Recultivating “Good Taste”: The Early Pahlavi Modernists and Their Society for National Heritage*

Everything had to be started over again...[we] longed for Persia to progress along modern lines, without discipline there was no hope.

Iranian Court Minister, Abdolhossein Teymurtash
28 August 1927

Given the limitation of Oriental taste when confronted with Western idea, the design [of Ferdawsi’s mausoleum] is admirable.

Robert Byron
The Road to Oxiana, 1937

The official records of the Pahlavi era assert, with staunch authority, that under the order of Reza Shah, “the creator of a civilization,” a few “intensely patriotic” men gathered sometime in 1921 and “spontaneously” formed a “cultural” group called the Society for National Heritage (hereafter SNH or the Society) or in Persian Anjoman-e Asar-e Mellé. Its aim, to “preserve, protect, and promote Iran’s patrimony,” seemed rather simple,1 During the ensuing fifty-eight-year, until the dawn of the Iranian Revolution, the SNH erected approximately forty mausoleum complexes, carried out
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1Talinn Grigor is a Ph.D. candidate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This article is part of a Ph.D. dissertation, entitled Cultivated Modernity: The Society for National Heritage and Public Architecture in 20th Century Iran, at the History, Theory, and Criticism Section of the School of Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

over sixty preservation projects, and created a national museum as well as a public library in Tehran. Its artistic and ideological scope was, no doubt, unprecedented in the cultural history of Iran and was bolstered by its publications, lectures, exhibitions, and contribution to the tourist trade. Each of its undertakings represented the general project of Iran’s modernity, identified by political historians as the “New Order” or the “New Iran.”

The significance of the program launched by the often remarkable, but at times despotic, “founding fathers” of the SNH, while later downplayed by both Pahlavi shahs, not only had a lasting impact on Iranian society but was neither spontaneous nor sporadic. A closer look at the politics of the 1920s and 1930s reveals that the Society was in the process of being formed since the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 and was a highly organized body integral to the massive project of Iran’s modernization. In fact, as Reza Shah’s dictatorship intensified, the most prominent politicians and intellectuals of the time instigated radical reforms through the Society whereby they could veil their most effective political muscle behind a benign cultural veneer. In so doing, they effectively and shrewdly co-opted the visual and spatial into the mainstream of Pahlavi ideology and program. Their techniques of cultivating and naturalizing the new parameters of modernity persistently intersected with their anxiety over collective memory, public space, and the cultivation of cultural taste—all of which were formulated along western lines. In lectures and writings, the concept of zawq—translated as the amalgam of “taste,” “elegance,” or “verve”—was to be “rediscovered” and “reclaimed” through a national artistic “spirit”; intrinsically “pure,” “authentic,” and above all, forgotten. In this “spirit” of revivalism and modernization, public landmarks were the most potent signifiers of “good taste,” at the same time the symbols and products of the dynamics of political power in modern Iran. For the modernists, therefore, the control over the physical and conceptual “heritage” enabled them to erase the immediate past to construct the “progressive” future. Destruction of building-as-representation proved central to the construction of the pending utopian future. Architecture was imperative to the success of the SNH’s modernizing agenda.

Major architectural works undertaken by the SNH include the construction of the modern mausoleums of Ferdawsi (1934) in Tus; of Hafiz (1938) and Shah Shuja’

---

\[1\] See E. Abrahamian, *Iran between two Revolutions* (Princeton, 1982), 120-123 & 135-138. “New Iran” is widely used by various Pahlavi official sources and later historians. As will be elaborated below, “Iran-e Naw” was also the name of the political party organized by Reza Shah’s court minister, Abdolhossein Teymurtash.

\[2\] Since Iran’s political system in the twentieth century, despite massive efforts to build modern institutions, remained essentially centered around the agency of powerful men, single individuals in their personalities and interactions were of primary importance to the political process. “In a political system where institutions are not paramount but where individuals in their interactions constitute the essence of the political process…their personalities are of primary importance.” M. Zonis, *The Political Elite of Iran* (Princeton, 1971), 10. In the 1920s, the agency of several men who formed the SNH redefined the cultural as well as political parameters of Iran.
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(1965) in Shiraz; of Avicenna (hereafter Ibn Sina) (1952) and Baba Taher (1970) in Hamadan; of Nader Shah (1959) in Mashhad; of Kamal al-Molk (1962) and Omar Khayyam (1963) in Nishapur; as well as those of American Art Historians Phyllis Ackerman and Arthur Upham Pope (1972) in Isfahan along a lost list of relatively minor memorials. The “scientific” process to which the monuments in question were subjected was highly consistent. The burial place of historical figures that suited the national agenda were selected, located, and eliminated. After the confiscation of the corpse for autopsy, a modern building was erected on the original site, after which the relics were interred as part of an official royal inauguration. While ordinary Iranians were excluded from witnessing these events, state-run media covered each ceremony in detail. The main result of this process was that historical figures were given a physical place to inhabit in the form of modern tombs. Their physiognomic particularities were reconstructed based on skull and bone examinations. This in turn, served to produce each figure’s life-size sculpture and color portrait. The modified biography and persona of these men were circulated among the masses by means of photographs, stamps, post-cards, coins, and various paraphernalia. Each fragment endlessly authenticated the implicit totality of the image invented by the SNH. At the end, the visual dissemination of these images made the rhetoric on the Iranian “Aryan” type, “ancient glorious past,” and “the impending modern nation” seem credible.

The significance of the SNH’s architectural and artistic ventures lies in the way they penetrated most aspects of Iranian society’s modernizing project. Despite their simplicity, the monuments themselves incorporated a complex range of modern practices. Architecture became a vital aspect of public instruction. Autopsies of remains stood as proof of the racial superiority of the nation while the adjoining museums not only validated the logic of its display but also provided such claims with an authoritative place of display. The revival of pre-Islamic icons and prototypes was incorporated into centuries old Islamic practices. The construction process harbored technically sophisticated documentation, categorization, and ordering of the national domain. Each monument’s presence instigated superficial revitalization of cities such as Tus, Nishapur, and Hamadan, which, while historically eminent, had become inconsequential to modern Iranian geopolitics. In this new politics of collective identity, pilgrimage became tourism. Furthermore, these projects provided a platform for western scholars like French architect André Godard, German archeologist Ernst Herzfeld, and American art dealer Arthur Pope to negotiate their conflicting personal and colonial ambitions. The discourse on Iranian architecture occasioned quarrels over techniques of preservation, authenticity of heritage, and ownership of archeological sites. In sum, these landmarks created novel ways to map modern space, time, taste, identity, and power, in that they not only reflected but affected sociopolitical developments in modern Iran.

This article first presents the Society and the politics of its birth, and then offers a critical analysis of its political underpinnings, pedagogical aims, and aesthetic ends in the hope of showing certain aspects of the larger cultural context of the first two
decades of Pahlavi Iran. More importantly perhaps, it tries to lay bare the intrinsic ties between the conception of “high” culture and the fabrication of political legitimacy; between the definition of “good” taste and the claims of ideological discourses, and, ultimately, between Iran’s modern architecture and Iranian struggle over modernity.

Debating Modernists

These men, all highly educated in the western tradition and native to Iranian culture, wholeheartedly believed in the inherently utopian and totalistic universal-modernism for Iran with all of its productive and destructive patterns. While they embraced the latest intellectual trends in Europe and the United States, they could at the same time draw on a rich repertoire of Iranian culture. They genuinely believed in the Aryan superiority of the Iranian nation and endeavored to revive its cultural expressions, deciding and defining the parameters of that nation’s new “heritage.” They forcibly westernized aspects of the Iranian life by crushing deep-rooted systems such as the ulama and the tribes, nevertheless exploiting these same networks and practices to permanently alter the society that they governed. These men engineered fictitious models of “modernity” through architecture to challenge labeled symbols of “the traditional.” The visual was pivotal to the success of their grand, often utopian, project.

