

The formation of the National Front in Iran

Dr. Najleh Khandagh^{1*}

¹Associate Professor, Tarbiat Modaress University, استان تهران تهران Al Ahmad Street، Jalal، پلاک No. 7, Iran

DOI: [10.36347/sjahss.2022.v10i11.001](https://doi.org/10.36347/sjahss.2022.v10i11.001)

| Received: 16.10.2022 | Accepted: 11.11.2022 | Published: 14.11.2022

*Corresponding author: Dr. Najleh Khandagh

Associate Professor, Tarbiat Modaress University, استان تهران تهران Al Ahmad Street، Jalal، پلاک No. 7, Iran

Abstract

Review Article

The grounds and manner of the emergence, ups and downs and collapse of the National Front (first period) between 1949-1953 are considered to be one of the most controversial topics in the history of contemporary developments in Iran. The social and political conditions of Iran underwent a huge transformation between 1941-1957. This development was caused by the arrival of the gravediggers and the fall of Reza Shah in September 1941. In this research, the fields of one of the most important political and social forces of Iran, i.e. "National Front" in the country's political scene after the fall of Reza Shah's dictatorship are investigated. The disintegration of Reza Shah's centralized system after his fall paved the way for the emergence of social forces that had been suppressed until then. The disintegration of Reza Shah's centralized system after his downfall paved the way for the emergence of social forces that had been suppressed until then. It was expected that by weakening the position of the court, the newly emerging parties would be able to eliminate the power vacuum that had arisen in the political arena. But it soon became clear that they not only could not do this, but they themselves had to submit once again to the restored power of the court. At the same time as the crisis dominates the society, the attempt to restore the desired dictatorship of court weakens the nationalists and the freedom seekers more and more. The actions of the court to create political restrictions and deprivation of civil liberties had coincided with the efforts of the British and Iranian Oil Company to stabilize its position in Iran. These two tyrannical and colonial actions were in conflict with what the nationalist and freedom fighters were pursuing. Alignment of those who called themselves "National Front", it was normal for the governing board and the oil company. The National Front was formed by those who were disillusioned with the political-social situation, and this factor caused all these forces to be on the same National front despite their sometimes conflicting nature.

Keywords: National Front, Reza Shah, Mohammad Reza Shah, internal tyranny, foreign influence.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Due to its strategic position, Iran has always been affected by international events, and in other words, Iran's destiny is linked with international developments. It was because of this relationship that with the beginning of the World War II the situation in Iran suddenly underwent great and dramatic changes. The Soviet Union and Britain, who were competing with each other for their interests in Iran during the last two centuries, united in World War II to confront Germany and reached an understanding on the occupation of Iran and the overthrow of Reza Shah, who was accused of supporting Germany. Following this agreement, on the third of September 1941, the allied forces entered Iran and subsequently the reign of Reza Shah dictatorship ended. Although the third event of September 1941 and the entry of the foreign army into Iran was very shocking and painful for the people

of this region and caused many problems and sufferings, at the same time, it freed the nation from the yoke of Reza Shahi's dictatorship and dismantled the dictatorship and a new spirit was breathed on the half-souled body of the constitutional government, and freedom seekers were once again given a chance to express their opinions (Khosrozade, 2019, 51-89). In this way, with the fall of Reza Shah, Iranians practiced the test of democracy and for this reason concepts such as democracy, rule of law, freedom of speech, etc. are the most important topics of this period. Social forces took advantage of the situation and raised the demands and interests of social groups and strata; in this sense, various political parties and groups emerged in this period. The first party was formed by some members of the "Fifty-Three" group, whose creed was communist and was named "Tudeh Party". The Tudeh party gained many supporters among the new middle class, i.e. "intellectuals and industrial workers" (Matin-Asgari,

2018, 79-93). But in practice, this party could not choose an independent policy for itself and from the very beginning it became a tool for Soviet diplomacy in Iran, and this factor caused it to be marginalized from the political arena.

During this period, the absence of a superior political power was well felt in the country's political arena, many centers of power were created. As various researchers such as Ervand Abrahamian have said, in this period, power had multiplied and was divided among several institutions and groups, such as: the king and the court, the prime minister and the cabinet, the parliament, etc. scattered and there was no dominant power that could control other centers (Ricks, 1983, 268-270). Mohammad Reza Shah was still very young and inexperienced and did not have the ability to confront other forces and in fact, Mohammad Reza Shah was considered a spectator in the political scene until the middle of the 1941s. The presence of foreigners in the country brought many economic problems in addition to political complications. The lack of food, the rise in the price of essential goods, the various needs of the Allies and the inability of the government to collect agricultural products and prevent hoarding of food had made the economic situation unstable.

Another characteristic of Iranian society after the fall of Reza Shah is the flourishing of another stage of nationalism. This nationalism had two basic characteristics: 1: the fight against tyranny and internal corruption 2: opposition to foreign interference and influence; The nationalists objected to the incompetence of the government and the ruling body and its inability to deal with administrative-financial corruption and to ensure the basic rights of the people of the society. In general, it was dissatisfaction with the existing situation that provided the ground for the emergence of the "National Front" (Lambton, 1957, 12-25). In the domestic context, the main goal of the protests was towards the ruling body, and in the foreign dimension, it was aimed at the Iran-British Oil Company, which was considered as a symbol and a base of influence of the colonialists. In the opinion of Iranian freedom seekers, the root of many of Iran's political and social miseries and failures lies in the existence and presence of this company and in fact, it was the activities of this company in the country that led nationalist forces together and put aside differences. A matter that initially resulted in success, but finally, due to the tensions that arose between them, divisions were created among these nationalist forces, especially the "National Front", which itself resulted in many consequences for the country. Undoubtedly, the collapse and its side effects require a lot of extensive research, which is beyond the scope of this discussion considering the topic of this discussion, i.e. "grounds for the formation of the National Front" (Mokhtari, 2008, 457-488).

