

MUSADDIQ 'S MEMOIRS

By: Dr. Mohammad Mosaddiq, Champion of the Popular Movement of Iran and Former Prime Minister

Translated by: Hassan Amin, Advocate (Edinburgh) and Former Professor of Law at Glasgow Caledonian University

Continued from Issue 36: November 2006

FOURTEEN MONTHS IN THE POSITION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Soon after my resignation a number of people from different classes went to the Sahibqaraniyeh Palace, demanding that the government should speak to me. These people came straight from the Palace to my house and made me agree to resume work in the ministry of finance. When I was reappointed, the minister resigned from office. Then someone else was appointed in his place so that what the last minister had left unfinished in relation to the opium monopoly could be completed. The government monopoly on opium was a very important source of state income in those days and I shall explain it in detail.

The government of Vusuq had farmed out the state monopoly over the cultivation, collection and distribution of opium for a number of years to Alexander Khan Tomanians at a yearly rental of 8 million rials. In accordance with a cabinet decision, an appropriate lease contract had been concluded whereby all the offices and facilities in the department of opium monopoly were delivered to that merchant.

The contract did not specify the exact amount of the rental which had to be paid on the opium. [This was a loophole which could easily be abused by the lessee against the government.] There was a rumour that the prime minister and finance minister of the day had both made a big killing for themselves via the conclusion of that contract, and its continued use throughout the term of its running. In order to appease the public and pacify the opposition, Qavam al-Saltaneh who was appointed minister of finance after the conclusion of that lease, added an article to the contract as follows:

The total rental which will be given each year to the lessee by the government shall be 10,450,000 rials, on the following basis:

- (a) 8,000,000 rials in consideration of the rent received by the government.
- (b) 2,500,000 rials as disbursements to reimburse the lessee for his expenses in the administration of the monopoly.
- (c) 4,000,000 rials as the expected profit made by the lessee.
- (d) If the lessee applies for a greater amount of bandroll than the total aggregation of the quantities mentioned above, he shall pay for half of the price of any additional bandroll he so obtains from the government. This additional payment shall be over and

above the contract price payable to the government under the lease contract.

This article, which halved the unwarranted profits to be made by the lessee out of the contract, also reduced by half the objections of the opponents. By the provisions of this article any profit made by obtaining additional bandroll would be equally divided between the government and the lessee.

No more than a few months after the leasing of the opium monopoly, Ala al-Saltaneh was asked to form the government. The lessee had not been able to take full advantage of the monopoly as he could not effectively prevent the consumption of unauthorised opium which was available without the payment of the official rental. So he applied to revoke the lease contract. Technically, and in accordance with the terms of the contract, the lessee did not have the right to rescind the contract. Even if he made a loss as a result of this operation, he would still be obliged to pay the full contract price to the government. Nevertheless the authorities accepted the lessee's request for cancellation. It was quite an issue how to resolve the problem and how to undo the contract after it had been executed for a while. The lessee's period of management of the monopoly should have technically been considered as a trustee position and all the loss or profit he had made should have reverted to the government. As a trustee he was entitled to recover all the expenditures that he had made for the administration of this monopoly from the total amount of 6 million rials which he had received up to the date of cancellation. Having deducted his expenses he was required to give the government the balance between his earnings and expenditures. This proposition was not accepted and, hence, the lessee was planning to abuse the public treasury in another way.

The ministry of finance in those days was located in a building known as the Sun House which is the site of the same ministry today. Situated on the opposite side of the ministry of finance there was another building which was then the site of the ministry of foreign affairs and which now belongs to the Lion and Sun Society. I was working every evening until ten o'clock at night in my office. After the government had accepted the cancellation of the opium lease contract, on several successive nights I saw that there was a light on in one of the rooms in the northerly side of the opposite foreign affairs' building. It was evident that something was going on there every night. Upon inquiries I was told that by the order of the minister of finance a commission, composed of a number of departmental heads, had

been set up in that building. I was surprised, because a commission to do with the ministry of finance ought to have been convened in our own building and not in the one opposite. However, sometime later, I noted a telegram in an official file of the ministry which read as follows:

Department of finance, City of Kirmanshah. You had been ordered to take delivery of the monopoly of opium offices from the lessee and then to return same to him on the basis of trust. The first part of the order has been executed but the second part has remained unfulfilled. Explain why?

