hand in the assassination of Amin-al-Solṭān, even though he categorically denied any involvement (Ṣayḡ-al-Eslāmi, pp. 34-39; Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 339-42).

Another major task of the first Majles was the preparation and ratification of the Supplement to the Constitution (*Motammem-e qānūn-e asāsi*; see [CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION iii. The Constitution](#)). Taqizadeh was one of six deputies who drafted the supplement, and he believed that it needed to be ratified within two or three days. However, as the provisions of the supplement were sufficiently compromising to the shah's authority, its ratification did not go smoothly. The document was fiercely debated for no less than seven months and was eventually signed by the shah on 9 September 1907. During this tumultuous period, the bazaars in Tabriz were shut down several times, members of the influential Central Committee (Anjoman-e markazi), which represented more than 140 societies of Tehran, took refuge in the Majles, and, most bizarrely of all, Ayatollah ʿAbd-Allāh Behbahāni's mattress was taken there in order to energize the spirit of the protesters (*Maqālāt* I, pp. 280, 349).

As relations between the Majles and the shah worsened, the bazaars in Azarbaijan and other provinces were shut down in support of the Majles, and telegrams of protest were sent to Tehran. At one of the Majles sessions during



this period (25 December 1907), Taqizadeh accounted for these intense feelings: “I do not believe that all this is chaos, as some claim. It is a popular uprising (*enqelāb-e melli*) in support of the Majles ..., indicating that the nation can safeguard its rights” (*Modākarāt*, 2005, pp. 534-35). When Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah signed and sent a copy of the Qur’ān to the Majles in December 1907, in order to appease the emotionally charged supporters of the Constitution, Taqizadeh characterized it as a superficial gesture. In Taqizadeh’s opinion, what was required to resolve the standoff between the two sides was the fulfillment of the devised peace agreement (*ṣolḥ-nāma*), which stipulated that the Majles be reinstated and the shah stop meddling in its affairs, as well as the punishment of those involved in the incident at Tupkāna Square, where anti-constitutionalists had gathered for several days under the leadership of Shaikh Fażl-Allāh Nuri (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 66-67; *Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 535). Taqizadeh publically continued to criticize Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah’s anti-Constitution position, thus infuriating the latter to the extent that he was rumored to have threatened that if he got his hands on Taqizadeh, he would “tear his eyes out with a knife” (Dawlatābādi, apud Mojtahedi, p. 92); in another rumor, he is said to have taken an oath to kill Taqizadeh with his own hands (Tadqizadeh, 1993, p. 75). Prior to the shelling of the Majles, Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah asked that Taqizadeh and seven others be sent to exile during peace negotiations with the deputies (Tafreši, p. 262).

In numerous speeches delivered at the Majles, Taqizadeh emphasized the importance of respecting the law and of legislating necessary and effective new laws. Aware of the desire of some members to make changes in the basic standing orders (*nezām-nāma-ye asāsi*), he declared that “it must be recorded that in the future no interference be allowed in the Constitution without the approval of the Majles” (*Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 91). Regarding the issue of corruption, he stated that law should determine the punishment of bribe-takers. When the issue of reforming the Ministry of Justice was brought forth, he commented that “first a law forbidding bribery should be written, then an ‘Adliya [Ministry of Justice] be created” (*Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 162). In response to the problem of state officials being unclear about their legal duties and the confusion caused by undesirable interference on the part of the authorities, Taqizadeh made the following declaration: “Let a one-line law be written so that nobody would have the right to interfere in the affairs of others,” adding that “law should typically apply to the majority.” In his view, the wellbeing of every country depended on the law (*Modākarāt*, 2005, pp. 163, 171, 181 [?]). Another demonstration of Taqizadeh’s insistence on safeguarding the law was



his obstruction of a bill sent to the Majles by the court minister with respect to the salaries of the royal guards. Taqizadeh believed that such a proposal should come from the appropriate party, namely the minister of war. He had intended to draw the court's attention to the fact that the country had one single budget and that any kind of expense ought to be specified in it; he argued that this was the method practiced in "civilized countries" (*mamālek-e motamaddena*; *Moḍākarāt*, 2005, p. 127).

Taqizadeh was also a firm believer in the separation of powers in government. He reminded the Majles that it should avoid taking on tasks for which the executive branch (*qowwa-ye mojriya*) was responsible, and that it should not interfere in every single detail of ministry functions. Emphasizing the responsibility of the ministers to the Majles, he insisted on their being present at sessions and answering questions, strongly warning those deputies who arrogantly refused to attend (*Moḍākerāt*, 2005, pp. 94, 121, 124, 372, 395). In a short incomplete essay, entitled "Tāriḵ-e enḡelāb-e Irān" (written circa 1910), Taqizadeh wrote that "ministers continue to be heedlessly indifferent, ignoring the Majles altogether" (*Maqālāt* I, p. 345). Taqizadeh considered the nation's security as the main responsibility of the government, and he criticized frequent cabinet changes. Meanwhile, he believed that the ministries should expand their employment of lesser-known individuals rather than their own relatives, and hire people with the right capabilities, by which he apparently meant younger people (*Moḍākarāt*, 2005, pp. 507, 609).