Research History

In the book "History of the National Front", Ahmad Maliki believes that the name "National Front" was first given to the group that together with Dr. Mossadegh took the court to protest the non-free elections of the 16th term of the National Council. In the book "Liberal Nationalism in Iran" (Maleki, 2007, 52-9). Suzan Siavashi has investigated liberal nationalism and the influence of its supporters in the country's political scene. One of the basic issues that has been noticed by the author is the composition of the National Front, which he has briefly introduced, but his review is not very detailed and has fundamental weaknesses, such as the image he presented of Mossadegh is not very acceptable. He described Mossadegh in a way that is more like dictators than a democratic person (Siavoshi, 2008, 135-7).

In the book "Iran Between Two Revolutions", Ervand Abrahamian has presented a sociological study with a Marxist perspective on the structure of the National Front and its parties. He considers internal mismanagement and America's plan to be important factors in the collapse of the National Front (Abrahamian, 1982, 379-385).

"The National Front according to the SAVAK documents" is a book in which the SAVAK documents about the "National Front" have been published. The book contains extensive explanations about the history of the idea of nationalism in Iran, the policies and religious principles of the nationalism movement and the idea of nationalism, the historical performance of this current in the contemporary history of Iran, the history of the first to fourth National Front, their leaders and their actions (Prepared by Historical Document Review Center Publications, 2000, 221-25).

Gholamreza Nejati has authored a two-volume book called "Mossadegh Years of Struggle and Resistance". This work is a political biography, but because the fate of Mossadegh and the National Front are not separate from each other, it is considered one of the important sources about this organization. The author himself was from the military branch of the Nationalist Front and was one of the activists of the "Nationalist Officers' Organization", but his affiliation with the National Front did not make the author deal with a valuable issue and investigate it impartially. This book, like many other works of Mossadegh government, has analyzed the fields of formation of the National Front and its structure and nature in brief (Nejati, 1999, 487-493).

Fakhreddin Azimi has presented a new analysis about the opponents of the National Front by examining the political environment and conditions of Iran at that time in his book "National Sovereignty and its Enemies". He believes that the National Front's internal and external opponents are connected and

ignoring each of them harms the importance of the work. Azimi emphasizes the role of Kashani, Makki, Baghai and Haerizadeh in overthrowing Mossadegh government. He also points out that Mossadegh's supporters were not so strong and coherent that they could help him in critical moments and they did not have a good political vision to analyze the situation and protect the National Front against dangers, which threatened it (Azimi, 2022, 115-19).

Katouzian in the book "Mossadegh and the Struggle for Power", which is actually a political biography and a suitable source for examining the National Front. First, it introduces Mossadegh and his political activities before the formation of the National Front, and then enters into the discussions related to the National Movement. He links the grounds for the formation of the national Front to the tobacco movement and in fact considers the national movement to be the completion of the constitutional revolution (1906) (Katouzian, 1999, 227-234).

Gravand, in collaboration with other authors, in an article titled "Formation of National Front Discourse: Internal Split and the Coup of August 19, 1953" investigates the formation of the National Front, the causes of its creation, the internal split and how the coup of August 19, 1953 took place. They it is looking for the answer to this question: Why was the National Front party coalition able to achieve stability and political stability in the government structure after achieving its goal (national oil)? In order to find suitable answers, he considers his hypothesis that the national Front was formed with the aim of the national oil industry and gaining political-economic independence of Iran; But after achieving it due to the creation of internal gaps and weakness in the institutionalization of their achievements, the competitors found the opportunity to marginalize it (Gravand, Suri, & Suri Lekki, 2016, 61-90).

Karimi Melleh in an article entitled "Forty-year history of the National Front" deals with the history of the formation, activity and developments of the National Front from 1949 to 1989. He considers the formation of the First National Front to be the result of the necessity of organizing the irregular and disorganized political masses and the necessity of creating a power base and center of political struggle against the government after World War II (Karimi Melleh, 1996, 23-63).

Grounds for the formation of the National Front

Some researchers attribute the formation of the National Front and the nationalization movement of industry to movements like the Reggie incident. But in general, the emergence of the national movement was the result of the efforts of Iranians to modernize the society and maintain the independence of the country and establish the rule of law after the fall of Reza Shah,

the ground was once again provided to achieve these goals (Ghods, 1991, 219-230). The formation of the National Front was a result of the developments that occurred in the political, social and economic structure of the country, for this reason, in order to better deal with these developments involved in the formation of the National Front, we will examine each one separately.

Political and economic fields

1. Attempt on Shah's life:

Hajir's government, which proved ineffective in solving problems, there for Hajir had to resign as prime minister. Mohammad Saed Maragheh was appointed by the Shah to form the cabinet in November. Saed, like the previous prime ministers, faced the problem of oil and related contracts. But the assassination attempt on the Shah's life had a great impact on the process of the oil issue and the government's plans (Zirinsky, 1992, 639-663).