Not having been privy to that arrangement, I understood nothing of that telegraph. So I took a note of its contents and wrote on the file that I needed verbal explanation from my subordinates on the matter. Pursuant to that note, one of my colleagues in the department of assessment of revenues came to my office and brought another file with him. He explained that the telegram in question was in accordance with the minutes of a commission set up by our minister to consider the opium monopoly. That commission had resolved that all the local departments of finance throughout the country should take delivery of the monopoly of opium premises in their vicinity because the lessee had cancelled the contract. These premises, however, had to be given back to the lessee so that he could continue working as a trustee. This order had been enforced all over the country apart from Kirmanshah; hence the telegraph in question, asking why the second part of the commission's instructions had not been implemented.

In order to keep the commission's resolution secret and escape adverse publicity in the newspapers, the minister had obtained a free reference number from the secretariat and sent the commission's minutes to the lessee with a covering letter signed and sealed by himself. The verbal explanations were enough to make me realise what had happened. However, as the commission's minutes were ambiguous and confusing, I took them home with me to study carefully. After further perusal, I got the point. Relying on the additional article of the contract, the government had decided to pay to the lessee an extra sum of 14,500,000 rials in the name of rental. This was extraordinary because during the few months that the lessee had been in charge, he had not himself requested more than 6 million rials worth of rental. Furthermore, the commission had allowed the lessee to continue to manage the opium monopoly as long as it took him to give 8 million rials to the government and make 4 million rials profit for himself.

In order to be reassured of these facts, I invited a number of well-informed directors in our ministry to my office. Without giving any background explanation, I presented them with the minutes a masterpiece of work in the constitutional era! I asked these colleagues to read the text and let me have their written comments. The result of the investigations and contemplations

made by all of them was the same. So it became apparent that the approval and enforcement of those minutes had caused a great loss to the public treasury. The commission had taken the position that it was the government's obligation to guarantee that the lessee should receive or make a profit of 4 million rials every year. To state the obvious, each party who enters into a contract takes a risk: he may either make a loss or a profit. The lessee did not have the right to cancel the contract, and the ministry was entitled to enforce the contract against him; but the government accepted his cancellation. Once the cancellation was accepted, by law the lessee was obliged as a trustee to account: for his period of management and return to the treasury all moneys received by him net of his expenses.

The minister of finance who had accepted the lessee's request for cancellation of the opium monopoly lease had already resigned. His successor, who had approved the decisions of the opium commission and had notified the lessee of those decisions, was no longer a member of the cabinet because the government of Ala al Saltaneh had fallen. Then the shah ordered Ain al-Dawleh to form a new government. In these circumstances, the government needed someone to take charge of the ministry of finance who could ensure that the opium monopoly would remain in the hands of Alexander Khan [Tomanians] for long enough to enable him to make the 4 million rials profit. Therefore, the same minister who had originally farmed out the monopoly of opium to Alexander Khan was given the post at the ministry of finance again.

The new minister came to my home to secure my services. Although he had a cold personality, he tried hard to be friendly with me on that occasion, and succeeded in persuading me to continue in my job as the secretary. I agreed to stay on because otherwise a large amount of state revenues which could be used to solve many of our economic problems would have been wasted. I went to the ministry of finance with him. My staff prepared a detailed report on the opium contract which I sent on to the minister with my recommendations. He kept that report throughout his term of office without giving any reply to it. Eventually, when the cabinet of which he was a member resigned, he sent the report along with other letters back to the ministry of finance.

Following the fall of the government, Mu'in al-Mulk, the shah's private secretary, wrote to the secretaries of all the ministries to remain in their posts until such time as a new cabinet was formed. This order was intended to ensure that administrative affairs would not be left unattended. Being in charge of the ministry, I thought of dealing with the case of the opium monopoly myself. At that time the modern criminal code had not yet been drafted. A customary penal code had been drafted under the government of Vusuq al-Dawleh, but this was not part of the enforceable laws within the judicial system. In the circum-

stances, therefore, the attorney-general could not prosecute those civil servants in the ministry of finance who had signed the commission's minutes. The only way to prosecute was to resort to the reorganisation of the ministry of finance act. This law envisaged the formation of a high administrative council, composed of the heads of the departments of the ministry of finance, to look into misconduct by staff.

I remember vividly that on the very first day that I was allowed to run the ministry of finance, and that was a Saturday, I invited the high administrative council to meet on Tuesday to hear the case of the opium monopoly. However, on the following day, there was a telephone call from the royal palace stating that the ministers who had already resigned should continue work until the formation of a new cabinet. The outgoing minister of finance abused this royal order and telephoned the heads of departments whom I had invited to attend the high council, telling them not to attend the meeting in which we were to hear that case. Therefore, on the day scheduled for the hearing, those invited neither came nor wrote to me to explain why they could not attend that hearing. Only J.B. Heynssen, a Belgian adviser who was the director-general of the department of customs, formally wrote to me stating that because the minister had telephoned him not to attend the council, he would not be attending. In such circumstances, my engagement in the ministry of finance could no longer be of benefit, and I resigned from the post.