In the summer of 1921, a few men did come together, all leading politicians and some serious scholars; however, this was not done by the order of Reza Shah. Much of what was “kingly” about the shah was the result of these men’s work. Among the SNH’s prominent founders was the court minister Abdolhossein Teimurtash, described by the American attaché as a man of “brilliancy [with] elements of madness,” the mastermind of the SNH. A scholar among the group was former
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4US State Department Records, Charles Calmer Hart, “Teymourtache Dismissed and Great Was the Fall Thereof,” dispatch 1310, 891.44 Teymourtache, Abdul K.K./1, December 29, 1932, Tehran, Iran. Titled Sardar Mu’azzam, Teimurtash was a parliamentary deputy from the second to the sixth Majlis. During the premiership of Reza Khan, he twice occupied the position of the minister of works along with a number of other important posts. Finally, in early 1926 he resigned from the sixth Majlis when he was appointed the minister of imperial court by Reza Shah. He is reported to have known the details of each ministry better than the ministers themselves. According to Hart, “Teymourtache was the active head of the Persian Government. He took business out of the hands of all the cabinet ministers and discussed every problem in minute details, as if he might have had it solely in charge.” As minister of the royal court, he dictated most of the policies and supervised their progress. His familiarity with the bureaucracy, which he had devised, the ease with which he manipulated the system, and through which he maintained an unrivaled command over its parts made him the most powerful man in Iranian society after Reza Shah. However, suddenly dismissed, Teimurtash was accused of fraud, accepting bribes, and embezzling public funds during his trial of March 17, 1933. A few months later he was murdered in jail. See further, H. Katouzian, State and Society in Iran, The Eclipse of the Qajars and the Emergence of the Pahlavis (London and New York, 2000), and The Political Economy of Modern Iran (London and New York, 1981).
prime minister Hasan Pirnia who wrote *History of Ancient Iran* in four volumes. Another scholar-politician, Mohammad Ali Forughi was Reza Shah’s first and last minister who throughout his life remained the most publicly recognized figure of the Society. Firuz Mirza Firuz, the prominent Qajar nobleman and minister of finance, would be instrumental in the SNH’s dealings with the French in the sphere of archeology. The Zoroastrian Majlis deputy Arbab Keikhosraw Shahrokh played an important role in promoting the so-called neo-Achaemenian style of the 1930s. Justice and finance minister Ali Akbar Davar was influential in financing the SNH’s projects by using the bureaucratic machinery. Other high-ranking politicians and founders of the SNH included former prime minister Hasan Mostawfi, and Hasan Esfandiar, Ebrahim Hakimi, and Hajj Seyyed Nasrollah Taqavi, who were likewise leading politicians. In due course, the Society would also recruit other men of power such as Seyyed Hasan Taqizadeh, Isa Sadiq, and Ali Asghar Hekmat.

The cooperation of the political elite and founders of the SNH dated back to before Reza Khan’s 1921 coup, their zeal for modernization having been shaped by the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 in their formative years. Disillusioned with the chaotic tendencies of the constitutional era, some of them had formed themselves into the Tajaddod or Modernization parliamentary group in the fifth Majlis.
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5 Titled Moshir al-Dawleh, Hasan Pirnia is considered one of the most prominent politicians of the late Qajar period. He became prime minister a few times before Reza Shah, perhaps the most difficult of which was in 1920 when the fate of the Anglo-Iranian Agreement of 1919 was in balance. But after Reza Shah’s accession, which he did not approve, he voluntarily retired from politics and withdrew from the public scene to focus on his scholarship. In the following years, he remained in the executive committee of the SNH and published a number of influential books on ancient Iran.

6 Mohammad Ali Forughi, titled Zoka’ al-Molk, Reza Shah’s first and last prime minister, was first appointed to the post in December 1925, but was sacked and disgraced in 1936 during his second term of office. After the 1941 Allied invasion of Iran, Reza Shah again, in despair, turned to Forughi, who took the responsibility for running the country and managing the accession of the young Prince Mohammad Reza. Forughi was also the founder of the Academy of Iranian Culture and a professor at the prestigious Tehran School of Law and Political Science. In 1901, in his academic role, he wrote a textbook titled *History of Iran*, reprinted in 1917. In the Board of Trustees of the SNH, throughout his life, he remained the most publicly recognized figure of the Society.

7 Titled Nosrat al-Dawleh, he was one of the triumvirs who negotiated the ill-fated Anglo-Iranian 1919 agreement. In cultural affairs and as the governor-general of Fars, Firuz’s strength lay in his ability to persuade Ernst Herzfeld to conduct archeological studies at Persepolis after 1923. While he was much less involved with the architectural projects of the SNH, he is nevertheless considered a prominent member who greatly influenced the final draft of the 1927 Archeological Convention. Accused of bribery, he was dismissed from the cabinet and arrested in 1929, and was eventually murdered in jail 1937.

8 Arbab Keikhosraw Shahrokh was the Zoroastrian Majlis deputy from 1909 until his “mysterious” murder in 1940. He was perhaps the most active member of the SNH in the 1920s and 1930s, particularly during the construction of Ferdawsi’s mausoleum, witnessed by the overt and unique use of Zoroastrian emblems on the landmark. See further Shahrokh, Sh. & R. Writer, *The Memoirs of Keikhosraw Shahrokh* (Lewiston, 1994).

9 Ali Akbar Davar, a talented but unassuming member of the SNH, is better known as the architect of the new judicial system who later becoming finance minister. His role was vital to the financial survival of the SNH until his suicide in February 1937.
eventual rise of Reza Khan to absolute and arbitrary power owed a great deal to his alliance with the Tajaddod group who championed his strong-arm leadership.\textsuperscript{10} Teymurtash, Davar and the future minister of culture and education Seyyed Mohammad Tadayyon were among the leaders of this group.\textsuperscript{11} Not long after Reza Khan became shah, Tajaddod was replaced by New Iran (\textit{Iran-e Naw}), with a policy “modeled upon that of the Fascists.”\textsuperscript{12} The objectives and membership of New Iran all the while remained essentially those of Tajaddod. Robert Clive, the British Minister in Tehran, reported that “the promoters of this party are a few of the younger and more advanced Persian politicians, like Taimourtache, Minister of Court; Prince Firuz, Minister of Finance; Davar, Minister of Justice; together with a sprinkling of the younger Deputies and higher officers of the army. His Imperial Majesty the Shah is said to be the honorary president.”\textsuperscript{13} The group’s objectives were summed up in a public speech delivered by its official head, Teymurtash, on August 28, 1927: “The independence of Persia under the banner of Pahlavi; the progress of Persia through the power of Reza Shah to \textit{civilization} and \textit{modernity}; resistance to foreign influence; opposition to all reactionary and subversive ideas; and honesty and devotion in public administration.”\textsuperscript{14} However, despite its support for Reza Shah, the party was suspected of promoting “republican sentiments” and was outlawed by the shah.\textsuperscript{15} Still, for a while, it guaranteed the passing of “bills presented to the Majlis by the Government…without much trouble.”\textsuperscript{16} The party’s demise was later followed by Teymurtash’s fall from grace in 1932, and his murder in jail shortly afterwards.

Just as later Pahlavi historiography deflated Teymurtash’s major role in Iran’s modernization project, it also failed to make the link between his New Iran Party and the Society for National Heritage, which I believe was a direct one. Although short-lived, the ideals of New Iran resurfaced in the activities of the SNH, of which the most symbolic of all was declaring the honorary presidency of the shah. Although every member of the SNH’s Board of Trustees was in the cabinet, the Society itself was an independent body.\textsuperscript{17} An analysis of the structure, policies, and aims of the

\textsuperscript{10}See further, Abrahamian, \textit{Iran between two Revolutions}, 120-123 and Katouzian, \textit{State and Society in Iran}, 280-289.