After the events in Azerbaijan, Mohammad Reza Shah gradually revealed his true face. By interfering in the affairs of the experienced and legislative power and weakening powerful people like Qavam and appointing prime ministers loyal to the court like Hajir, he wanted to strengthen the foundations of his monarchy like Reza Shah and implement his own dictatorship. Mohammad Reza Shah had not yet provided a suitable opportunity to implement his plans. Because after the collapse of Rezashahi's centralized political structure, influential figures such as Qavam and Mossadegh found a stronger role in the political scene. Before the incident in Azerbaijan, the Tudeh party played an important role in the political scene. After the Azerbaijan uprising, the Tudeh party faced a crisis from within, and Khalil Maliki, Ishaq Eprim and Anwar Khameei left the Tudeh party due to there differences with others. These differences stemmed from Tudeh party's support of Azerbaijan's democratic sect, participation in Qavam's cabinet, the way of choosing central core members and subordinates of Soviet politics (Tabatabai, 2020, 97-146).

The Shah intended to achieve his goals through cabinets and the appointment of submissive prime ministers such as Hakimi and Hajir. The heavy shadow of the dictatorship was getting wider day by day, and this caused the dissatisfaction of the freedom-loving political forces and their warning about the return of the dictatorship. The way the chosen government was not compatible with human laws. Terror reigned over the country and efforts were made to remove the obstacles of the dictatorship. Hakimi and Hajir promised the Shah to Amendments to the Constitution, but they failed to do so. Saed also had this plan in mind, but instead of trying to implement it, a suitable excuse was provided. Shah was assassinated on the 4 February 1949 during the celebration of the

anniversary of the establishment of Tehran University. The assailant, Nasser Fakharaei, had a reporter's card of the Parkhom Islam newspaper with him. Shah survived this assassination attempt, but his assailant was killed on the spot. Different opinions have been expressed about this action and its perpetrators (New York Times, February 5, 1949). Some writers consider it to be the plan of the British, in the speech of this group, their anti-English point of view should not be ignored. According to their opinion the British government wanted to extend the oil contract, so it wanted to threaten Mohammad Reza Shah and his companions with this action. Some consider this action to be a pre-planned that the king designed to achieve his goals (Scott Cooper, 2008, 567-591).

The Tudeh party and religious groups were the main suspects in this incident, it seems that religious elements did not play a role in this action because the clerics considered the Shah as the embodiment of Iran's independence and authority. Accusing Kashani of involvement in this action was only to create suffocation in the country. Kashani had not taken any action against the Shah, but the extremists assassinated him. Dr. Fereydon Keshavarz, a leader of the Tudeh party, says that Kyanori, one of the leaders of the party, knew about Fakharaei's plan to assassinate the Shah. In the meeting of the central board of the party, they had proposed a plan to assassinate the Shah, most of the party leaders were against it because they considered turning to armed measures dangerous for the continuation of the party's activities, but Kayanuri maintained his relationship with Fakhr Arai and encouraged him to assassinate the Shah.

Some consider Razmara to be involved in this action and believe that this plan was designed by Razmara in cooperation with the Tudeh party in order to prepare the ground for the change of the monarchy in favor of Razmara by assassinating the king. The issue that strengthens this opinion is that the Chief of Army Staff used to accompany the Shah in ceremonies such as the 4th of February*, but Razmara was not present in this ceremony and the assailant was immediately shot by the bodyguards and killed.

*February 4th is the day when the Shah went to the officers' university to perform the ritual of parade and sight seeing with units of the imperial army.

In any case, it should be seen who benefited the most from this action. After the assassination of the king, the court and the government quickly started to take advantage of the opportunity. After the failure of Trevor Shah, Kashani was exiled to Beirut. The Tudeh Party was declared illegal and an order was issued to pursue and arrest its leaders (Huw, Sandra. & Peter. 2007, 93-116).

Saed used this opportunity and requested a vote of confidence from the parliament on February 5th. Out of 93 people present in the parliament, 89 people voted for him and only four people voted against him. This action of the parliament gave the government more self-confidence, therefore, it considered the field suitable for the implementation of its plans. The representatives, who were greatly intimidated, did not have the ability to oppose any of the proposed bills. Another factor that affected the silence of the representatives was the election of the 16th parliament, because if they oppose the government's bills, they would lose the chance to participate in the 16th parliament. Dr. Zanganeh, the Minister of Culture, in the first step, sent the press restriction bill to punish the perpetrators of press crimes to cancel their privileges to the parliament for approval, which was easily and approved immediately by the parliament. But the most important plan of the government was to increase the powers of the king. The bill to establish the Constituent Assembly to increase the authority of the Shah was approved by the Parliament, the right to form the Senate and dissolve it was handed over to the Shah, and in this way, both the Shah achieved his wish and the half-democracy that was created during these years after the fall of Reza Shah. It threatened the existing system and sounded the alarm for the constitutional system (Torabipour, Bigdeli, & Ahmadinab, 2022, 3703-3717).

A few months after these events, in the summer of 1949, the Iran Party criticized the return of the dictatorship by issuing a statement emphasizing the backwardness of the country and the low level of literacy and social welfare. That party believed that the only solution to the problems was to create a "democratic government".

2. Economic situation

The occupation of Iran by the allied forces had an undesirable effect on the country's economic situation, and Iran once again experienced enormous economic problems, similar to the World War I. The key economic sectors, namely agriculture, industry and domestic and foreign trade, were severely damaged by the occupation. The railroad was taken over by the allies and this caused internal trade to be largely shut down. Allies' need for raw materials (foods) and bad harvest caused famine in many regions of the country. The post-war period did not provide a suitable solution for economic problems. Allied forces spent a lot of money, which fueled inflation. The war caused some people of the upper and middle classes of society who dealt with goods and credit to get a suitable and new opportunity to profit. In this way, the people of the lower classes of the society and those who had a fixed income were bankrupt (Walton, 1980, 271-292). The war also had an effect on disrupting the social fabric of the country and became a factor to further stimulate urbanization and large groups of businessmen,

professionals and those who worked in public services were employed by the Allies. In addition, the working class increased because new railways, construction operations and the development of oil-rich areas and refineries all required workers. One of the factors that contributed to the expansion of the working class was the damage done to the agricultural sector because this sector attracted 25% of the labor force and provided 50% of the gross domestic product before the occupation of the country. There was a drastic drop in production and the production of basic agricultural products and livestock breeding was reduced during the occupation (Mahdavy, 1965, 137-146).