A week after my resignation, the late Mustawfi al-Mamalik was asked to form a new government. Although the reasons for my resigning office were not unknown, the new prime minister asked me why I had resigned. I had to tell him everything that had occurred in relation to the opium monopoly and brief him on the great loss that the public treasury had suffered. At the end, he personally asked me to go to the ministry of finance and relieve him from its troubles, the troubles being no more than that in the constitutional era a legal administrative trial had been organised. I said what greater trouble was there than the fact that we had no money in the treasury, and that our only available revenues coming from the monopoly of opium which could cover the immediate and necessary expenditures - were being lost? I said that now that the premier was asking me to continue work I would only do so provided he would not withdraw his support from me in dealing with the opium monopoly. I needed his support to prove what I was saying, and to make reparations for the losses which had been sustained by the public treasury.

My insistence on going ahead with the proposed administrative hearing in the ministry of finance made Mustawfi's task more difficult. The prime minister wanted me to continue my work in order to reassure the people that things were in order, while, in the meantime, he would gain a breathing space to reflect on what to do. On the other hand, I had made the contin-

uation of my services conditional on the trial of those whom I believed guilty of misconduct. My proposition involved an amount of bad publicity for the government, and a full disclosure to the public of everything which had happened. Because the prime minister could not talk me out of it, he promised that he would assist me.

Mustawfi formed his government and he appointed Mohammad Quli Khan Hedayat, Mukhbir al-Mulk, to head the ministry of finance. The new minister's brother was Haj Mukhbir al-Saltaneh,² the head of the legal department of the ministry of finance who was one of the people whom had invited to the high administrative council. Again on the very first day that I began work I ordered all the paperwork needed for the conducting of the hearing and the invitation to the heads of departments to be made ready. The letters of invitation were signed by the new minister and were duly sent to the appropriate heads of department.

One of the accused civil servants wrote a memorandum in opposition to the hearing. He stated that, according to the statutory provisions, the high administrative council should be convened under the chairmanship of either the minister or the secretary. However, in his case the then minister, being a relative of his, was not qualified to participate in that hearing. He further argued that I, as the secretary, was disqualified from participation in the trial because I was the plaintiff. So in his view neither the minister nor the secretary could chair or pass judgement in the high council. Accordingly, he did not attend the meeting, nor did any other of the accused.

I complained to Mustawfi, the prime minister, and, on account of his earlier promises to help, sought his assistance. The prime minister said that he knew from day one that this trial was a non-starter, but that my insistence on holding it had inclined him to go along with the idea. I replied that if we could not stick to our original agreement, the prime minister had yet made no losses, and I was prepared to resign. Mustawfi was a democrat and as at that time foreign powers did not dominate the political scene, people could criticise the irregular conduct of the government. So the prime minister said that he was prepared to accept my advice, and go along with my views.

I said the law on the reorganisation of the ministry of finance had provided the setting up of a high administrative council to try any civil servant in the employ of that ministry. We required some internal regulations to be made in relation to the duties and functions of that high council, and the disciplinary procedures pertaining to it. I explained that one of the accused had objected that because the minister was his relative he could not chair the council for his trial. The other three had said that the secretary, i.e. myself, was the plaintiff in the case, and was thus also disqualified from chairing, or voting in, the proceedings. It would be a good thing, I suggested to the prime minis-

ter, if a number of other well-informed and trustworthy people could be appointed to listen to my complaints, and produce a report for the government so that the fate of the lessee and the accused (civil servants) could be determined as soon as possible.

Mustawfi was in the habit of not talking before thinking. After some contemplation, he said he would present my proposal to the cabinet on the same day, and let me know of its outcome. Consequently, the cabinet approved four or five people to form a disciplinary commission to hear my complaints. The members so approved were Mohammad Ali Furughi³, the president of the court of cassation, Mirza Ahmad Khan Ashtari, Mirza Davud Khan Ali-Abadi, Mirza Ahmad Qumi, and another person whose name I do not remember, and whose identity I have no means of discovering in this prison. These gentlemen were authorised to investigate the signatories of the minutes relative to the opium lease. However, the civil servants accused of misconduct declared their refusal to attend the hearing on the premises of the ministry of finance. As a result, the tribunal chose the Nizam Room (which is now part of the ministry of justice) for the meetings. Still the accused did not attend, saying that they too had some complaints against my conduct as the secretary of the ministry of finance. They insisted, therefore, that they would attend the hearing only on condition that I was also made a subject of investigation.