\textsuperscript{11}At the time, the Ministry of Culture and Education was known as the Ministry Culture and of Education, Endowments, and Fine Arts: \textit{Vezarat-e Ma'aref, Owqaf, va Sanaye-'e Mostazrafeh}. Tadayyon played a major role in the Franco-Iranian negotiations for the ownership and management of the archeological sites in 1927.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{The Times}, September 1, 1927.

\textsuperscript{13}FO 371, 12293/E3909, Clive, April 26, 1927.

\textsuperscript{14}FO 371, 12286/E4109, Clive, September 10, 1927. Emphasis added. See further \textit{Ettela'at}, Shahrivar 9, 1306/August 31, 1927.

\textsuperscript{15}“Annual Report for 1932,” FO 371/Persia 1933/34-16967.

\textsuperscript{16}FO 416, 113/E2445 Clive, April 30, 1930.

\textsuperscript{17}The financing of Ferdawsi’s mausoleum got complicated since SNH was not affiliated to any government department. See Iran National Archives 240, Micro-reel 291, Document 54, page 17; Esfand 8, 1312 (1933); Iran National Archives 240, Micro-reel 291, Document 54, page 5; Khordad 3-26, 1313 (1934); and Iran National Archives 240, Micro-reel 291, Document 53, page 3; Mehr 11, 1313 (1934).
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SNH reveals that it was rooted in politics, however its effectiveness lay in its apparent political apathy, which gave it an independence rarely found under Reza Shah. It needed this subterfuge for its survival. It seems that what these men were not allowed to do through the political apparatus, they tried to implement in the guise of an apparently apolitical cultural organization. Article twenty of the SNH’s first by-laws clearly states: “a member will be dismissed from the organization in case of involvement in political activities in the name of the Society.”

The SNH’s implicit political nature was enhanced in October 1927 when Reza Shah issued a decree that prohibited members of the court and cabinet as well as government officials to join any political party. Teymurtash and his party colleagues had to disband Iran-e Naw, but the British minister reported that “the party still meets secretly.” It appears that from that moment onward, these reformist leaders initiated and implemented their most radical ideas through the SNH, both in opposition to an increasingly despotic monarch and in tandem with the ever-present influence of the imperial powers. The series of landmarks erected by the SNH would serve as a platform to implement radical reforms. Their urging of further secularization and “progress” was to be materialized through modern institutions housed in these complexes; western style libraries, museums, bookshops, and restaurants were to instruct the people on life “along modern lines.” The new monuments were also to guarantee the successful “erasure” of old structures and habits for the prosperity of “discipline,” “homogeneity,” “reason and sense,” all for the “good of the country.”

During his August 1927 conversation with the British Embassy’s Oriental Secretary, Teymurtash acknowledged:

Persia, after twenty years of so-called Constitutional Government, had made little progress, and it has, so far, failed to grasp even the principles of Constitutional Government. Everything had to be started over again…[w]e longed for Persia to progress along modern lines…without discipline there was no hope. Elected on no programme and on no principle, [Deputies’] acts were devoid of reasoning and sense. A homogeneous and disciplined party, grouped around a personality and working through the personality for the good of the country, was the only hope for the future.

19FO 371, 12286/E4503, October 8, 1927, and FO E 4742/34/34, R. Clive, November 7, 1927.
20Teymurtash in conversation with the British minister in Tehran, FO 371, 12293/E3909, August 26, 1927.
21FO 371, 12293/E3909, Tehran, August 26, 1927, emphasis added. See further on the disillusionment with constitutionalism and popularity of dictatorship among modern intellectuals and middle classes, H. Katouzian, State and Society in Iran, 3-10, and Iranian History and Politics (London and New York, 2003), 2, 5, and 8.
During the decades following their demise in the 1930s, the efforts of these men were unacknowledged by official Pahlavi accounts. Most records fail to mention the individual agency of the “founding fathers” in the establishment of the SNH. Published by the Ministry of Culture and Art, *The Record of Reza Shah the Great: Founder of Modern Iran* celebrated the 2500-year anniversary of the Persian Empire in October 1971. Prefaced by Cultural Minister Mehrdad Pahlbod, the text under the heading “The Establishment of the Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli” confirms that the SNH was created by the order of Reza Khan when he was the war minister. Reza Khan was also made the honorary director of the SNH; “The Shahanshah paid particular attention to the protection and care of ancient Iranian heritage because it reminds us of the glorious periods of Iran.” Therefore, Minister of War Reza Khan “established an entity in the name of the Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli.” While Keikhosraw Shahrokh notes in his memoirs, “in 1926, under the auspices of His Majesty Shahanshah Reza Shah Pahlavi, a committee for the preservation of national heritage was formed,” later Pahlavi sources go further in maintaining, “His Majesty…allowed a group of Orient’s historians to search and renovate historic sites in all of Iran [sic].” Both sources remain suspect as regards to historical reality, bureaucratic structures, and personalities of those involved.

The *Karnameh*, the official 980-page record of the SNH, is the 131st and the most elaborate publication of the Society by far. It depicts their entire operations in painstaking detail from its inception to the year of the *Karnameh*’s publication in 1976. Although it claims scholarly precision and utilizes “scientific” methods to support its statements, the text is imbued with state propaganda and censorship, historic inaccuracies, and clumsy errors and omissions. The very opening paragraph is revealing:

> Early morning on the 3rd of Esfand 2479… a passionate and strong-minded son of Iran [Reza Khan] rose and rescued the nation from the grip of foreigners, tribe chiefs, and poverty. Two years had not passed from the arrival of Reza Shah the Great on the political scene when peace and security were attained. On his order in the Fall of 2481 a group of prominent intellectuals, admirers of the nation’s heritage and proud of Iran’s progress, set up a society called Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli. [Their] purpose [was] to preserve and restore historic landmarks and honor the memory, culture, and artistic glory of ancient Iran.

Yet however “passionate and strong-minded” Reza Khan might have been, he could not have single-handedly “secured” Iran from all its misfortunes in a single

---

“morning;” nor was absolute “peace and security attained” by 1923. Incidentally, the imperial dates in the newly enforced calendar are significant because they indicate the hegemony of the imperial concept of “time” and “history” in the 1970s, which originated in the foundation of the Achaemenian Empire. However, the account then goes on to state that at the request of the SNH in 1925, Prime Minister Reza Khan accepted the presidency of the Society. The account involves some inaccuracies regarding the dates of various events. And although its preface explicitly states that the then minister of education and chairman of the SNH, Isa Sadiq, had read and edited the manuscript, a comparison with Sadiq’s own writing on the subject, from which the Karnameh quotes extensively, reveals a number of inconsistencies with the facts.26

Furthermore, according to the Karnameh, during this early period because of a lack of an office, the executive committee of the SNH met at the residence of one of the members. The report stops there. Sadiq, in his memoirs writes, “The first time that I became aware of such a group was when Teymurtash, whose children were attending the school where I was an instructor, invited me to his house in the northern side of Jaleh Avenue.”27 Hence, and notwithstanding the later propaganda, we may reasonably conclude that the Society was formed largely by the personal efforts of Teymurtash. He offered his residence for the first few meetings and solicited members of the political and educational arena to promote the Society. The seemingly insignificant omissions and commissions in Karnameh appear to be very important when one considers the SNH as a political as well as socio-cultural instrument. The agency of Teymurtash, Forughi, and Firuz Mirza become more and more apparent as the SNH’s story unfolds and spreads to archeology, autopsies, and the invention of patrimony.