The chaotic economic situation was such that in some places people had turned to eating grass to relieve hunger. The industrial sector was not very productive and the economic crisis had a direct impact on the livelihood of the workers, so they went on strike and sanctuary. The activation of trade unions after the fall of Reza Shah, which were formed to organize workers' activities and were directly connected with the Tudeh party. In the oil-rich areas of the south, where the most skilled and highly paid industrial workers were employed there, the trade union activity was very clear and obvious, and through it the workers not only raised their demands, but also intervened in political issues. The workers in these areas were dissatisfied most of their dissatisfaction was caused by the all-round discrimination that was applied against them, not only in terms of salaries and wages. Rather, it was applied even in other cases compared to British employees. The unrest in the south was very widespread and the central government under the influence of Iran and England Oil Company suppressed the strikers in 1946 (Abbasi, 2015).

On the other hand, the farming class was under severe economic pressure in the 1940s and suffered from severe poverty because inflation, both during the war and after. Because the structure of agriculture in Iran was the same as in medieval times, the system of serf lords was still established and was done according to traditional agricultural methods. Apart from middle peasants or prosperous peasants, most of the villagers were agricultural workers whose land was insufficient and their living standards were very low. The main characteristic of the serfdom system was ownership taxes in such a way that the product was divided between the owner and the serf based on the general rule, i.e. in proportion to the five factors of production, labor, land, water, cattle and seeds, therefore, little income was given to the farmers and most of the income went to the owners. Since the serfs owned only one of the five factors of production, they were always exploited in the most severe way by the big owners and government agents. Before the formation of the National Front, the only action that was taken to improve the situation of farmers was the approval of the letters issued by the government in 1946 stating that "in

all parts of the country, taking into account the customary years of each place, fifteen shares will be added to the farmer and this the additional amount was fifteen shares of the owners, which was given to the farmer as a contribution from the owner's share" (Majd, 2016, 557-563). It was obvious that this ratification did not bring about any fundamental changes because the conservatives, who were big landowners themselves, sought to consolidate their position from the mid-1940s, and the revival of the conservative forces destroyed the effect of this ratification. The farmers did not welcome it either and it was finally abandoned (Erkan, 2010, 109-132).

3. Additional Contract

Gas-Golshaian contract or "Additional contract" is a contract that was signed on June 29, 1949 between the government of Iran and the representatives of Iran and British oil companies as an appendix to the 1933 contract. According to this contract, the oil company accepted adjustments in the amounts paid to Iran. The name of the contract is taken from the names of two of the negotiators, Sir Neville Gass (from the company officials) and Abbas Qoli Golshahian (Iran's Minister of Finance). This contract was not approved by the National Assembly due to the efforts of the minority of the 15th parliament, especially Hossein Fatemi and Hossein Makki, and instead, the law of nationalization of the oil industry was approved in the 16th Parliament (Ghasimi, 2011, 442-456).

B - Intellectual and social fields

One of the distinctive features of the 1940s was the publication of various newspapers. Although these newspapers were not of high quality, they had a significant effect on increasing the political and social awareness of the society, and through them people were aware of the plight of the society. The newspaper "Bakhtar Emrooz" by editorship Dr. Fatemi and "Shahed" by editorship Ali Zohri had a great impact on people's awareness. In his editorials, Shahed criticized the medieval and backward politics of Britain. "Until today, Britain has been able to base its policy on superstitions, grudges, lust and other natural human instincts. It is true that people have not changed, but only resorting to vices cannot ensure the happiness of the British. Globalist tendencies have been found that will no longer allow British to behave as before and if the Britain want to have friends in the East, they must consider their policy (Gheissari, & Nasr. 2006, 45-74)." Another order had ruled the world, and Britain did not have the authority of the past, and in order to maintain its position, it was necessary to pay attention to the intellectual and social developments of the countries in which it had interests. This article is one of the newspaper articles "anti-colonialism" newspaper articles, and this ideology gradually became the dominant ideology and gradually prepared the people for a "national movement". "Bakhtar Emrooz" newspaper strongly criticized the policy of foreign governments

regarding Iran and the state of poverty and intellectual backwardness of the country. He considered Iran to be a spectacular and interesting country for Europeans due to the presence of millions of hungry and poor, slaves and owners, servants and masters.

The emergence of parties also had a great impact on people's awakening. The Tudeh party played an important role in this way and was effective in increasing the awareness of the working class about their rights (Miyata, 1987, 313-328). Therefore, they tried to assert their rights. For example, the workers in the southern regions made a lot of effort in this way. One of their biggest measures to secure their interests was the strike of oil workers in June 1926. Although the Tudeh party played an important role in political and social developments, but some believe that the party prevented the emergence of a comprehensive national movement. For this reason, it prevented the formation of an anti-colonial movement until the Tudeh party had an active presence on the scene. But after its suppression, the objective ground for the formation of the "National Front Party" was provided (Ranjbar Daemi, 2021, 617-635).