The first Majles hardly demonstrated the best order, as the deputies were not yet familiar with parliamentary procedure and etiquette. This was the subject of Taqizadeh's first extensive speech, in which he emphasized the importance of regularly attending and participating in Majles sessions. He stipulated four conditions in this regard: regular participation of deputies, adherence to the internal regulations (*neḡām-nāma-e dāḡela*) of the Majles, completion of the election of deputies from the provinces, the presence of the ministers to answer questions directed at them; and he demanded (*moḡālaba*) the Constitution from the government (*Moḍākarāt*, 2005, pp. 75-76). He considered the British and French parliaments to be two suitable models for the Majles, remarking that "the [real] deputy should be one who could make the Majles like those of Britain and France." At another time he stated that "taking an oath is not needed for the deputies who represent the nation," apparently meaning that it was the members of executive branch who should take such an oath. In his opinion, one of the deputies' duties was to see to



petitions coming from the provinces (*Modākarāt*, 2005, pp. 79, 568).

Part of Taqizadeh's parliamentary efforts were directed towards curtailing the power of grandees and ruthless local oppressors. These efforts resulted in the dismissal of Mas'ud Mirzā Z̧ell-al-Solṭān and the prince regent (*nāyeb-al-salṭana*) Kāmṛān Mirzā from their offices (*Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 253). Taqizadeh also strongly disapproved of the rebellion of Abu'l-Faṭḥ Mirzā Sālār-al-Dawla, Moḥammad-'Ali Shah's brother, who had unsuccessfully tried his hand at claiming the throne. In December 1906 and December 1907 he sent warnings to the government concerning Ġolām-Rezā Āṣaf-al-Dawla, governor of Khorasan, and Sālār Mofakḳam Bojnurdī, governor of Qučān, under whose watch the inhumane sale of over 70 Qučāni children to Turkmen had taken place (Kasravi, I, p. 303, II, p. 169). Both men were eventually dismissed, tried, and punished (*Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 314).

Taqizadeh's stance against those whom he considered treacherous, with a record of oppression and unjust political conduct, was uncompromising, and he firmly demanded the most severe punishments for them. Maḥmud Eḥtešām-al-Salṭana, the Majles speaker, refers to his uncompromising stance in his memoirs: "Despite his [Taqizadeh's] youth and lack of experience, he demonstrated immense patriotism, being very active but keeping away from corruption until the day of the shelling of the Majles (*ḳod rā tā ruz-e tup bastan-e Majles āluda nakard*). He took no account of friends or foes over the country's interests ... but unfortunately he was rather impetuous, seeking fame, and spoke of revolution, of holding national tribunals, and punishing the supporters of despotism" (Eḥtešām-al-Salṭana, p. 650).

Taqizadeh spoke three times about the actions of the cleric Ḥājj Āqā Moḥsen 'Erāqi, stating that, had his actions been stopped, influential men would not have caused disturbances elsewhere (*Modākarāt*, 2005, pp. 245, 265, 297 [?]). Once in a while, he would remind the Majles of the seditious acts of Sālār Mofakḳam, Qawām-al-Molk Širāzi (an influential figure in Fars), Raḥim Khan Čalbiānlu (a notable tribal leader in Azarbaijan), Amir As'ad Ḳal'atbari (a powerful landowner in Tonakābon), Jahānšāh Afšār (a landowner in Zanjān), Mollā Qorbān-'Ali (the leading cleric of Zanjān), and Eqbāl-al-Dawla Kāši (a notable figure close to the court), who had made trouble in Varāmin (*Modākarāt*, 2005, p. 541). The purpose of these reminders was to highlight the fact that the government was not executing its legal duties, that people were not being treated in a lawful way, and that it was the local khans who virtually ran the country. Taqizadeh's aggressive defense of the people's rights was



exemplified in his response to a telegram from the governor of Gilan to the Majles stating that “the subjects (*ra’āyā*), thinking that constitutional kingdom (*salṭanat-e mašruṭa*) means being tax-free, have rebelled and refuse to pay taxes.” Taqizadeh retorted that the subjects were of two kinds; one comprised city residents, who are the shah’s subjects, while the other includes villagers who are “the slave-like subjects of unpronounced kings” (*abd-reqq-e salāṭin-e bi-esm*), meaning the local landlords. He adds now that the urban subjects “have somehow come to terms with the shah, making [despotic] monarchy constitutional; is it fair that the rural people remain under the same despotic rule of the past?” He also once observed: “the previous monarchy of Iran consisted of an oppressive group who did whatever they wished” (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, pp. 187, 360).

Other examples of Taqizadeh’s concern for people’s rights included his support of a petition sent to the Majles by a Zoroastrian group regarding the murder of a merchant by the name of Fereydun, and his backing the request made by the Armenian community in Iran to have their own representation at the Majles, on the grounds that they were part of the Iranian nation and thus entitled to vote and elect their own deputies (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, p. 647). Taqizadeh’s defense of the principle of equal rights elicited severe criticism in certain circles, and the anti-constitutionalist cleric Sayyed ‘Ali Āqā Yazdi publicly called him an infidel (*kāfer*; Kasravi, II, p. 268). Taqizadeh remained steadfast to his beliefs, however; responding to a deputy who had asked if the assembly of women was religiously legitimate, he said: “There is no legal objection to their forming into a gathering. Muslim women have always and everywhere gathered. Nor is there any objection to it according to the Constitution. The term Iranian in the Constitution includes both men and women” (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, p. 625).