The constitutional principles and regulations of the Society resembled those of a political organization as well. In 1922, its four primary aims were listed in its first by-laws, composed of 14 articles and 21 regulations. The “purpose of the Society is to cultivate public fascination with Iranian scientific (elmi) and industrial (san’ati) historic heritage (asar-e tarikhi) and to attempt to protect the fine arts (sanaye’-e mostazrafeh) and handicrafts (sanaye’-e dasti) and to preserve their old style and method,” stated the first article.28 The eighth article itemized the initial objectives: “1) The establishment of a museum in Tehran; 2) The establishment of a library in Tehran; 3) The recording and classification of those works necessary to the preservation of a national heritage, and; 4) The tabulation of priceless collections related to libraries or museums that are in the possession of the state or national organizations.”29 Additional aims were stipulated in the ninth article: “Steps will be taken to use the above mentioned collections to benefit the masses through instruction at schools, exhibitions, and

lectures. Moreover, attempts will be made to preserve and revive the Iranian crafts (sanaye') and arts (honar-ha).”

Consisting of a fifteen member strong Board of Trustees, it enlisted “unlimited public and honorary members.” That Board held complete control over the organization: corrections or modifications to the by-laws, the conditions of membership, financial as well as administrative decisions, the summoning of meetings and the election of the members to the Board of Directors all depended on its vote. By 1926, the Society was fully prepared to begin its mission civilisatrice of cultivating “good taste.”

Heritage Discoursed

In 1925 selected historic edifices were indexed as “national heritage” (asar-e melli); the year 1927 was marked by the unprecedented de-capitulation of the French rights over all Iranian archeological sites. The index consisted of a list of archeological and architectural sites around the country. The importance of the list lay in its simultaneous claims to exclusivity and comprehensiveness. The success of the 1927 Convention gave the SNH both a national prestige and an international reputation which the imperial powers had to reckon with. Tasks undertaken in their entirety by the various members of the SNH nevertheless remained in the margins of Iranian historiography probably because these men were known, first and foremost, as political figures. Thus far, their efforts for the arts have been portrayed as exactly that—a trivial aspect of politics relegating Iranian agency to the margins of its own history. However, 1934 proved the opposite for in that year of heavy-handed Pahlavi reform, art and politics virtually merged as one and the same entity. Although the archeological negotiations were long and convoluted on all sides, the 1927 Convention was the Society’s first triumph. Moreover, the two official objectives of the SNH, stipulated in the 1922 by-laws, were honed into completion. The French observed in February 1927 that, “the ‘Commission for National Masterpieces’…has inaugurated the National Library and the Museum.”

During this period, moreover, the Society was deeply engaged in what would soon be its next triumph, one far more spectacular. This noteworthy event in 1934, namely the erection and the inauguration of a modern mausoleum for Ferdawsi, would place “marginal culture” at the heart of the political map of modern Iran. It would decisively alter and radically refigure its conceptual framework, leaving “an eternal mark” on the land. If the Archeological Convention was a triumph over the imperial “other,” this was a victory over “history” itself.

In implication more than actual scope, the construction of Ferdawsi Mausoleum and the Index were enormous undertakings that operated hand in hand, each feeding

---
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the other for its validity and authenticity. Both were also products of an arbitrary and selective process sustaining the political propaganda machine. Both were an outcome of modern systems of thought and action; scientific, hence ostensibly “natural”; highly sophisticated for their time, still almost historically inevitable. Both were invented, awaiting a tradition; both were imagined, awaiting a nation; both were politics, awaiting legitimacy through practice. Therefore, during the preparation for Ferdawsi’s tomb, the Society felt that its public obligations lay first and foremost, in the effort to “introduce this fantastic historic heritage to the citizens and captivate them in this 1000-year old heritage.” In order to create these intrinsic collective feelings among the masses, the SNH invited a number of well-known local and western Orientalists to deliver public lectures and publish articles on the arts and culture of (mostly ancient) Iran. On August 13, 1925, the German archeologist Ernst Herzfeld, who had come to Tehran from Kabul by the SNH’s invitation and money, delivered a lecture at the Ministry of Culture about the importance of “the nation’s heritage.”

Herzfeld declared,

Historic buildings and heritage are plenty and everywhere in Iran, and I cannot mention all of them. Since the Aryan tribes, or more precisely because of them, this country is called “Iranshahr,” that is about nine centuries before Christ, and the true ancient heritage of Iran dates from that period… This nation has reached the zenith of its culture at least on four occasions: first, the Achaemenian period when Iran was the center of the known world and lived in security for two hundred and fifty years; second, the Sassanian period, which, in fact, is considered the period of Iran’s progress; third, the Seljuk period when Iran became the progressive force among Islamic nations during a time when Europe had just come out of its savagery; and fourth, the Safavid period during which the Iranian craft was specially brilliant and coincided with Europe’s penetration into Asia. If you refer to world history, you will see that no nation has so much cultural heritage. Greece, while it had a progressive period five hundred years before Christ to three hundred AD, subsequently had nothing. Italy has two progressive periods, Rome and Renaissance, whereas European civilization is so relatively young that comparison is simply irrelevant.

Periodization and comparison as effective techniques of making a discourse was exactly what Herzfeld was doing. Methodologically, not only was he categorizing

---

32Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 4.
33At the time, the ministry was called Mas’udiye; what came later be the ministry of culture and art. On June 2, 1925, Prime Minister Forughi wrote to Teymurtash, “As Your Excellency may recall, Professor Herzfeld, who is a German Orientalist scholar has come to Tehran by the invitation of the Society for National Heritage. The aim of the Society in inviting him was to benefit from his skills in the establishment and organization of the national library and museum of Iran; [he is to] help the Ministry of Public Instruction” in this task. Iran National Archives, document 110/letter 3927. Khordad 11, 1305/June 2, 1926, Tehran, Iran.
34SNH 92, Majmu’eh-ye Entesharat-e Qadim-e Anjoman (Tehran, 1351), 41-43. Emphasis added.
Iranian cultural history into neat periodic compartments but also constructing the classic Orientalist east-west binaries. Much of the later art historical treatises would reinforce the four, allegedly “pure” and uncontained, historic periods. While dividing the stages of Iranian cultural development between the Achaemenians, Sassanians, Seljuks, and Safavids, his historic narrative, nonetheless, rotated around one man: “National buildings and monuments are not limited to old buildings, inscriptions, and sculptures. For example, the true Iranian heritage is the Shahnameh, which is the masterpiece of Ferdawsi, the only great poet of this country.”

Herzfeld quoted Ferdawsi's own poetical remark on his Shahnameh: “I have elevated a citadel of poetry, which will not be affected by wind and rain…”

This first public lecture organized by the SNH was designed to introduce and promote the idea of a new mausoleum for Ferdawsi, thereby implicating him in the undertaking; just as he spoke for the Iranian nation, the national elite spoke for him. In the sixth Majlis in 1927 Zoroastrian representative Shahrokh, while requesting permission to speak about Ferdawsi, had, as a rhetorical gesture, immediately stressed that “such a great man…does not need me to speak on his behalf.” Confident that he would “not be confronted with [any] objections,” Shahrokh began by reassuring his parliamentary colleagues that in speaking on Ferdawsi’s behalf he himself was “of no significance.” Moreover, he felt that what he had to say about the poet would “not add to [Ferdawsi’s] greatness, but would only make” Shahrokh “feel small.” In that meeting, the Majlis deputy spoke on behalf of the historical figure in order to convince the parliament to approve the proposed budget for the construction of Ferdawsi's mausoleum. The historic figure had “toiled to revive these nationalistic aspirations” and deserved a resting place “worthy of his greatness.”