Formation of the National Front

1. 16th parliament elections

Saed's government failed to get the Additional contract bill approved by the 15th Parliament, so the main plan of the government and the court was to strictly monitor the elections of the 16th Parliament in order to elect representatives who are loyal to them. The court and supporters of British politics and the Iranian and British oil company wanted to elect representatives why to obey the command so that they can easily pass the bills, in particular, the Additional contract bill should be approved by the parliament. Some ministers, the prime minister and the chief of the army staff had a strict supervision of the elections to prevent the election of their opponents to the parliament. In addition to the Additional contract, another issue considered by the court was the amendment of the constitution, which the "constituent assembly" entrusted to the National Parliament in April 1949. In order to show himself neutral, on the 13nd of August, the court appointed Mohammad Sadegh Tabatabani, who was considered a reliable person, as the head of the monitoring committee for the elections of the 16th parliament. The purpose of this appointment was to take advantage of Tabatabai's relatively bright records as a constitutionalist and pro-democracy person, to validate the validity of the 16th Parliament elections (Toro, 2021, 37-45).

With the start of elections in early September in different cities; The court, the army and the influential owners had a strict control over the elections. This action caused many protests from pro-freedom political forces. The Tudeh party had already been declared illegal, so it could not take any action against

the elections. Nationalist forces criticized the way it was held. Fatemi wrote about this in the editorial of "Bakhtar Emroz" newspaper." The elections of the 16th Parliament were worse than the elections of the 15th Parliament" Due to mismanagement in the elections of the 16th Parliament, a group of people protested this, but the pro-court press denied the involvement of the Shah and attributed it to military officers who are trying to deprive the people of their freedom. In Tehran, the first protest against the management of 16th parliamentary elections on September 13 began. Some journalists and newspaper managers gathered together with the minority of the 15th Parliament at Dr. Mossadegh's house and protested the government's action (Kauz, Khosravi Sharoudi & Rieck, 2001, 57-84). Most of the Newspaper Managers took part in this meeting. This group believed that the only solution to the country's problems is the freedom of elections and the establishment of democracy. This group decided to take sanctuary in National Front of the royal palace to convince the government to accept their demands. For this end, by publishing a declaration, they asked all freedom seekers to help this group. On the 15rd of October, a large crowd of Tehran people gathered in National Front of the palace in support of this call. In a letter to the Shah, Mossadegh criticized the Mismanagement in elections and asked him to respond to the people's complaints and protests. In his letter, Mossadegh considered preventing healthy elections to be harmful to the independence of the country and said that the government should not provide an excuse for the border tribes to turn to a foreign government to meet their needs and asked the Shah to appoint more reliable people to monitor the elections.

In response to the protestors, Shah announced that the elections will be held in complete freedom and requested to negotiate with a person representing the people. Definitely, the desired representative was Mossadegh, but he rejected this offer. Hajir - the minister of the court - asked the protestors to choose some people as representatives and stay in the court until the situation is clarified. Some people were selected from among those present, and these people were the core of the National Front, which formed the "National Front Party" some time later. The important point that can be seen in this action of the freedom fighters is that despite knowing about the court's plans, they appealed to the Shah himself to handle the protest. It seems that the most important goal of the nationalists was to make the king understand that he swore to the constitution and loyalty to the constitutional government, but he ignored them with his actions and that he only has the right to reign, not rule. The Shah hoped that this time, like the 15th Parliament, the protestors would end their sanctuary, so he refused to respond to their request. The protestors went on a hunger strike to put more pressure on the king. They did not get any results and were forced to end their sit-in on

18 October by issuing a statement (Efimenco, 1955, 390-406).

In this statement, the oppression of the Iranian nation was once again emphasized. The freedom seekers could not ignore the lies of the ruling body. In the declaration, the point that was emphasized was that "the main goal of the ruling body to interfere in the elections was to spoil the huge oil reserves and align with the British policy." The most important advantage of the sanctuary was to organize the freedom seekers and in fact, the election is considered as an accelerating and effective factor in the formation of the National front and group unity as the leaders of the national movement. It was because of the disappointment of from the court that they thought of forming a coalition National front.

2. Naming the National Front

In the beginning, freedom seekers and nationalists were known as "Court Occupant Board". Ahmad Maleki, one of the founders of the National Front, believes that after Hejir's assassination, the court siege team gathered at Mossadegh's house and chose the name "National Front" for the group. The following decisions were made during the meetings of the "Court sanctuaries Committee" in Mossadegh house: 1: This board chose the name "National Front" for itself. 2. A commission was elected to prepare the constitution and regulations of the National Front. 3- The advertising commission composed of newspaper managers and some members of the National Front was formed to promote the "National Front's" programs. In countries that do not have strong and coherent parties, political groups usually try to form an all-encompassing National Front so that they can unite all fighters and groups that pursue the same goal. According to Mossadegh's definition of the National Front, "the National Front is the center of parties, communities, and organizations that have their own organizations and have no goals other than freedom and independence" (Gasiorowski, 2004, 60-1). This ideal is not something that a small number of thinkers can implement in the country. The executor of this ideal should be the Iranian nation. Leaving some people abroad and not accepting them for any reason is against the interests of the country."

Dr. Fatemi had a great influence in naming the National Front. Maliki attributes the naming of the National Front to Dr. Fatemi and says in this regard: "Regarding the discussions about the country's situation, Dr. Fatemi said in a speech, "Now the benefits of collective work have become clear to all comrades, the power and influence of unity has become clear to everyone. How good are these people for doing important political and state work?" Let's join hands and start fighting for the progress of various national goals under a special order and discipline in the name of the National Front" (Gheissari, 2010, 64).