Again, I had to speak to the prime minister. This time he complained that since I had rejected his initial advice to drop the matter, I had run into difficulties which made him get the cabinet's approval to appoint a board of inquiry; and I had now got myself into a bigger mess, when the accused were asking for an investigation of my own conduct. He said I should now admit that he had been right, and wondered what I was going to do to save my own reputation. I said my reputation would be lost only if I could not prove my point. Therefore, at my request the prime minister obtained another cabinet decision giving leave to the accused to press charges against myself, and the hearing began in earnest.

At this stage, a bunch of gutter newspapers began a campaign of invective and defamation against me. I was working in my office when I heard a newspaper boy outside the ministry building shouting 'the excommunication of the secretary'. The paper - a satirical weekly which had not been published for sometime - was shown to me by Shukuh al-Mulk. The allegation of blasphemy referred to what I had written in the introduction of my doctoral thesis in relation to the history and sources of Islamic law. In that thesis, I had, inter alia, said that 'Mohammad(s)⁴ revealed his mission at the age of forty'. This had been deliberately mistranslated from French into Persian to read that 'At the age of forty, Mohammad believed himself to be the representative of God'.⁵ They then went on to say whatever was needed to prove my lack of faith.

I have no wish to discuss the truth or falsehood of those allegations. I just wish to emphasise that the more the spiteful hired press wrote on such matters, the more my reputation was enhanced in the society. There were two possible reasons behind this popular reaction. Either the people thought that the accusations were tendentious and baseless, or else they believed my services to be in the country's interest, and, hence, were prepared to put their trust in me regardless of the allegations. I can give no other explanation for all the good wishes which were so generously extended to me. In a word, the more insults and abuse were hurled at me, the higher became my prestige in society. It was then that I realised the truth of my mother's advice to me that 'the weight of the people in society corresponded to the troubles they were prepared to endure for the sake of people'. Those words of wisdom had such an impact on me that, in any matter concerning the good of the people, I was always prepared to put up with anything, and remind myself that no individual person's interest would be secure unless that of the people as a whole is also secure. It was this regard for public opinion which - during my premiership when I was responsible for the good and bad of the country - impelled me to issue a public statement saying that no one would be prosecuted for any criticism of my conduct in the press. My objective in issuing this statement was to ensure that the press would not be afraid of censure, or arrests, for criticising either my own conduct or the conduct of my government as a whole, so that if their criticisms were reasonable, I would try to make my decisions consistent with public opinion. It was this attitude which enabled me to be of more service to the country, and gain people's trust and confidence as well.

Freedom of expression and of the press is one of the basic pillars of the constitutional system. It enables the press to guide the people on good or bad policies, and inform them about the character and conduct of politicians. If the press is not free it would be impossible to probe the character and conduct of those in authority. Those who fear freedom of expression and of the press, and thus deny people such freedoms, not only contravene the constitution, but also serve the interest of foreigners, and betray their own country.

Anyhow, I have been carried away and should now return to our main topic, that is, the trial of those civil servants in the ministry of finance. I found eleven other points of misconduct by the accused. I added these points to the original statement of charge relative to their involvement in the contracting out of the opium monopoly. I worked on this case hard and most of my evenings were spent on preparing additional material in its support. The trial lasted for a few months. As I had not been frightened by the defamations and the excommunication thrown at me, my opponents tried to liquidate me physically. Faced with this, I had to employ a number of armed bodyguards to protect

myself both inside and outside the ministry of finance.

When the hearing was in progress, Mustawfi al-Mamalik decided to reshuffle his cabinet. He put forward my name to the shah for the post of minister of finance, and that of Mumtaz al-Mulk for the ministry of justice. We were due to go together to Farah-Abad Palace to be presented to the shah. I was waiting in the ministry of finance to be taken to the Palace, but the prime minister did not contact me and took Mumtaz al-Mulk alone with him. It later transpired that a number of the relatives and supporters of the civil servants who were under investigation had threatened the prime minister that if I were to be appointed to that ministry they would cause trouble for him. After that incident a number of people began to try to persuade me not to pursue the investigations. I was told that if I were to drop those charges, the supporters of the defendants would no longer block my appointment to the ministry. I found the proposal incompatible with my integrity and I firmly turned it down.