On the practice of inspection of a book prior to publication, Taqizadeh argued that, “only religious books should be inspected by the Education Ministry (*Wezārat-e ma’āref*), not books in general. All other books ought to be subject to possible judicial punishment.” On the regulatory code for social organizations (*anjomans*), which at the time limited the people’s right to assembly, Taqizadeh commented that, “In Islam, there was freedom of assembly; there is no need for this regulatory code (*neḏām-nāma*) ... the Constitution is enough.” For Taqizadeh, three simple regulations were enough: a social organization may not constitute a threat to order; it may not oppose religious and profane laws; and it may not carry arms (*Moḏākarāt*,



2005, pp. 302, 519).

According to the Constitution, there had to exist both a Consultative Assembly and a Senate, and Taqizadeh had faith in the establishment of the latter. On the governors of the provinces, he was of the opinion that nobody could become governor of a province in which he owns more than 1,000 *tumāns* in personal property besides his accommodation (*Moḏākarāt*, pp. 80, 170). He was fundamentally opposed to setting up special courts, believing that “the Justice Ministry should conduct all trials,” the only exception being the way merchants were tried. He consented to the idea of creating a regular national army (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, pp. 322, 501, 530). However, he opposed the renewal of the contract with the foreign director of the School of Agriculture, saying that, “our ministers should free us from these foreign (*farangi*) chains.” He even went so far as to threaten that: “if they are not willing to cut these chains loose, they should be dismissed.” Taqizadeh was also opposed the traditional method of granting administrative posts to those who had offered gifts to the government. He once remarked about Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah saying: “he has received 16,000 *tumāns* and given away the magazines,” insinuating that the shah had ceded control over military equipment.

When the concept of law (*qānun*) was being discussed, Taqizadeh proposed that an academy be established to coin newly needed words (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, p. 165), marking the first official call for the founding of a [Farhangestān](#).

As a member of the Finance Committee, Taqizadeh aimed to undo the work of previous state accountants (*mostawfi*) and formulated the following basic proposals: a decrease in pensions and salaries; an investigation into the taxes collected in excess of what was required; abrogation of the practice of granting land tenure, *toyul*; and the repealing of the prices of goods fixed by landlords for tax purposes (Taqizadeh, 1958, pp. 10-12). He believed that any income related to the government ought to be under the close scrutiny of the Finance Ministry, maintaining that the improvement of the country’s affairs depended on a well-planned budget. Another important step was the attempt to found a national bank, a proposal which Taqizadeh considered essential to the overall improvement of the country and supported wholeheartedly, despite doubts expressed by some religious figures (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, pp. 118, 119; see [BANKING i. History of Banking in Iran](#)). When the Majles strongly opposed foreign loans, Taqizadeh warned that: “Borrowing is utter infidelity.”

In regard to the *toyul* system and pensions, he addressed the Majles saying:



“Since our monarchy has turned constitutional, the *toyul* holders must also become constitutional,” which led to the creation of an adjustment committee (*komita-ye ta’dil*) with Taqizadeh as one of its members. The adjustments made by the committee caused hue and cry of those who had been benefiting before. Their uproar brought about the unfortunate incident at the Tupkāna (Tehran’s main square then) and the gathering of mobs and thugs there. When wives of the previous shahs, whose regular pensions had been cut, protested, Taqizadeh said: “before, a certain shah had before married several wives; now, they should not live on the nation’s money until the end of the world” (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, pp. 187, 514-15). Taqizadeh has been accused of “favoritism and seeking leadership” and of “being subversive and of a republican persuasion, desiring a republic system with himself as its president” (Kāšāni, II, pp. 496, 538-39).

An ardent nationalist, Taqizadeh opposed the [Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907](#), which established Russian and British spheres of influence in Iran. In protest, he took sanctuary (*bast*) in the British embassy alongside thousands of other opponents of the agreement. In a letter to Charles Murray Marling, the British Chargé d’Affaires, he spoke of the damage done to the Constitution as a result of the agreement (Mo’āšer, p. 759). He also criticized the weak reaction of the ministers when Britain and Russia sent soldiers to [Ahvaz](#), [Mohammara](#), and [Ardabil](#) (*Moḏākarāt*, 2005, pp. 579-80, 593); and he commented on the arrival of the Ottoman army in the city of [Sardašt](#), in an article published in the daily *Šobḥ-e šādeq*: “The nation will dispose of the enemy with its own bare hands, the same way as did the French, driving the two neighboring invading states out of their homeland” (n. 130, 7 Ša’bān 1325).