The point that comes to mind is why the nationalists did not form a coherent party to continue their activities and started forming a National Front, that is, a collection of parties and groups. In this regard, several points should be noted. First: The political and social situation governing the society should be such that it is not possible to form a strong party. "National Front" was formed in a special and exceptional situation. In Iran, it was not possible to form a strong party without dependence on a foreign power and this contradicted the neutral policy that the nationalists had adopted. "Relying on one party would limit the activity of freedom seekers and their social base." "National Front" was a name that magnetically attracted people. Dr. Fatemi believed that in Iran, the formation of a party contradicts the interests of several groups. A: Foreign policy, which has full influence in the country. Their supporters sit behind the tables and hold the people's destinies in their hands. B: The second group are those who do not want to lose their medieval privileges. They are big landowners and owners of capital, when they see that their privileges and feudal interests are affected, they will prevent the formation of the party with their lives. C: The third group are those who have made religion their shop and as soon as they see that a political party is being formed, they destroy the political organization in their own way with the weapon (religion) they have.

The second reason for not forming a party should be found in Mossadegh's personality. He was present in the political scene of Iran since the constitutional revolution and he had observed the failure of the parties during this period and he knew very well that turning to the party at this time is a big risk and the groups can be united only in the form of a National Front (Abrahamian, 2008, 115).

He says about this, "My opinion is that there is no big party in Iran. Because everyone wants to be part of the governing and committee" Mossadegh considered himself the speaker of the nation and considering the history of the party in Iran, he did not want to get involved in party and group disputes. In the struggle that Mossadegh had undertaken, he needed the support of all national and religious forces, and he was well aware that if he relied on a particular party, he would not only lose some of his supporters but also increase his opponents. This point should be kept in mind, among the supporters of Mossadegh and the National Front, there were people who did not believe in working within the framework of the party (Lorentz, 2010, 224).

3. Hajir's assassination and its results:

Hajir was trying to finish the elections and open the parliament before the Shah's trip to America. But he never succeeded. In order to prevent his actions, the Fadayan Islam organization assigned one of their

members, Hossein Emami, to assassinate Hajir. As a result of the propaganda against Hajir, many people considered him to be the main cause of election fraud. His closeness to England and his absolute command from the Shah and Ashraf (Shah's sister) strengthened this opinion. At first, the ruling body was trying to attribute Hajir's assassination to Mossadegh and Kashani in order to suppress the National Front. Attributing Hajir's assassination to Mossadegh was not correct because Mossadegh never supported violent actions. Even during his prime ministership, he had not used such a method against his opponents. Another point in this case is that Mossadegh did not have a relationship with the Fadaeiyan Islam that he wanted to use to implement his plan. Hajir did not have a good relationship with Kashani and was against Kashani return to Iran but Kashani never sought revenge (Behdad, 1997, 48).

Hajir's assassination dealt a severe blow to the court. The king lost one of his closest allies, and according to the British ambassador, the king no longer had anyone to speak for him. Hajir's assassination gave the ruling body a good opportunity to use the situation and suppress the opposition. Razmara had complete control over the situation, declared martial law in Tehran. On the advice of the military governor of Tehran, Mossadegh went to Ahmad Abad (his home). Some of Mossadegh's companions were released and others were arrested. Severe restrictions were placed on the press and some newspapers were banned (The Canberra Times. 7 June 1951).

The governing body could not continue the pressure and intimidation procedure, with the increasing criticism and attacks of the opposition on the government's policy, the governing body was forced to retreat. On the 9th of November, the elections in Tehran were declared invalid; Tabatabai, the head of the Election Monitoring Association, announced in a message that the elections were not held in full freedom, and he resigned from his position after this admission. The good fortune of the nationalists at that time was that the Shah wanted to travel to America. Before the trip, he was facing several problems and there was a possibility that if he did not solve them, it would be a problem for him. The presence of a powerful person like Razmara at the head of the army, the dissatisfaction of the freedom fighters and nationalists, then the Shah traveled to America, he wanted to travel to a country whose people were famous for freedom in the eyes of Iranians. He wanted to show himself as a freedom-loving person, that's why he tried to satisfy the demands of freedom-seekers and disgruntled nationalists. In the first move, the Shah appointed Major General Zahedi, one of Razmara's rivals, who had a close relationship with the nationalists, as the head of Shahr bani. It seems that one of the Shah's goals in these changes was to show that he is not a take order from Britain and that he does not take

orders from any foreign power in the removal and installation of key posts (Awsatí, 2003, Vol .1, 247-255).

After these changes, some leaders of the National Front who were in detention were released and the restrictions imposed on Mossadegh and other members of the National Front were lifted. National Front members resumed their activities. Dr. Fatemi once again dedicated his fiery editorials in the "Bakhtar Emoraz" newspaper to reforms and how to do them. He considered the invalidity of the elections as the beginning of transformation in Iran. He criticized the state of society and introduced the policy of foreign governments as the main cause of Iran's backwardness. The first step for transformation should start from the parliament. While the nationalists protested the way the elections were held, the Times of London criticized the action of the National Front and wrote:" Although there is no apparent threat of a dictatorship, Mossadegh and his colleagues have used it as an excuse to oppose the ruling body because they have no chance of success in the elections."