The old and the new were lumped together, claiming scientific veracity: reviving a past that could not possibly be recalled and speaking on behalf of the dead better than they could. This nationalist tradition, which had in fact been an invention, acquired an international expression on October 1971 when Mohammad Reza Shah celebrated the 2500-year anniversary of the Persian Empire with great pomp and ceremony. In the presence of the international audience and the political elite of the time, on “this illustrious occasion in the history of Iran,” the shah stood in front of Cyrus the Great’s empty tomb at Pasargadae and “bow[ed his] head low before [Cyrus’] resting...”
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36 *Entesharat-e Qadim*, 35.
39 “Michelet not only claimed to speak on behalf of a large number of anonymous dead people, but insisted, with poignant authority, that he could say what they ‘really’ meant and ‘really’ wanted, since they themselves ‘did’ not understand. In this vein, more and more ‘second-generation’ nationalists learned to speak ‘for’ dead people with whom it was impossible or undesirable to establish a linguistic connection.” B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London, 1991), 198.
place and honor[ed his] unforgettable memory.”40 The shah reassured “the eternal hero of Iranian history” and “the great liberator of history” that he could “sleep comfortably” for we are “vigilant to protect your glorious heritage.” Long before that October, dead poets and scientists like Ferdawsi, Hafiz, Ibn Sina, Sa’di, and Omar Khayyam were being made to speak to modern Iranians, telling them what they “really” wished both for themselves and the nation. The discourse of the early 1920s set a trend for the destruction and reconstruction of graves for the subsequent historical figures; all of them had something to say about the form of their resting place. These were centuries old “unfulfilled wishes,” integral to the “forgotten greatness” of Iran for which the twentieth century politicians and scientists could speak. Architecture conditioned the revival of historical impossibilities. Mausoleums, as a particular kind of architectural typology, served the political aims well. Owing to its primary function and tectonic quality, a mausoleum preconditions an a priori existence of a “great hero.” If there was a tomb, therein must rest a hero. The physical presence of a tomb is in itself the undeniable evidence of important historical events. Following this logic, the narration of this “hero-ness” was merely consequential. This habit of talking to dead people and being “spoken back” by the dead became an institutionalized practice, an inherent component of the production and meaning of the SNH’s mausoleum complexes. It is also a practice invented by the construction of these projects.

By the request of the SNH in 1925, Herzfeld worked on a list of archeological and architectural works that crystallized a limited number of sites as Iran’s national heritage.41 Worried by the grave implications caused by such a seemingly comprehensive project, French Chargé d’Affaires Gaston Maugras confirmed the veracity of it to his superior in Paris, “Mr. Herzfeld after having come here at the expense of the Institute for National Works has sojourned since then in the same conditions. He is in charge—in Tehran and in various provinces—of missions in an official [capacity, creating an]…archeological inventory…”42 That “archeological inventory” was, in fact, a simple project with enormous consequence, which Maugras knew only too well. The German Orientalist had spent months traveling around the country and visiting the sites at the expense of the SNH. Now, he was asked to classify “things into categories” and give them a hierarchy based on the hegemonic concept of modern Iranian identity as defined by the political elite who had financed his ambitions.

40A. Aryanpur, A Translation of the Historic Speeches of His Imperial Majesty Shabanshab Aryamehr (Tehran, 1973), 50.
41Similarly, the Egyptian Committee for the Conservation of Monuments of Arab Art, in the 1860s “set up a ‘First Commission’ to list monuments worth preserving and a ‘Second Commission’ to oversee repairs and select relics for a museum.” D. Reid, “Cultural Imperialism and Nationalism: the Struggle to Define and Control the Heritage of Arab Art in Egypt,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 24:3 (1992): 61.
42Gaston Maugras was the French minister in Iran. Archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Direction des Affaires Politique et Commerciales Asie-Oceanie 1919-1929, Perse 66, Fouilles archeologique E387-3, 44, November 5, 1926, Teheran, Iran.
At the end of August 1925, the index was ready. Titled *A Brief Inventory of the Historical Heritage and Edifices of Iran*, it was the SNH’s first and methodologically most decisive publication.\(^4^3\) Although concise—in incorporated within thirty-eight small pages—it was intended as a comprehensive catalog based on “scientific” observations and examinations. A preface explains the scope and nature of the project, after which the sites are numerically listed under each major city or region: greater Tehran, Azerbaijan, Zanjan, Mazandaran, Khorasan, Semnan and Damghan, Astarabad, Isfahan, Fars, Khuzistan, Hamadan, Kerman, and Kalat. The classification of sites was arbitrary to the extent that small cities such as Hamadan and Na’in and large provinces such as the regions of Azerbaijan and Khuzistan were lumped together as equals. It was a systematic way of cataloging, thus setting the limits of “this” nation’s heritage. The logic of their order was governed by Herzfeld’s own preconceived ideas about Iranian imagined identity, supported and financed by the preconceived ideas of his patrons.

The seemingly simplistic act of making a list, more importantly, gave Herzfeld an advantage over his French rivals. The index, coupled with its publication, was a big blow to French cultural hegemony in Iran; Maugras knew this well. It was, after all, on the basis of this “list” that Iranian cultural artifacts were to be revalorized, fenced off, and displayed to the world. It was also on this basis that “things” were going to be price-tagged and sold off to western museums. Herzfeld’s inventory ultimately became the very foundation for the “invention” of Iran’s “historical monuments.”\(^4^4\) In the final official list of national heritage, based on Herzfeld Index, “of the 247 buildings which had been scheduled by the end of 1932 as historic monuments, 82 were pre-Islamic.”\(^4^5\) The mere presence of the index legitimized the sanctity of such “scientific” endeavors. From a vague set of artifacts, distributed on the territory of Persia, it became a discernible entity with an active function on Iranian identity, memory, and history.

During that same year, 1925, two other Orientalists were introduced to the Iranian cultural landscape; they were to remain there in some sense even after their death, for, in 1969, the SNH would erect the joint mausoleum of Phyllis Ackerman and her husband Arthur Upham Pope in the heart of Isfahan.\(^4^6\) In the interim, the two

\(^{4^3}\) SNH 1, *Febrest-e Mokhtasar-e Asar va Abnieh-ye Tarikhi-e Iran* (Tehran, 1304/1925); and SNH 2, *Asar-e Melli-ye Iran* (Tehran, 1304/1925).


\(^{4^6}\) Arthur Upham Pope (1881-1969) and Phyllis Ackerman (1893-1977) were American art historians and art dealers who devoted most of their professional lives to the research and publication of Iranian art, architecture, and archeology. Their two lasting contributions included the *Survey of Persian Art: From Prehistoric Times to the Present*, 1938-1939 and its reprint, 1964, both funded by the Pahlavi royal patronage and the organization of several international exhibitions and conferences on Persian art.
American art historians would imprint the development of Iran’s artistic legacy perhaps more profoundly than any other Westerner in the twentieth century. At the end of April 1925, Pope made his debut in Tehran during “the most powerful and profound of all these orations.”47 His first lecture at the house of Sardar Asa’d Bakhtiar was organized by Hossein Ala, Iranian ambassador to the US and the UN as well as a loyal and enduring member of the SNH, and translated by Mohammad Ali Forugh. Moved by “such cataract of exciting and new ideas,” Forugh asked Pope for a second presentation in a few days, this time translated by Isa Sadiq, who would shortly become minister of education. At the ministry of posts and telegraphs, Pope stood in front of high-ranking officials: Reza Khan who would become shah within a couple of months, Majlis deputies, the cabinet, and the American community. Titled “The Past and Future of Persian Art,” the speech, although addressing Iranian craft, its history, and historiography, was political in nature.48 Within the first paragraph, the Achaemenian and Sassanian “great names” like Cyrus and Ardeşir were cited. In 1920s Iran, where revival of the “nation’s real heritage” was the state’s main concern, the names of such pre-Islamic rulers were uttered as national slogans. Cyrus, founder of the Achaemenian dynasty in 550 BC and Ardeşir I, founder of the Sassanian Dynasty in 224 AD, were evoked as “pure” Persian heroes, the founders of the nation. The mention of their names at the start of Pope’s speech was not accidental. It was clear that historic fragments were being selected in order to force themselves upon a modern reduction of history. What was not clear is exactly who was doing the selecting: the Iranian modernists or the western Orientalist? In any case, they all agreed that Iran’s pre-Islamic past was the period to opt for.