Later, the members of the disciplinary commission who were conducting the hearing were themselves subjected to threats and intimidation. Sadly, this was effective in the case of a number of them. As a result, the hearing was practically stopped and did not proceed according to the due process of law. I strongly objected to the cabinet about the suspension of the investigations. Mustawfi sent for Mohammad Ali Furughi, the commission president, and insisted that the trial should take its due course. After that, the commission started working judiciously within its terms of reference. At the end of the hearing, the commission took a decision which contained the following punishments:

1. Two heads of department were suspended without pay from the ministry of finance for a period of three years.
2. Two directors were disqualified from public service on a permanent basis.
3. I was also found guilty of administrative misconduct on the grounds that, in accordance with the law of reorganisation of the ministry of finance, the high administrative council had to be called by the minister whereas I had taken that upon myself. I was fined the equivalent of four months of my salary. I was convicted in spite of the fact that in the absence of a minister, I was entitled to call for the high council in my capacity as secretary, just as when Mukhbir al-Mulk resigned as minister, I was performing all the ministerial duties. The commission was aware of all this. At that time Mirza Ahmad Khan Ashtari, a commission member, had been asked why I had been found guilty. He had replied: 'He was guilty of catching thieves'.⁶

Here I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to those people who are still alive and who offered me all kinds of assistance during that period. Also, I offer my blessings for the souls of those who have passed away. In particular, I salute Mirza Taqi Khan Binish who in his satirical column of the Setareh-Yi



Iran newspaper enlightened the public with a few short, sharp sentences about the proceedings of the commission.

A few months later, the commission concluded its task and submitted its report to the cabinet. However, the pressure coming from my opponents to stop the implementation of the commission's decision was tremendous. As a result, the decision landed in the prime minister's office without any action being taken against those who were found guilty. Whenever I brought the subject to the attention of those in authority, I was told that it was not even in my own interests to pursue the matter, although I regarded my conviction then, as my conviction now, as my greatest pride.

At this time Salim Khan Izady, a deputy in the Fifth Majlis, wanted to go to the city of Rasht in order to meet the leaders of the Jangal Movement.⁷ He sent me word that if I had anything to say I should let him know so that he could pass my message on to the Jangal guerrillas. I asked him to let the guerrillas know that our system was still just as it was before their uprising, and that there had not been the slightest change in our administration. I also passed this message to them: 'For some time I have been involved in an investigation which you must have read about in the press. In spite of all my troubles, the government is now unwilling to enforce the decision of the commission.' In order to ensure my message was accurately relayed to the people concerned, I also wrote a note on this point and gave it to Izady. When the next issue of the Jangal newspaper arrived, it contained a very strong attack on the government because of its failure to enforce the decision in question.

The Jangal newspaper was keenly read both by the public and by the prime minister of the day. Following that publication, Sayyed Husain Ardabili, the editor of the Iran newspaper, then the only newspaper which received a government subsidy, came to the ministry of finance to interview me. He told me that he wanted some information about the hearings. From what he was saying it was clear that the prime minister wanted another newspaper to run a story similar to that published in the Jangal so that he could enforce the decision. I mentioned that the trial in our ministry was no news to anyone. Everybody knew that for some time I had been pushing for the hearings to be held. Indeed, I had accepted office in the government of the day on condition that the government would give me help and support to run the financial affairs of this country one way or another.

However, although the commission had taken its final decision, it had disappeared into a void. Only two days after this interview, the Iran newspaper published a report about the findings of the hearing. Afterwards, the commission's decision emerged from the portmanteau, and the departmental directors who had been found guilty were dismissed. Also, a third of my salary was deducted, but for a few days only, because, I too, left office for another reason which I shall explain. It is a statement of the obvious to say that as Germany was increasingly losing the battle in the First World War, so national democratic sentiments in Iran were becoming weaker. In those circumstances, the British government was trying to strengthen its position in Iran in whatever way possible. The British made the maximum use of the various governments which came and went during that period, until they managed to bring their own candidates to power.