On the one hand, the members of the National Front faced the flexibility of the government's policy and on the other hand, they were very popular among the people. They unabashedly criticized the policy of the government and the army chief and the declaration of martial law. Mossadegh considered military rule against the constitution and asked the government to abolish it to respect freedom. Beqaei believed that the army is responsible for suppressing the society. His criticisms were so bitter that the military governor of Tehran once again detained him. On the 8th of February, the elections in Tehran and several other constituencies were held again. At the invitation of the National Front, a large demonstration was held in Baharestan. Mossadegh, the leader of the National Front, gave a speech in this demonstration and criticized the government's attempt to shut down constitutionalism and fraud in city elections and said:" Individual and collective freedom is lost in Iran. The press is not free, while the free press is the promoter of freedom and herald of constitutionalism and democracy. The movement that started from Tehran shows that the people of Iran have the ability to digest democracy. Some freedom fighters formed an organization called "Election Freedom Monitoring Organization" after the election" (Assadi, 2012).

This organization was established in September by some students and young people who support freedom and its leadership was entrusted to Baghaie. The newspaper "Shahed" was the advertising speaker of this organization. In the elections, the organization cooperated with some other groups, including students who were related to the Mujahid Muslim Assembly organization. Despite the strong monitoring of the elections by the nationalists, the leader of the National Front again warned of the

possibility of fraud in the elections and called the second round elections in Tehran shameful. The National Front considered the government's action in not fulfilling its promise to establish democracy, freedom and justice to be far from humanity and the constitution. The success of the National Front in Tehran elections was undeniable; Due to the strict supervision of the National Front on the elections of the ruling body, it could not hold the elections according to its wish. The only area in which the government had the ability to exert influence was Lavasanat constituency, which the leaders of the National front protested against its fraud. The National Front was determined to declare the Lavasanat elections as illegal by the Election Monitoring Association. Considering the fraud in this area, the probability of success of the conservative representatives was higher. In April 1950, the Election Monitoring Association declared Lavasan elections invalid. With the cancellation of these elections, seven representatives of the National Front entered the 16th Parliament (Mahdinia, 1999, 258-265).

The 16th Parliament was opened on the 9th of February 1950 with the presence of the Shah. Representatives of the National Front and other representatives of Tehran entered the parliament on the 6th of May 1950. Representatives of the National Front formed the "Vatan Faction". After entering the parliament, the Vatan Faction announced its plan to enforce Iran's rights to South oil and revise the election law.

CONCLUSION

The National Front of Iran is an opposition political organization in Iran, founded by Mohammad Mosaddegh in 1949. It is the oldest and arguably the largest pro-democracy group operating inside Iran despite having never been able to recover the prominence it had in the early 1950s. Initially, the National Front was an umbrella organization for a broad spectrum of forces with nationalist, liberal-democratic, socialist, bazaari, secular and Islamic tendencies, that mobilized to successfully campaign for the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry. In 1951, the National Front formed a government which was deposed by the 1953 Iranian coup d'état and subsequently repressed.

The National Front was responsible for the nationalization of the British-owned Iranian oil industry in 1951. Its influence declined after the Anglo-American coup of 1953, which overthrew Mohammad Mossadegh and reinstated Mohammad Reza Pahlavi as shah. The rise of the National Front was triggered by opposition to parliamentary election fraud. In October 1949 Mossadegh led a delegation to the shah's palace to protest the lack of free elections. A committee of twenty members was then formed to negotiate with the court minister, who promised to end electoral problems. The

same committee later met at Mossadegh's house to form the National Front as a parliamentary faction. The National Front's diverse wings included social democrats, constitutional monarchists, and Islamists (led by clerics). Its social base consisted of bazaar merchants and craft guilds, members of the small industrial bourgeoisie, and urban professional middle classes. The National Front tried to enhance its political position by using the postwar rivalry between Britain and the United States for influence in Iran.

With opposition to foreign domination as its main goal, the National Front focused on ending British control of Iran's oil industry. The British rejected its demand for total Iranian control and equal profit-sharing with the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. When the parliament nationalized Iranian oil, the shah delayed signing the bill, finally doing so in April 1950 when Mossadegh was elected prime minister.

Facing a British boycott of Iranian oil and increasing American hostility, Mossadegh's government encountered serious difficulties. The National Front's initial strength was its unification of disparate ideological and political currents under the banner of oil nationalization. But with the rapid polarization of Iranian politics in the early 1950s and under intense foreign pressure, the National Front began to unravel. Most significantly, its conservative and religious factions began opposing Mossadegh's defiant secular nationalism and defected to the monarchist and Anglo-American camp.

In general, as mentioned, the National Front was a product of the situation that ruled over Iran. The political and social situation of Iran changed with the arrival of the Allies. The emergence of parties and the publication of newspapers and the competition of foreign governments to obtain oil concessions had a great impact on the political and social awareness of the people. Thoughts such as hatred of foreign influence and patriotism opened their place in the society. Opposition to imperialism and dictatorship temporarily united the new and traditional middle class political forces, so political parties and groups gathered under the banner of the National Front.

REFERENCES

- Khosrozade, S. (2019). The status and social position of the military in the first Pahlavi period and its impact on the September 1941 events, *Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 51-89.
- Matin-Asgari, A. (2018). *Subverting Constitutionalism: Intellectuals as Instruments of Modern Dictatorship*, Published online by Cambridge University Press, p.p. 79-93.
- Ricks, T. M. (1983). *Reviewed Work: Iran between Two Revolutions by Ervand Abrahamian*, Published by Middle East Institute, 37(2), 268-270.