TAQIZADEH AND MOḤAMMAD-‘ALI SHAH

The rift between MoḤammad-‘Ali Shah and the Majles widened, following an unsuccessful attempt on the shah’s life on 27 February 1908. Taqizadeh expressed regret over the incident, emphasizing the necessity of firm relationships between the people and the shah. On 4 June 1908, the shah left his palace for [Bāḡ-e Šāh](#), a residence just outside the city where he would be safe under the protection of the [Cossack Brigade](#). As the conflict worsened, Taqizadeh warned that the Russians might bring in forces to protect the shah (Mojtahedi, p. 91). Eventually a letter dictated by Mostašār-al-Dawla, criticizing the shah’s conduct, was written and delivered to him on 7 June 1908, to which he responded. After a week, the shah ordered the shelling of the Majles. With the deputies dispersed and the Cossacks in control, the



Constitution was effectively shelved on 15 June 1908 (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 72-75).

On the eve of the day when the Majles was shelled, Taqizadeh and several other deputies, including 'Ali-Akbar Dehḳodā, left the Majles for home. The following morning, Taqizadeh took refuge at one of the embassies, dispatching Mirzā 'Ali-Moḥammad Khan Tarbiat with a letter bearing no address (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 76-77). Eventually Taqizadeh opted to go to the British embassy, perhaps because he was held in high esteem by Marling, who considered him to be the most intellectual representative of the nation. He was admitted there, together with ten companions, and was later joined by a much larger group. After twenty-five days and some negotiation between the British embassy, the royal court, and the government, it was agreed that Taqizadeh, Dehḳodā, and a few others should be banished to a foreign country for one and a half years (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 74-100; idem, *Maqālāt* I, p. 293). While he was at the embassy, Taqizadeh wrote a letter to the staff there, informing them of the conditions of Iran, the shah's hostile activities, and the role of the Russians in the bombing of the Majles (Afšār, ed., p. 109). Marling then proceeded to send the translation of the letter's abstract to Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Minister (Mo'āṣer, p. 757).

In mid-July 1908, Taqizadeh and his exiled companions arrived at Baku, at which point they separated and headed for different destinations. The society (*anjoman*) of Iranians in Baku had intended to send people to Europe to promote in newspapers the idea of constitutional government in Iran. Taqizadeh received 1000 rubles from the society (*anjoman*) for this purpose and set off for Paris with Tarbiat, who had just arrived from Tabriz (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 91-95). Upon receiving Edward Granville Browne's written invitation on 15 August 1908, he traveled to Cambridge and stayed in a boarding house as Brown's guest (Browne, 1992, p. 1; Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 94-97). Browne, who was supportive of Taqizadeh's pro-constitutional activities and displeased with Russia's interference in Iranian affairs, commissioned Taqizadeh and Tarbiat, who joined Taqizadeh in Cambridge, to catalogue Persian and Arabic books at the Cambridge University Library, pretending that the University paid them, although it was Browne himself who provided for their livelihood out of his own pocket (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 95-98; Browne, 1966, pp. 332-33).

One of Taqizadeh's significant undertakings in England was the publication of a statement, signed by Mo'āzed-al-Salṭana and Taqizadeh and titled "Manifesto



from Refugees,” in the daily *Times*, regarding Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah’s misconduct and his disregard for the rights of Iranian people (*Times*, 5 October 1908, no. 38778; repr. as Appendix 1, in Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 915-20; Browne, 1966, p. 226). Taqizadeh and Abu’l-Ḥasan Mo‘āzed-al-Salṭana Pirniā were able to arrange a meeting with the publishers of the *Times*, thanks to the help of Browne (Taqizadeh, *Maqālāt* I, p. 307; idem, 1993, pp. 99-100). Following this, another declaration addressed to British people, entitled “Persia’s Appeal to England,” was published privately on 27 October 1908 (repr. as Appendix II, in Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 901-14). This document was distributed among members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords. On 29 October 1908, Taqizadeh and Mo‘āzed-al-Salṭana were invited to deliver a speech, entitled “A Summary of Recent Developments in Persia,” before a group of 25 sympathetic British members of both houses of parliament, Edward Browne, and a number of journalists. A major outcome of these activities was the establishment of the Persia Committee, a multiparty foreign-policy pressure group (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 100-102; idem, *Maqālāt* I, pp. 307-8).

Taqizadeh returned to Iran in January 1909, after receiving a telegram from Julfa, informing him of the dire conditions at Tabriz. The shah had ordered ‘Ayn-al-Dawla to move to Azarbaijan to engage Sattār Khan and his companions, the so-called *mojāhedin* (freedom fighters), who were defending the Constitution. From his position at Bāsmenj, ‘Ayn-al-Dawla had put Tabriz under siege, which threatened to cause a famine in the city. Taqizadeh set off for Iran via Istanbul. In Tbilisi, he learned more about the struggle between ‘Ayn-al-Dawla and the constitutionalists, and he sent a letter to Sattār Khan encouraging him to hold out. He asked Sattār Khan not to yield to any peace agreement, not to let the governor of Tehran into the city, and to wait for help from the Caucasus. In the letter he called the shah a rebel (*ṭāḡi*), characterizing his body as Iranian and his soul as Russian (*jasadaš irāni wa ruḥaš rus*). He urged Sattār Khan to set up a provisional government and to hold temporary Majles sessions in Tabriz and also advised him to wire a message to the French Parliament or a French newspaper to forestall the payment of a loan that the shah had asked (Afšār, ed., pp. 133-35). In another letter, addressed to Istanbul (1 Ša‘bān), he praised the Iranians there for helping the constitutional warriors (*Maqālāt* I, pp. 373-76).