Pope’s next paragraph, in the same vein, reminded the audience that “the voices of her poets still stir hearts everywhere”; that Ferdowsi, Sa’di, Hafiz, and Khayyam had “survived.” Pope further asserted that the ancient “Greek civilization” was “preserved” and “transmitted” to Europe by the “extraordinary intellectual power of … Avicenna.” However, “ravages of bandits, poverty, misrule, famine and ignorance” had “blight[ed] Persian art of all kinds.” During this lengthy talk, Pope conveyed several politically current themes. He began, first, by glorifying Persian history, historical figures, and the “spirit” of the nation. Then under the heading of “The Periods of Persian Art,” he listed the “great art periods” that shaped Iranian history with its various inventions and influences on other “civilizations.” Under his second heading, “Some Fundamental Characters,” Pope elaborated on the “fundamental principles of Persian art,” although he confessed that such “full understanding” is “no small matter” for “such a gifted nation as Persia.” He said that art was mainly successful primarily in its decoration, “beyond all these, Persia is famous for her brilliant decorative arts.” Appreciating handicraft production, he affirmed that

47 Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 10. See also H. Mazaheri, Aramgah-e Kharejjan dar Isfahan (Isfahan, 2000), 291.
industrial and mechanical inventions “often increase power at the expense of happiness, a cause of jealousy and strife….” This emphasis on craft and ornamentation was course intrinsic to the Orientalist tradition that, while the “sensuous” and the “decorative” were fitting to the oriental environment, the “technical” and “scientific” were suitably allocated to the “modern” western world.

Pope’s final headings, “Practical Measures for Revival of Persian Art” and “Wrong Views of Art that Delay Revival in Persia,” brought his narrative into the twentieth century, addressing the concerns of the politicians in the audience. He chose his words well:

If by instruction and by example these wrong theories that retard the revival and development of a real artistic sense can be corrected, then with the government’s energetic support of practical measures, the future of Persian art is secure. The claims of art on the attention of busy ministers and administrators may at first seem slight. Yet, art is a vital necessity of life for the nation….The government and people together must do everything possible to bring art again to life in Persia.49

Reza Khan, sitting in the audience along with Teymurtash, Forughi, Firuz Mirza, Sadiq and other reformists, must have been particularly moved by the enormous responsibility that Pope placed on the state in undertaking the task of revival of ancient glories and the cultivation of taste. “The government must see to it,” he said, “that as in the ancient days of Persia’s greatest glory artists shall receive encouragement from the highest sources and be shown to the public for what he is: a benefactor to the nation [sic],” a point which may well have impressed Reza Khan.50 Convincingly arguing on the basis of art, Pope implored the reformists to endeavor to “bring back” the civilization of ancient Iran. It was there that his most fundamental ideas about Iran’s artistic heritage were formulated. According to the American art historian and member of the CIA Donald N. Wilber, the speech resonated with Reza Khan’s beliefs about Iran’s past glories. “He became restless before the end, but there can be no doubt of the lasting impact of what he heard on the occasion…he was convinced that the heights reached by Iranians in the past must be scaled again…..”51

It was there that he recognized the political potential of “mere art.” Later, influenced by Pope’s minor remark on the missing tiles on the mosque of Sheikh Lotfollah in Isfahan, Reza Khan ordered their immediate replacement as well as the duplication of the mosque’s dome and drum in the newly built Marble Palace in Tehran.52 In the same vein, the opening up of the mosques to non-Muslims, a decree from Reza Shah,

49Pope, “The Past and Future of Persian Art”; see Gluck, Surveyors of Persian Art, 110.
51D. N. Wilber, Reza Shah Pahlavi: The Resurrection and Reconstruction of Iran (Hicksville, 1975), 98. This point is confirmed by Lenczowski: “…Reza Shah’s awareness of [Iran’s] great past was stimulated by the work of…Arthur Pope.” G. Lenczowski, ed., Iran under the Pahlavis (Stanford, 1978), 37.
52Bahr al-Ulumi, Karmameh, 12.
must have also been Pope’s proposition to the king. For, Pope had confessed to a friend, standing on the roof of Louvre, that he planned to photograph Persian architecture, “including especially the occupied mosques, rigidly closed to all unbelievers…."

Soon after, under Pope’s “objective professional counsel,” the Iranian state laid claim to various historically revered spaces as mosques, shrines, and madrises. They were to be turned into “historic heritage,” a bold confirmation of Iran’s ancient legacy, open to all kinds of visitors. The main Safavid mosque in Isfahan, Masjed-e Shah, was the first to be opened to foreign tourists.

Immediately translated into Persian, the twenty-six pages of this lecture were published and distributed by the joint efforts of the SNH and the ministry of public instructions. According to Education Minister Isa Sadiq, this translation was “for the use of teachers all over the country,” written by a man who “first reawakened our own love of beauty by pointing out the significance of our accomplishments; it was [he] who thus promoted the understanding and appreciation of Iranian art and craftsmanship in all its forms.” In later Pahlavi historiography, the event was a pivotal moment in national artistic rebirth where “Reza Shah’s awareness” of Iran’s pre-Islamic “great past was stimulated by the work of…Pope,” along with “the National Monument Society” that “owed much to his interest.” Even post-1979 sources concur that Pope’s “oration created excitement and it was from that moment that special attention was paid to the national arts.” This metaphoric cornerstone of “Persian Art” became a source of inspiration for local nationalists and westerners alike. Printed, reprinted, and cited many times over the decades, it resurfaced as a chapter in the Society’s ninety-second volume in 1972 and, for the last time, in Sadiq’s Past and the Future of Persian Art. Each of Pope’s points—from revival to museums, from pedagogy to art-value, from historical figures to the nation’s spirit—marked the subsequent undertakings of the SNH; each of these ideas was materialized in the monuments of the “national heroes.”

Between 1926 and 1929, the Society focused its efforts to further substantiate the discourse on Iranian cultural heritage. Experts continued to be invited to present talks on various aspects of Iranian art, craft, and architecture. On September 15, 1926, Herzfeld offered his views on Shahnameh and its role in the making of Iranian history, which had already been translated and published by the SNH as the third volume in the series. The Society’s next publication was a result of his February 1927 research paper, which discussed the newly discovered seals in Hamadan. The two cylinder seals, one gold the other silver, were inscribed in cuneiform script. The text in the
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54 See Abrahamian, Iran between Two Revolutions, 141.
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60 SNH 3, Shahnameh va Tarikh (Tehran, 1925).
three languages of Old Persian, Elami, and Babylonian was translated as, “Darius Great King, King of Kings, King of Countries, Son of Gostasp the Achaemenid. Darius King says: This is the Country that I rule, from Selk to Kush and from Hindus to Seperd. Ahura Mazda who is the Great God has given me this Country. Ahura Mazda protects me and my Family.”61 As soon as it was discovered, the Achaemenian inscription mutated into a “tradition”: words that were used and reused in newspapers, speeches, ceremonies, and royal declarations; words that were inscribed on palace walls and published in textbooks. Following this, it was only natural for the SNH to adopt the image of the seals as its first logo (Fig. 1).62 Sometime after 1934, this was replaced by the silhouette of Ferdawsi’s monument (Fig. 2), to be later substituted again by a more elaborate icon containing a fragment of Ibn Sina’s new mausoleum in Hamadan (Figs. 3 & 4). While it is difficult to date these logos, we know that as early as 1925 Herzfeld was commissioned to design a “vignette for the Anjoman.”63