- Lambton, A. K. S. (1957). *The Impact of the West on Persia*, Published By: Oxford University Press (International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)), 33(1), 12-25.
- Mokhtari, F. (2008). Iran's 1953 Coup Revisited: Internal Dynamics versus External Intrigue, *Middle East Journal*, 62(3), 457-488.
- Maleki, A. (2007). *Memoirs of Ahmed Maleki, the director of the Star newspaper (The History of the National Front)*, Islamic Revolution Documents Center.
- Siavoshi, S. (2008). *Liberal nationalism in Iran*, Publisher: Baz, second edition, pp.135-137.
- Abrahamian, E. (1982). *Iran Between Two Revolutions (Princeton Studies on the Near East)*, Princeton University Press, pp. 379-385.
- Prepared by Historical Document Review Center Publications. (2000). *The National Front according to the SAVAK documents*, publish by: Publications of Historical Documents Review Center, pp. 221-225.
- Nejati, G. H. (1999). *Mossadegh: Years of Struggle and Resistance (Volume 1,2)*, Publisher: Rasa, second edition, pp. 487-493.
- Azimi, F. (2022). *National Sovereignty and its Enemies*, Publications: Nagareh Aftab, fourth edition, pp.112-115.
- Katouzian, H. (1999). *Musaddiq and the Struggle for Power in Iran*, Publisher: I.B.Tauris, fifth edition.
- Gravand, M., Suri, A., & Suri Lekki, M. A. (2016). *Formation of National Front Discourse: Internal Split and the Coup of August 19, 1953*, Historical approach, 17, 61-90.
- Karimi Melleh, A. (1996). *Forty-year history of the National Front*, 15th Khordad Quarterly, first term, 21, 23-63.
- Ghods, M. A. (1991). *Government and Society in Iran, 1926-34*, Middle Eastern Studies, 27(2), pp. 219-230.
- Zirinsky, M. P. (1992). *Imperial Power and Dictatorship: Britain and the Rise of Reza Shah, 1921-1926*, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 24(4), 639-663.
- Tabatabai, A. M. (2020). *The Last King: Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, The Autocratic Reformer*, Oxford University Press, pp. 97-146.
- New York Times, (February 5, 1949). *Ruler of Iran Is Wounded Slightly by Two Bullets Fired by Assassin* <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/library/world/mideast/020549iran-assassin.html>
- Scott Cooper, A. (2008). *Showdown at Doha: The Secret Oil Deal That Helped Sink the Shah of Iran*, *Middle East Journal*, 62(4), 567-591.
- Huw, T. O. D., Sandra, M. N., & Peter, C. S. (2007). *Evidence-based policy and practice in public services*, The Policy Press University of Bristol, 93-116.
- Torabipour, O., Bigdeli, A., & Ahmadinasab, N. (2022). *Examining the events of the 16th Parliament based on the role of the National Front*, *Political Society Research*, 5(12), 3703-3717.
- Walton, T. (1980). *Economic development and revolutionary upheavals in Iran*, *Cambridge Journal of Economic*, 4(3), 271-292.
- Mahdavy, H. (1965). *The Coming Crisis in Iran*, *Foreign Affairs*, 44(1), 134-146.
- Abbasi, S. (2015). *8-10 million Iranians died over Great Famine caused by the British in late 1910s, documents reveal*, <https://english.khamenei.ir/>
- Majd, M. G. H. (2016). *Iran Under Allied Occupation In World War II: The Bridge to Victory & A Land of Famine*, Publisher: UPA, 557-563.
- Erkan, S. (2010). *The Invasion Of Iran By The Allies During World War II*, <http://codrulcosminului.usv.ro/>
- Ghasimi, R. (2011). *Iran's Oil Nationalization and Mossadegh's Involvement with the World Bank*, *Middle East Journal*, 65(3), 442-456.
- Gheissari, A., & Nasr, V. (2006). *The Triumph of the State, 1941-1979*, Oxford Academic, pp. 45-74.
- Miyata, O. (1987). *The Tudeh Military Network during the Oil Nationalization Period*, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 23(3), pp. 313-328.
- Ranjbar Daemi, S. (2021). *The Tudeh Party of Iran and the land reform initiatives of the Pahlavi state*, *Middle Eastern Studies* 1958-1964, 58(4), 617-635.
- Toro, M. E. (2021). *The Rise and Fall of Mosaddeq: Political Survival, Ideology, and Revolutionary Coalitions*, University of Washington, pp. 37-45.
- Kauz, R., Khosravi Sharoudi, H., & Rieck, A. (2001). *Iran, Middle East, Central Asia, and South Asia*, (1), pp. 57-84.
- Efimenco, N. M. (1955). *An Experiment with Civilian Dictatorship in Iran; The Case of Mohammed Mossadegh*, *The Journal of Politics*, 17(3), 390-406.
- Gasiorowski, M. J. (2004). *Mohammad Mosaddeq and the 1953 Coup in Iran*. Syracuse University Press. pp. 60-61.
- Gheissari, A. (2010). *Iranian Intellectuals in the Twentieth Century*. University of Texas Press. p. 64.
- Abrahamian, E. (2008). *A History of Modern Iran*, Cambridge University Press, p. 115.
- Lorentz, J. H. (2010). *National Front". Scarecrow Press. Vol. 209. p. 224.*
- Behdad, S. (1997). "Islamic Utopia in pre-revolutionary Iran: Navvab Safavi and the Fadayian-e Eslam". *Middle Eastern Studies*, 33(1), p. 48.
- The Canberra Times. 7 June 1951, "Plot revealed to assassinate Persian premier".
- Awsati, A. R. (2003). *Iran in the Past Three Centuries. Vol. 1*. Tehran: Paktab Publishing, pp. 247-255).
- Assadi, M. (2012). *Abdol Hossain Hajir* , <http://www.iichs.org/>
- Mahdinia, J. (1999). *The political life of Abdul Hossein Hajir*, Publisher: Goldis, p.p. 258-265.