On 7 January 1909, Taqizadeh arrived in Tabriz (Amirḳizi, p. 250) and was welcomed by ‘Aliqoli Sardār As‘ad Baḳtiāri. Upon discovering his arrival in the city, ‘Ayn-al-Dawla started corresponding with Taqizadeh, asking him to share



what he had learned in the West. ‘Ayn-al-Dawla had failed in his mission, and Tabriz was suffering from famine, mainly due to the closure of roads leading to the city (Afšār, ed., pp. 143-59, 154, 165; Taqizadeh, 1933, p. 121). The Russians, meanwhile, used the city’s poor condition as an excuse to move their army into Azarbaijan. The Provincial Council of Tabriz, which in practice had replaced the governorship of Azarbaijan, summoned Taqizadeh for consultation. Taqizadeh believed that, under such circumstances, they ought to appeal to the shah himself. Therefore, he wrote the text of a telegram that expressed the preference of the constitutionalists “to appeal to our unkind father rather than ask foreigners for assistance.” Due to a disagreement among the constitutionalists, however, the message was not wired until the following day, by which time the situation in Tabriz had worsened. When Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah read the telegram, tears ran down his face (Taqizadeh, 1959, p. 81; idem, 1993, pp. 126-28; Amirḳizi, p. 376).

The siege of Tabriz lasted from January until April, when Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah, facing a serious shortage of funds, finally yielded to British and Russian pressure and permitted a Russian column to relieve the city. Russian intervention in Tabriz caused the revolutionaries and Russian subjects who feared capture to retreat toward Tehran. At the same time, the shah was threatened by pro-constitutionalist Gilāni and Baḳtiāri forces, who were advancing on the capital. The revolutionaries were convinced that positive action would induce the shah to restore the Constitution, which he did on 5 May 1909 (14 Rabi‘ II 1327), his birthday, declaring the restoration of the principles of the Constitution and setting July 19 (Rajab 1) as the date for general elections (Nāẓem-al-Eslām, II, pp. 400-01, 402-03). As forces from **Rasht** advanced toward Tehran, the Baḳtiāris advanced from **Isfahan**, so that by early July they had 2,000 men in Qom. After an unsuccessful attempt at compromise with the shah, the two forces entered Tehran on 13 July 1909 (24 Jomādā II 1327), and three days later the shah took refuge in the Russian embassy (Nāẓem-al-Eslām, II, pp. 486-93).

TAQIZADEH IN THE SECOND MAJLES

After the takeover of Tehran by the triumphant constitutionalists, a Supreme Council (Majles-e ‘āli) of more than 300 members, drawn from various groups, deposed Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah and placed his minor son Aḥmad Mirzā (r. 1909-25) on the throne as **Aḥmad Shah Qājār** (27 Jomādā II 1327/16 July 1909; Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 145-46; Nāẓem-al-Eslām, II, pp. 493-95; Browne, 1966, pp. 321-22, 324-25). Taqizadeh, who was still in Tabriz, returned to Tehran to join



the Council, following the receipt of a telegram from Sardār As‘ad and ‘Azod-al-Molk, the recently elected regent and new head of the Qajar tribe. Once in Tehran, Taqizadeh was elected to the Council’s Higher Committee (Komisiun-e ‘āli) and to this Committee’s Provisional Board of Directors (Hay‘at-e modira-ye mowaqqati), consisting of 20 members, who were essentially replacing the royal authority (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 149-50; idem, *Maqālāt I*, pp. 298-99). As a member of the Board of Directors, Taqizadeh played a prominent role in three major diplomatic episodes.

First, he was chosen as a member of a five-man delegation that negotiated the terms of the shah’s removal and his return of the crown jewels with British and Russian envoys (Amirkizi, pp. 391). The other four were Ḥasan Wotuq-al-Dawla, Şādeq Mostaşār-al-Dawla, Ḥosayn-qoli Nawwāb, and Moḥammad-Şadiq Ḥazrat Maẓāher (Taqizadeh, *Maqālāt I*, p. 299). The result of these negotiations was a protocol, signed by the official representative of the Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the draft of which remains among the papers of Mostaşār-al-Dawla (II, pp. 294-98). The crown jewels were returned, and Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah set off for Russia (Mostaşār-al-Dawla, I, pp. 293-98). Taqizadeh later provided Amirkizi with a detailed account of delegation’s last meeting with Moḥammad-‘Ali Shah. According to it, the shah summoned Taqizadeh after the meeting and asked him privately to persuade the Board of Directors to allow him to remain in Iran, even if under close surveillance (Amirkizi, pp. 391-94).