One Thursday morning, Mustawfi al-Mamalik sent for me and told me that the opponents of his government did not stop at causing any kind of trouble and disruption. The food supply was unsatisfactory and a number of people were dying of famine daily while the government was unable to do much. Therefore, he was thinking of resigning office to save his own reputation. I told him he was right, and that there was nothing he could do but to resign. There was no money to buy wheat and foodstuffs and no motor vehicles to bring in crops from the distant parts of the country (particularly from the province of Sistan which had had a bumper crop that year, and where, in any case, corn was cheap. After more talks and appraisals of the situation, particularly with respect to financial matters, Mustawfi decided to discuss the issues in the cabinet, and to resign from office. In the afternoon of the same day, he went to Farah-Abad Palace and submitted his resignation to the shah. Because no other newspaper except Iran was currently in circulation, and because that newspaper did not come out on Fridays, few learned about his resignation on that day. On Saturday morning, orders came from Farah-Abad Palace that the secretaries of ministries should carry on their work in the prime minister's office until a new government was formed, and so we did. A few days later the news came that a group of armed men had barricaded themselves in minarets of the Masjid-i Shah [the shah mosque].⁸ Later, various opposition groups came to the prime minister's office to insult the prime minister. They included all the opposition personalities as well as the ulama, former ministers, and some who wanted to become prime minister themselves, and they gathered in Gallery House which accommodated the prime minister's office. As the government had already resigned, there was no point in the demonstrators making speeches and attacking it. Only some workers of the printing house which printed Sayyed Zia al-Din Tabataba'i's newspaper Ra'd [Thunder] said a few words about the bread shortage, and this led to an agreement that they should collectively receive 180

kg. of bread per day. Therefore, the demonstrators went away.

Next day Samsam al-Saltaneh was appointed prime minister. The minister of finance in Samsam's government was the same man who had signed the contract for the opium monopoly under Vusuq al-Dawleh, and who, after Ain al-Dawleh's resignation had telephoned the departmental directors of the ministry of finance not to accept my invitation to attend the high administrative council. Also in his cabinet was the minister of finance who had once signed and sealed the minutes of the committee of the departmental heads and directors of the ministry of finance, and sent them directly to Alexander Khan. The latter was also made a minister, and, although these two men had been at loggerheads before, they settled their differences after joining the cabinet to let the government work proceed smoothly.

Given the circumstances, I did not wish to continue work as the secretary in the ministry of finance, but I was worried that my voluntary resignation would be described by my critics as jeopardising public business, and the argument that those ministers would, otherwise, not have been able to remove me from my post. Therefore, I decided to go to work for a few more days to see what would happen. I did so until one day when Husain Ala,⁹ who was minister for public utilities, sent me a letter whose contents were as follows: 'Because the new minister of finance does not wish to work with you I thought of letting you know that it would be better if you voluntarily resign from office before any decisions [by the minister].' This let me off the hook, and I showed the letter to anyone who was not happy with, and protested against, my resignation. This was an account of my fourteen months' service in the ministry of finance.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 17

1. Tr. The Red Cross used to be called the Lion and Sun Society in Iran. After the 1979 revolution the name was changed to Red Crescent.
2. Tr. Mehdi Quli Hedayat, Mukhbir al-Saltaneh, served under the Qajars as governor-general of Fars (1910), and governor-general of Azerbaijan (1921), and under Reza Shah as prime minister (1926-33).
3. Tr. Mohammad Ali Furughi, a noted statesman and scholar, was a minister, and prime minister, several times during his career. He was the author of a number of scholarly works including Sayri Hikimat dar urupa (A History of European Philosophy).
4. Tr. The Perso-Arabic letter 's' here stands for 'God's blessings and peace be upon him'.
5. Years later (in 1953-4), in my trial in the military court at the Saltanat-Abad, the question of this sentence and my 'excommunication' was brought up once again. A French text of my thesis had been lost in the looting of my house during the 19 August 1953 coup. I had managed to get a copy of its Persian translation and submitted it to the court.
6. If Ashtari were still alive and asked about the reason for my being convicted in the military court he would have answered the same.
7. Tr. A coalition of democratic and socialist radicals led by Mirza Kuchik Khan.
8. Tr. The famous mosque in central Tehran built by Fath'ali Shah Qajar. It was renamed 'Imam Mosque' after the 1979 revolution.
9. Tr. Husain Ala, Mu' in al-Vizareh, (1883-1964) a lawyer by training who served in high offices as ambassador, minister, prime minister and court minister under the Pahlavis.

انتشارات دایرة المعارف ایران شناسی

محصولات فرهنگی ما را از طریق پُست مستقیماً خریداری فرمایید. ما تعهد می کنیم که اثر خریداری شده را برای خودتان یا برای دوستان یا خویشان علاقه مند شما در داخل یا خارج از کشور با پست سفارشی ارسال کنیم.