These logos remain, nevertheless, further visual manifestations of the technique of making political discourse through art. The use of the image of the “newly discovered seals” gave both an official authority and a wide popularity to the archeological excavations supported by the Society. The imagery of the mausoleums of Ferdawsi and Ibn Sina were similarly popularized and legitimized by the use of their elevation drawings as the official emblem of the Society, which were published and disseminated among the public. Each text—text-as-image—authenticated the other texts invented by the SNH. The three emblems, moreover, invented their own historiography and that of the SNH in the form of image. The SNH’s deep involvement in the archeological affairs of the country is made manifest in the first logo, designed most probably during the drafting of the first by-laws in 1922. It brings to the fore the main preoccupation of the Society during that time: Iranian archeology, its discoveries, its politics, and those involved in it. The second logo similarly describes the SNH’s second major project undertaken in the late 1920s and the early 1930s, the design, construction, and inauguration of Ferdawsi’s monument.64 The style of the logo corresponds directly with the minimalist-modernist expression of the 1930s; it shadows the monument as well as its underpinning architectural trends. The

---

61 Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 6.
62 However, it is also possible that the image of the seal was not the SNH’s first logo but rather the logo of the 2500-year anniversary affixed to the gate of the SNH’s Tehran headquarters in 1971 on the occasion of the state-wide celebrations.
64 However, some SNH booklets, letters, and documents carry the Ferdawsi logo well after WWII. I am uncertain as to whether there was a consistent system to utilize the logos through the administrative, political, and technical changes of the Society. It might have been random, dictated by surplus letterheads, lack of technology to make new molds, etc. Nevertheless, the third logo remains predominant in the 1960s and 1970s. After the 1979 Revolution, the SNH’s logo, along with its name, was changed altogether.
third logo is a more complex and elaborate image of the Society. Depicting the three “blossoming” branches of the SNH—the archeological discoveries, the mausoleums reconstructions, and the national museum and library—this last emblem portrays each institution by a corresponding architectural element. The archeological undertakings are represented by the reconstructed façade of Darius’ palace in Persepolis; the national museum by the façade of the last Sassanian palace in Ctesiphon; and the architectural projects by the tower of Ibn Sina’s new mausoleum in Hamadan. Alternatively, the logo can be interpreted as the three stages of Iranian history as perceived and classified by the SNH: the Achaemenian and Sassanian “glorious” past is linked with and revived by the modern era; that connection is made by the new architectural language of Ibn Sina’s mausoleum.

Forughī and Herzfeld again joined forces on May 9, 1927. A conference was organized in the hall of the Ministry of Culture where each of them read a paper. Forughī, who had made a trip to the south of the country to visit the much talked about sites of Persepolis and Pasargadae, spoke about his observations on Iran’s national heritage:

I cannot adequately describe [my] feelings during my visit to our proud heritage. I am simply stunned by the idea that there are callous individuals who destroy such edifices…therefore I will refrain from mentioning the deplorable state of Persepolis. All the calamities that could have happened to it, have already happened. Both the inscriptions and the decorations are gone. Only the wonders of the time remain, and they must be preserved. The protection of our national heritage depends on the peoples’ appreciation and feeling of [the SNH’s] work. The awakening of this feeling, furthermore, is one of the responsibilities that the SNH has taken [upon itself]. And it hopes to reach its objectives via these means.65

In Forughī’s mind, it seemed, the task that these men had assigned themselves to accomplish, although embracing “scientific” and “rational” methods, at the end was about “feelings” and “awakenings.” It was also about destiny, of being somewhere in the past, regressive and traditional, and getting somewhere in the future, progressive and modern. The lecture is also indicative of the missionary nature of the Society, where “callous individuals” would be “awakened” to culture and brought to “appreciate” the nation’s “heritage” through the hard work of the SNH. Culture and progress, in this case, were synonymous.

In the same vein, the Hungarian ethnologist and founder of Tehran’s Museum of Ethnography, Ali Hannibal, talked about “the revival of the taste/spirit (زَوْق) of Iranian craft (سَنَاط).”66 During his lecture on June 9, 1927, he insisted that the SNH had a vital mission to carry out.

65Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 6-7.
66Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 7-8. Emphasis added. Also see Correspondence between Ministry of Culture and Education with Ministry of the Royal Court regarding Hannibal’s fee for the SNH
In terms of timing [the formation of the Society] coincides with another important event, namely the beginning of one of the historic moments for Iran. One of the darkest Iranian histories has ended and another period filled with hope has begun. The SNH, within its capability, should do two things: first, it should demolish the results of previously doomed periods and get rid of it. Secondly, it should provide grounds for the revival of previously forbidden taste and establish the foundations for this revival. At the time that the SNH initiated these two goals, the conditions were difficult.

Of course, Sirs, [you] can confirm that the destruction of Iranian beauty and craft is not only awful for Iran but also for the entire civilized world. Ignorant and indifferent people, antique dealers, and tourists were trying to demolish this entire great heritage. The situation was as such when the SNH was established [The above mentioned were] the causes of decline in Iranian artisanship.67

The dying Qajar era, presented here as the “dark ages,” had given birth to a new beginning. The role of “Iranian beauty and craft” in general, and the agency of the SNH in particular, were to prove pivotal to this historic change. The old, it was vehemently argued, had to be “demolished” in order to give rise to “revival” of “good taste.” The Hungarian turned Iranian added that the foreign elements claimed: “There are no museums in Iran; and the locals are not taking care of this heritage, hence we are taking it out of the country to protect it for the appreciation of the world. These were excuses by foreigners.” Intriguing furthermore is the manner in which Hannibal contradicts himself within the context of his own discourse. He firmly believed that the task at hand was to “destroy” the effects of the previous periods, which he felt were “bad omens”; still he condemned those “ignorant and indifferent people” who had done such deeds in the past; they had “destroyed” a great heritage. Hannibal was foretelling the operations of the SNH in the decades to come. All the existing tombs of the historic figures were destroyed by the state in order to preserve or reinvent the nation’s patrimony. There were other publications and lectures “to make aware the patriots of the country.” The discourse on Iranian national heritage, its architectural projects, and excavations of ancient sites continued to dominate the political milieu throughout the 1930s and 1940s. This chain of public representations of culture signaled a sustained discourse.

While authoritative words set the tone for most of the SNH’s subsequent activities, public landmarks were perceived by the early Pahlavi reformists as the most potent of such discursive formations; surely the most effective in cultivating “good taste” among the public. In April 1926, the Society embarked on such a project when after a conference, *Documents on Archaeology in Iran*, document 114, letter 1, Ministry of Culture and Education, 375-375; Tir 3, 1306/June 25, 1927 and Mordad 22, 1306/August 14, 1927.

“very difficult” journey through unpaved agricultural lands, Shahrokh had arrived in Tus to “discover” the “trace of two small graves.” The most fantastic of all the monuments ever conceived by the SNH is, undoubtedly, the mausoleum erected to commemorate Ferdawsi (Fig. 5). The efforts that went into designing and constructing the structure entail a convoluted story. Politicians and scholars like Teymurtash, Shahrokh, Herzfeld, Sadiq, Godard, and the German-trained Iranian architect Karim Taherzadeh Behzad were all caught up in a twelve-year construction process, which would prove to be just the beginning of forty years of restoration. An integral part of celebrations of the poet’s alleged millennium, the “discovery” of his equally alleged original gravestone occasioned a new structure to be inaugurated by Reza Shah in October 1934. First proposed by Herzfeld, the design was instead commissioned to Taherzadeh who was, in turn, fired for malpractice. Re-proposed by Godard, the final touches were laid by Teymurtash. The most striking decorative element was, and remains, the icon of Ahura Mazda, the Zoroastrian god, put on the central front façade of the structure, a direct copy from Persepolis’ Hall of One Hundred Columns or The Throne Hall. Forceful even as a mere fragment, it deferred a holistic reading of the entire undertaking. Morphologically, the structure was a synthesis between the Parthian mausoleum buildings and Cyrus’s tomb as examples of Iran’s pre-Islamic architecture. Despite extensive cost and effort, however, the landmark did not sustain its structural integrity for long because pressured by Reza Shah’s unyielding demands for a rapid construction, the monument was never reinforced with a foundation. The subsequent decades of fruitless restorations gave way to an imperial decree in 1964, which would set off a complete dismantlement of the monument to be re-inaugurated by Mohammad Reza Shah.