The second episode involved the capture of the prince Z̄ell-al-Soltān by Mojāhedīn forces in Gilan. Ignoring a warning from the British Embassy in Iran, Z̄ell-al-Soltān returned from Europe in hope of recovering his confiscated property and possibly landing a prominent position in the new government. The Mojāhedīn prevented him from traveling to Tehran and placed him under custody. Knowing that Taqizadeh had greater influence than the other deputies, the prince sent him a telegram requesting his release. This was followed by an appeal to Taqizadeh by Z̄ell-al-Soltān’s family, repeating the same request (Afšār, ed., pp. 169-200). In a six-page telegram to Gilan’s Provincian Council (Anjoman-e welāyati-e Gilān), Taqizadeh criticized them for disobeying the central government and reminded them that, now that the revolution was over, there were no room for anarchism. He demanded that the Council settle Z̄ell-al-Soltān’s case immediately, on the condition that he would pay the amount that he had been ordered to pay. At the end of the letter, Taqizadeh emphasized that he was speaking on behalf of the



Provisional Board of Directors. The Provincial Council of Gilan responded positively and Żell-al-Soltān was set free after he paid 300,000 *tumāns* (Afšār, ed., pp. 190-91; Taqizadeh, *Maqālāt* I, pp. 299-300).

The third episode, which led to the intervention of the British government, concerned the murder of two *Ismā'ilis* by a local preacher named Shaikh Moḥammad-Bāqer, at a village near Nishapur. The preacher claimed that he had received permission to carry out the killing from Mo'in-al-Ġorabā', a cleric in Mashhad. Since the *Ismā'ili* population in the area were followers of the *Ismā'ili* leader Āqā Khan Maḥallāti, who had a large number of followers in England, Sir Percy Molesworth Sykes, the British Consul in Mashhad, wired the news to the British embassy in Tehran on 7 December 1909. Concerned about the provocation of the *Ismā'ili* community in England, the British embassy wrote to Iran's Foreign Ministry, demanding that the Iranian government punish those who had committed the murders (Rezāzāda, pp. 313, 338). On the order of Sardār As'ad, Mo'in-al-Ġorabā' and Shaikh Moḥammad-Bāqer were both arrested, sent to Tehran, and imprisoned there. The former was eventually banished to Iraq, and the latter remained in jail.

Having demanded capital punishment for Moḥammad-Bāqer, Taqizadeh faced the criticism of influential clerics such as Shaikh Moḥammad-Ḥosayn Yazdi, to whom he responded very sharply, arguing that neither the Qur'ān nor the *Hadith* supported the idea that a murderer in clerical garb could not to be punished (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 152-55). In Taqizadeh's opinion, this harsh encounter was the root cause of the clerics' displeasure with him, which would gradually intensify following his stance on the second article of the Constitutional Supplement (Motammem-e qānun-e asāsi) in the first Majles, and which continued into the Second Majles. Before long, a decree was issued from the Shī'ite seminary at Najaf, in which Taqizadeh was pronounced as politically corrupt. This was followed by the appearance of "night letters" (*šab-nāma*) and various declarations against him, making it clear that his adversaries were trying to drive him out of the Majles by any means necessary (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 154-55). He was variously accused of paying a total of 10,000 *tumāns* every month to a group of men under him, of being a supporter of Britain, of speaking against such noted national figures as Ayatollah Behbahāni and Sattār Khan, and of interfering in people's affairs unlawfully (Šarif Kāšāni, II, pp. 485, 505, 531, 537-40).

One of the differences between Taqizadeh and the religious scholars at Najaf, which may have aggravated their disagreement, was the issue of forming the



Senate, as stipulated in the Constitution. Pressed by telegrams from the ulema (*‘olamā’*) at Najaf, the merchants, and some other influential individuals demanding the formation of the Senate, the vicegerent referred (in a letter to the Majles) to the decree of Āḵund Mollā Kāẓem Ḳorāsāni, which emphasized the urgency of setting up the Senate. Taqizadeh responded sarcastically that, while the signers of these telegrams (meaning the clerics) did nothing to establish the Constitution, they now expressed concern over the failure of the Majles to adhere to it (*qānun-e asāsi*). Taqizadeh’s reluctance to push for the establishment of the Senate was due to his belief that such an institution would further delay legislation of necessary laws. Forty years later, however, he strongly advocated the formation of the Senate, himself taking part in the election and being its president for a long time. This change of position was the result of his experience in the 15th Majles (1947-49; see Abrahamian, pp. 242 ff.), and political disturbances, which called for a two-chamber legislative body (*Moḍākarāt*, 1948, p. 100; Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 290-92).

As a member of the Second Majles (2 Du’l-qa’da/15 November 1909 to 3 Moḥarram 1330/24 December 1911), Taqizadeh’s new ideas and candid remarks on various issues often placed him at odds with the government and certain elements of the assembly. A firm believer in the centralization of power, both politically and economically, Taqizadeh argued for the urgency of importing silver and minting silver coins, based on legally specified standards approved by the Majles, a proposal that did not garner much support from the government. When the speaker of the Majles suggested that the deputies formally attend the Festival of Sacrifice (*‘Id-e qorbān*) ceremonies in the vicegerent’s presence, Taqizadeh disagreed with the idea, arguing that this would be insulting to their position as deputies (*Moḍākarāt*, 1948, p. 26). When the minister of the interior was asked to give explanation for the sale of alcohol and spread of wrongdoing in the country, Taqizadeh reminded the Majles that they only had to ensure that alcohol was not sold publicly; otherwise an indiscriminate ban on sale of alcohol would be a violation of the people’s freedom. In the same Majles session, he held the minister of the interior accountable for the disturbances in the province of Sistan, emphasizing the government’s responsibility for the security of the country (*Moḍākarāt*, 1948, pp. 5, 52).