عنوان کتاب	نویسنده	بها
دانشنامه‌ی تاریخ جهان (از آغاز تا ظهور صفویه)	ترجمه‌ی دکتر محمود زنجانی	۱۵۰۰۰۰ ریال
مجلد یکم ماهنامه‌ی حافظ (صحافی شده)	۱۲ شماره (فروردین - اسفند ۱۳۸۳)	۱۰۰۰۰۰ ریال
مجلد دوم ماهنامه‌ی حافظ (صحافی شده)	۹ شماره (فروردین - آذر ۱۳۸۴)	۱۰۰۰۰۰ ریال
مجلد سوم ماهنامه‌ی حافظ (صحافی شده)	۱۰ شماره (دی ۸۴ تا تیر ۱۳۸۵)	۱۰۰۰۰۰ ریال
مجلد چهارم نشریه‌ی داخلی حافظ (صحافی شده)	۸ شماره (امرداد ۸۵ تا اسفند ۱۳۸۵)	۱۰۰۰۰۰ ریال
چهل گفتار از چهل استاد در ایران شناسی	نوشته‌ی چهل استاد ایران شناس	۳۵۰۰۰ ریال
چهل گفتار در ایران شناسی و اسلام شناسی	نوشته‌ی چهل استاد ایران شناس و اسلام شناس	۴۸۰۰۰ ریال
تاریخ حقوق ایران (۸۸۸ صفحه)	پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۶۵۰۰۰ ریال
ادبیات معاصر ایران	پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۵۰۰۰۰ ریال
دایرةالمعارف خواب و رؤیا	پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۴۰۰۰۰ ریال
تأملات ناپهنگام نیچه	فریدریش ویلهلم نیچه	۴۰۰۰۰ ریال
دیوان کامل حافظ شیرازی	با مقدمه‌ی فارسی و انگلیسی	۳۰۰۰۰ ریال
دیوان اسرار: کلیات اشعار فارسی	حاج مآهادی سبزواری	۳۰۰۰۰ ریال
شواهد النبوة (۶۰۶ صفحه)	عبدالرحمان جامی	۵۰۰۰۰ ریال
زین العارفين: فقه و سیاست در عصر صفوی	سیدمحمد بن سید قریش سبزواری	۴۰۰۰۰ ریال
سلامان و ایسال در چهارده روایت	ابن سینا، خواجه نصیر، جامی و ...	۳۰۰۰۰ ریال
بازتاب اسطوره‌ی بودا در ایران و اسلام	پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۳۰۰۰۰ ریال
کارنامه‌ی غنی: تحولات عصر پهلوی	عصر پهلوی براساس یادداشت‌های دکتر قاسم غنی	۳۸۰۰۰ ریال
نامه‌های دکتر قاسم غنی	دکتر سیروس غنی و دکتر سیدحسین امین (چاپ لندن)	۴۰۰۰۰ ریال
تاریخ سبزواری: مشاهیر اسفراین، بیهق، جوین و سبزواری	سید علینقی امین	۴۵۰۰۰ ریال
یادنامه‌ی استاد سیدعلینقی امین	احمد نیکوهمت	۳۰۰۰۰ ریال
وحدت وجود در فلسفه و عرفان اسلامی	پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۱۵۰۰۰ ریال
سی دی صوتی: ایرانی‌ام، ایران زمین را دوست دارم	(شعر، موسیقی، سخن) شعر و صدای پروفسور سیدحسین امین	۵۰۰۰۰ ریال

برگ در خواست خرید تولیدات فرهنگی دایرةالمعارف ایران شناسی

الف - نشانی کامل پستی کسی که کتاب / مجله / سی دی / نوار صوتی باید برای ایشان پست شود:
نام و نام خانوادگی:

نشانی و کدپستی دریافت کننده:

ب- عنوان کتاب / مجله / سی دی نوارهای درخواستی:

ج: نحوه‌ی پرداخت بهای کتاب:

لطفاً بهای کتاب‌ها یا سی دی / نوارهای درخواستی به اضافه‌ی هزینه‌ی پست سفارشی (داخل کشور: ۱۰۰۰ تومان؛ خارج کشور: ۶۰۰۰ تومان) را جمع بنیدید و به حساب سیبا، شماره‌ی ۰۱۰۲۰۰۱۸۴۳۰۰۸ نزد بانک ملی، شعبه‌ی دانشگاه تهران، کد ۸۷ (به نام مهندس حجت حیدری) واریز فرمایید و سپس رسید بانکی و کتاب‌ها یا نوار مورد درخواست خود را با نامه یا تلفن یا فاکس به ما اعلام فرمایید.