On the Cossack organization, which was a reminder of the Russian political sway in Iran, Taqizadeh expressed the view in the Majles that it should become part of the War Ministry, arguing outspokenly that there was no



difference between a guilty Cossack and a guilty army soldier. In the same session, Taqizadeh criticized the government's manner of handling the sale of wheat, deploring the fact that the urban citizens ate cheaper bread at the expense of farmers, who had to provide their livelihood through selling wheat. Again, he opposed the finance minister's proposal in a parliamentary bill to hire foreigners for the government, because apparently no provision had been made for it in the country's national budget. To him a comprehensive national budget and its balanced distribution were of utmost importance. He defended the policy of first providing the budget, then making the purchases, and he firmly maintained this position both in the Majles and when he became finance minister in Rezā Shah's reign (*Modākarāt*, 1948, pp. 55, 60, 77, 192, 198, 218, 219, 306).

He protested against certain actions of provincial councils (*anjoman*), which he considered not in the interest of the country. He warned that, according to the law, such political bodies should be under the supervision of the Ministry of the Interior. Seeing that the nine-month-long presence of the Russian army in Iran undermined the country's sovereignty, Taqizadeh leveled strong criticism in the Second Majles against their remaining and interfering in the country's internal affairs, and he blamed the Foreign Ministry for not taking effective measures.

One instance of Taqizadeh's concern for social equality, including that of men and women, was his conviction that the pension of the dead paid by the government should be distributed among all the heirs. He believed that the concubines (*ṣiḡa*) were the most in need. He explicitly declared that the differences in this respect between males and females ought to be removed. He also expressed concern over the problem of pensioners (*Modākarāt*, 1948, pp. 192, 218, 219).

With the assassination of Sayyed 'Abd-Allāh Behbahāni (8 Rajab 1328/16 July 1910), Taqizadeh's presence at the Second Majles ended. Since both his personal adversaries and the deputies affiliated with the Moderate Party (*Ḥezb-e e'tedāl*) and opposed to Taqizadeh's Democratic Party (*Ḥezb-e demokrāt*) accused him of having been implicated in the assassination, he found it advisable to leave the political scene, and this was exactly what his enemies wanted. As the preparations for declaring Taqizadeh as politically corrupt had already been made even before Behbahāni's tragic incident, he asked for a three-month leave and set out for Tabriz after having delegated his position to Solaymān Mirzā Eskandari as the leader of the Democratic Party



(Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 155-58, 348-49; Malekzāda, pp. 212-220; Afšār, ed., pp. 207-14). After Taqizadeh's departure, there were comments at the Majles for and against his decision, some indirectly denouncing the accusations leveled against him (*Modākarāt*, 1948, pp. 351, 317-18).

Since Taqizadeh was exposed to danger in Tabriz, he left for Ottoman Turkey via Orumia and Koy on 19 November 1910, arriving in Istanbul on 1 February 1911. There is little mention in Persian sources of Taqizadeh's activities in Turkey, except that he helped set up in Istanbul a society of Iranian immigrants designated "Dissemination of Learning" (Našr-e ma'āref), which was, in fact, a reproduction of his Democratic Party. Taqizadeh's collaborators in this task were Moḥammad-'Ali Tarbiat, Mirzā Esmā'il Aṣef-al-Wozarā' (a family member), Moḥammad-Amin Rasulzāda (a Caucasian liberal and manager of the paper *Ruznāma-ye Irān*, who had been banished from Tehran), Ḥosayn Ṭāherzāda, and several others (Ṭāherzāda Behzād, p. 345). Taqizadeh also made a trip to Paris to see [Sardār As'ad Baḳtiāri](#). More indicative of Taqizadeh's activity are the five long articles, published in French, that appeared in the journal *Révue du Monde musulman*, 1913-14 (for the list, see Marashi, pp. 50, 150; texts also in Taqizadeh, *Maqālat* VII). The articles demonstrate that, during his stay in Istanbul, Taqizadeh had learned and written a great deal about Ottoman socio-political currents, Pan-Islamism, and Pan-Turkism (Taqizadeh, 1993, pp. 157-71).

Taqizadeh's later scholarly work and publications are discussed in [HISTORIOGRAPHY ix. PAHLAVI PERIOD \(2\) Specific Topics \(a\) Contributions of Taqizadeh to chronology, calendar systems, and related matters](#). See also, for his work in Berlin during 1916-22, [KĀVA NEWSPAPER](#).

Bibliography:

Ervand Abrahamian, *Iran Between Two Revolutions*, Princeton, 1982.

Iraj Afšār, ed., *Awraq-e tāzayāb-e mašruṭiyat marbuṭ be sālḥā-ye 1325-1330 Qamari*, Tehran, 1980.

Ġolām-Ḥosayn Afzal-al-Molk, *Afzal-al-tawāriḳ*, ed. Manšura Etteḥādiya and Sirus Sa'dvandiān, Tehran, 1982.

Esmā'il Amirḳizi, *Qiām-e Āzarbāyjān wa Sattār Kān*, Tehran, 1960.



Jamšid Behnām, “Taqizāda wa mas’ala-ye tjaddod,” *Iran Nameh* 21/1-2, Special Issue on Taqizadeh, 2003, pp. 77-89.

Edward G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, London, 1966, pp. 145-46.

Idem, *Nāmahā-ye Edward Browne ba Sayyed Ḥasan Taqizāda*, ed. ‘Abbās Zaryāb and Iraj Afšār, Tehran, 1992.

Yaḥyā Dawlatābādi, *Ḥayāt-e Yaḥyā*, 4 vols., Tehran, 1952-70.

Maḥmud Eḥtešām-al-Salṭana, *Ḳāṭerāt-e Eḥtešām-al-Salṭana*, ed. Sayyed Moḥammad-Mahdi Musawi, Tehran, 1987.

Hušang Etteḥād, *Pažuhešgarān-e mo’āšer-e Irān*, 8 vols., Tehran, 1999.

Ilse Itscherenska, “Taqizāda dar Ālmān-e Qeyšari: Molāḥazāt-i dar bāra-ye hamkāri bā Ālmān dar atnā-ye jang-e jahāni-e awwal,” *Iran Nameh* 21/1-2, Special Issue on Taqizadeh, 2003, pp. 49-75.

Aḥmad Kasravi, *Tāriḳ-e mašruṭa-ye Irān*, 3 vols. in one Tehran, 1940.

Homa Katouzian, “Sayyed Ḥasan Taqizāda: *Se zendagi dar yak ‘omr*,” *Iran Nameh* 21/1-2, Special Issue on Taqizadeh, 2003b, pp. 7-47.

Idem, *Iran: Politics, History and Literature*, London, 2013.

Mahdi Malekzāda, *Tāriḳ-e enqelāb-e mašruṭiyat-e Irān VI*, Tehran, n.d.

Afshin Marashi, *Nationalizing Iran: Culture, Power, and the State, 1870-1940*, Seattle, 2011.

Ḥasan Mo’āšer, ed. and tr. from English, *Tāriḳ-e esteqrār-e mašruṭiyat dar Irān: mostakraja az ru-ye asnād-e maḥramāna-ye Wezārat-e omur-e kāreja*, Tehran, 1986.

Dust-‘Ali Khan Mo’ayyer-al-Mamālek, *Rejāl-e ‘ašr-e nāšeri*, Tehran, 1982.
Moḍākarāt-e Majles dar dawra-ye dovvom-e taqniniya, Tehran, 1948.

Moḍākarāt-e Majles-e awwal, ed. Ġolām-Ḥosayn Mirzā Šāleḥ, Tehran, 2005.

Mahdi Mojtahedi, *Taqizada: Rowšangarihā dar mašruṭiyat-e Irān*, Tehran, 1978.



Şādeq Mostašār-al-Dawla, *Kāṭerāt wa asnād: Majmu'a-ye awwal*, ed. Iraj Afšār, 2 vols., Tehran, 1982.

Nāẓem-al-Eslām Kermāni, *Tāriḳ-e bidāri-e Irāniān*, ed. 'Ali-Akbar Sa'idi Sirjāni, 4th ed., 2 vols., Tehran, 1983.

Raḥim Rezāzāda Malek, *Enqelāb-e mašruṭa-ye Irān be rewāyat-e asnād-e Wezārat-e kāreja-ye Engelīs dar ketāb-e ābi*, Tehran, 1998.

Moḥammad Şadr Hāšemi, *Tāriḳ-e jar'ed wa majallāt-e Irān*, 4 vols., Isfahan, 1984-85.

Moḥammad-Mahdi Şarīf Kāšāni, *Wāqe'āt-e ettefāqiya dar ruzgār*, ed. Manşura Etteḥādiya wa Sirus Sa'dvandiān, 3 vols., Tehran, 1983.

Jawād Şayḳ-al-Eslāmi, *Qatl-e Atābak wa šānzdah maqāla-ye taḥqiqi-e digar*, Tehran, 1988.

Sayyed Aḥmad Tafreši, *Rūz-nāma-ye aḳbār: Ruznāma-ye aḳbār-e mašruṭiyat*, Tehran, 1973.

Karim Ṭāherzāda Behzād, *Qiām-e Āḍarbāyjān dar enqelāb-e mašruṭiyat-e Irān*, Tehran, 1955.

Sayyed Ḥasan Taqizāda, *Moktaşar-e tāriḳ-e majles-e melli-e Irān*, Berlin, 1958.
Idem, *Tāriḳ-e awā'el-e enqelāb-e mašruṭiyat*, Tehran, 1959.

Idem, *Maqālāt-e Taqizāda*, ed. Iraj Afšār, 10 vols., Tehran, 1970-78.

Idem, *Zendagi-e ṭufāni: Kāṭerāt-e Sayyed Ḥasan Taqizada*, ed. Iraj Afšār, Tehran, 1993.

Ḥabīb Yağmā'i, ed., *Yād-nāma-ye Taqizāda*, Tehran, 1970.