تهران - تقاطع انقلاب و فلسطین - ساختمان مهر - شماره‌ی ۲ - طبقه‌ی سوم - دایرةالمعارف ایران شناسی

کدپستی ۱۴۱۶۸ ؛ تلفن ۶۶۹۶۸۴۸۸ ؛ فاکس ۶۶۹۶۸۴۸۷

HAFIZ MONTHLY

A JOURNAL OF IRANIAN STUDIES

Issue : 38

January - March, 2007

ISSN : 1735-1421

All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor:

Hassan Amin, Ph.D. (Glasgow), Advocate (Edinburgh)
The Encyclopaedia of Iran Publications
Mehr Building, 2 Palestine Street, Enghelab Avenue,
Tehran, Iran, Post Code: 14168
Tel: 009821-66968488

Fax: 009821 - 66968487

- Editor-in-Chief : Professor Hassan Amin, Ph.D.
- Executive Director: Hojjat Heydari, MSc.
- Design Consultant: H.R. Mohseni, M.A.
- Librarian: Manouchehr Raeesi
- Typesetting & Layout: Azam Daneshjoo, B.A.
- Assistant Manager: Akram Heydari
- Public Relations: Ali Akbar Asadzadeh, LLB.

Hafiz Monthly, is an independent Iranian journal - dedicated to Iranian studies. The authorities of the Islamic Republic of Iran - in breach of the freedom of the Press-stopped its publication and circulation in October 2006. It is now only published as a gesture of "civil disobedience"! It covers a wide range of subjects - including Persian literature and contemporary political history, as well as the cultural, legal and political developments in the present-day Iran. The varied essays and reports represent all the major cultural, legal and political trends in the contemporary Iran. In each issue, **Hafiz Monthly** publishes several detailed research articles and interviews, along with a number of shorter works by contemporary Iranian scholars, writers and poets. The contributors range from national figure, examiners, leading professors, well-known authors and scholars to younger and upcoming writers and poets. **Hafiz Monthly** also disseminates information on recent publications and cultural events in and about Iran and highlights social and economic issues which are of interest to its readership.

Hafiz Monthly is a refereed journal. The selection of all published material is processed through a qualitative assessment by the Editorial Board - with the help of outside experts and external assessors.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

برای اشتراک نشریه‌ی داخلی دوستداران حافظ

- هزینه‌ی اشتراک + هزینه‌ی پست در داخل کشور / یک سال: اشخاص ۱۲/۰۰۰ تومان؛ مؤسسات ۱۵/۰۰۰ تومان
هزینه‌ی اشتراک + هزینه‌ی پست در خارج کشور / یک سال: اشخاص ۶۰ دلار (معادل ریالی نیز پذیرفته می‌شود).
۱- برای اشتراک درون مرزی، وجه اشتراک (اشخاص حقیقی ۱۲۰۰۰۰ ریال / اشخاص حقوقی ۱۵۰۰۰۰ ریال) را به حساب سیبا، شماره حساب ۰۱۰۲۰۰۱۸۴۳۰۰۸ نزد بانک ملی، شعبه‌ی دانشگاه تهران کد ۸۷ به نام حجّت حیدری واریز فرمایید.
۲- برای اشتراک برون مرزی، وجه اشتراک را (۵۰۰۰۰۰ ریال / معادل تقریبی ۶۰ دلار به حساب سیبای بالا یا ۶۰ دلار به حساب ارزی پس‌انداز شماره‌ی ۹۹۰۳۶ بانک سپه شعبه‌ی میدان هفت تیر (کد ۲۴۷) به نام حجّت حیدری واریز فرمایید.
۳- برگ اشتراک (فرم زیر و یا نامه‌ی جداگانه) را همراه رسید بانکی به نشانی مجله ارسال فرمایید:

تهران- تقاطع فلسطین و انقلاب - ساختمان مهر - شماره‌ی ۲ - دایرة‌المعارف ایران شناسی - کدپستی: ۱۴۱۶۸

برگ درخواست اشتراک ماهنامه‌ی حافظ

نام و نام خانوادگی متقاضی:
در صورت تمدید اشتراک شماره‌ی اشتراک موجود:
آدرس پستی برای ارسال مجله: شهر:
یا: خیابان: کوچه: پلاک:
کدپستی:
صندوق پستی:
تلفن (در صورت علاقه‌مندی):

دعوت به اشتراک نشریه‌ی داخلی دوستداران حافظ