The landmark’s inauguration in 1934 was coupled by an elaborate Congress of Orientalists, which lasted four days and ended on October 8 with a closing note by the minister of culture and education (ma’aref), Ali Asghar Hekmat. Early next morning, the scholars were put on a bus headed towards Tus. To personally ensure that everything was in order, as was his style, the shah went ahead of the guests; he was particularly anxious to inspect the roads. After a stopover in Nishapur to visit Omar Khayyam’s grave, the scholars arrived in Mashhad on October 12, the much anticipated and widely advertised day of the inauguration. Like the landmark, a towering figure, Reza Shah was “a man of few words.” At exactly 4 pm, he walked into the garden, stepped up the monumental staircase, and firmly positioned himself behind the table. His military uniform made discernible against the structure’s white backdrop, he declared:

68Shahrokh, Memoirs, 73.
69“Drawings and Maps, D-758,” Herzfeld Archive.
70“His Majesty himself went 50 kilometers ahead of the caravan to personally check the condition of the road…” See Sadiq, Memoirs, 2: 220; and Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 51-52.
We are very happy on the occasion of the millennium of Ferdawsi that we are able to fulfill one of the oldest wishes of the nation and demonstrate with the existence of this structure the nation’s appreciation [to Ferdawsi]. The people of Iran are sorry that Ferdawsi Tusi had to endure suffering (ranj) and that he was not sufficiently appreciated for his [effort] to revive the language and history of this country. Although by loving the poetry of the Shabnameh Iranians have made their hearts the resting-place of Ferdawsi, it was necessary to take some action and construct a structure and decorate it so that [the people could] also display their apparent (zarber) appreciation. For this reason, we ordered full attention [be paid] to the construction of this historic monument.

The author of the Shabnameh by constructing a lofty citadel, undamaged by the wind and the rain, has made his own name eternal; therefore, he neither needs such a ceremony nor [such a] structure… However, appreciation of [its] servants is the spiritual responsibility of the nation and shall not refrain from the expression of [such] appreciation. I have the highest level of satisfaction by seeing a group of scholars, our friends, and friends of our craft and literature, [who] have rushed from the corners of the world…to the resting-place of the Wise Orator and joined us to share our appreciation….With expression of joy for your loving feelings, we invite the audience to the opening ceremony.72

The idea of linking Cyrus, a ruler with an empty tomb-chamber, to Ferdawsi, a poet with a forgotten tombstone, and the belief that such connections are not only viable but also necessary to the birth of the nation, and that such reawakening is possible through architecture, is remarkable. While evidence without context is ambiguous at best, it may be said that only unyielding modernists like Teymurtash, Shahrokh, Forughí, Firuz, and Davar could have imagined and enforced such an idea. This conspicuous reference to the pre-Islamic culture of Iran epitomizes the revivalist vision of the early Pahlavi elite. Aside from the stylistic preference of the 1930s, the more plausible explanation for the use of the white stone was the evocation of Ferdawsi’s “extremely pure” language because “Arabic loan words are less than five percent” of the words used in Shabnameh.73 The architectural language was novel and epitomized the Aryan rhetoric with pure and “ uncontaminated” white stone, with its revivalistic Achaemenian and Zoroastrian ornamentations and prototypes, and its selected inscriptions from Shabnameh. Its functional concepts, however, were taken from long-existing religious practices. Intended as a secular pilgrimage site, it exploited the Shi’a ritual of ziyarat and took the name of Ferdawsiyeh from the distinctively Shi’a

73 I. Sadiq, Ferdawsi (Tehran, 1945), 14.
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architectural concept of Hosseinieh. Even so, it remained essentially modern in its style, function, composition, and narrative quality. Its sophistication lay in its methodological simplicity: specific but distinct parts assembled to project a holistic certainty.

Furthermore, over its half-century construction, not only did this monument use a considerable amount of money and skills, but also it turned out to be the longest and most problematic venture undertaken by the SNH. In 1934, it used 177,300 tomans or £22,162; in 1968 it took another 9,858,559 tomans or $1.4 million. As the sole public landmark personally unveiled by “the father of modern Iran” it received the most lavish royal attention, but later resulted in discontent and disapproval by critics of the Aryan ideology of the regime, leading to a haunting question for many Iranians in the twentieth century: “Hossein at Karbala or Cyrus at Pasargadae?” By (re)appropriating Ferdowsi as a vital link to the origin at Pasargadae, the Society provided the nation with a site on which collective history could be experienced at an exact place and time. The discourse that the early Pahlavi elite conjured up and nurtured to maturity through this structure was one of modern certainties, “bright futures,” and “civilizing taste.” It had also much to do with inventing imagined historic links and generating a sincere collective memory for pre-Islamic Iran. As such, Ferdowsi’s mausoleum remains to this day the supreme icon of the “totality of the Pahlavi project” as articulated in Teymurtash’s Iran-e Naw Party manifesto, itself “the most audacious aspect” of the Aryanist and modernist ideology, which began to be applied under Reza Shah. It is, therefore, a cultural expression and material encapsulation of that manifesto in that it simultaneously signaled “ancient history” and “modern progress” as well as “taste” and “civilization” “along western lines” on an imaginary spot and based on the amalgam of archeological fragments. Ultimately, it places the very history of Reza Shah’s Iran on the “exact spot” that never was. It launched out not just a new aesthetics, but also a novel definition and function given to public symbols, spaces, and practices in modern Iran.

Destructive Pedagogy

At its core, the mission of the SNH was one of aesthetics; it was a mission civilisatrice, “the purpose of which [was] to cultivate public fascination in Iranian scientific and industrial historic heritage and to attempt to protect the fine industry and handicraft and to preserve their old style and method,” states the first article of the SNH’s by-laws. This undertaking had two major consequences for the architectural profession in Iran: the revival of “forgotten” forms and the destruction of “traditional” forms.

---

74 Hosseinieh is the term used for the space specially constructed or converted for Rawzeh-khanis in commemoration of the martyrdom of Imam Hossein during the month of Moharram.

75 “But it was the totality of the Pahlavi project as expressed in the Iran-e Naw manifesto which was the most audacious aspect of the reform programme.” A. Ansari, Modern Iran since 1921: the Pahlavis and After (London, 2003), 45.

76 Bahr al-Ulumi, Karnameh, 13-21.
These two concepts, turned into ideologies, shaped the architectural culture of the early Pahlavi Iran. Both are fundamental to the understanding of the Iranian physical and public environment and its subsequent development.

The continual process of depicting the past was not only projected as sets of events and forms that could be renewed, but also as a vivid collective memory that must be reawakened. This course of awakening was manufactured through material mimicking of past objects such as we find on the façade of Ferdawsiyeh. The revival of material traces of pre-Islamic dynasties laid the ground for the much broader project of collective memory. The exclusively psychological venture of memory was seen as one akin to that of revived architecture. Memory and form were synonymous. The SNH cultural revivalism was different from its Qajar predecessors—for instance, Fath Ali Shah Qajar’s 1823 order to carve neo-Sassanian rock cuts at Cheshmey-e Ali, in Ray—in that it consistently privileged the image of Ahura Mazda over Ali, or Cyrus over Hossein, as the “true” signifiers of Iranian identity. Moreover, the systematic, official, and political use of “memory” was imposed by the elite as an integral part of the process of modernization. The SNH’s various attempts at reviving selected decorative and morphological elements from Achaemenian and Sassanian artistic repertoires underpinned the ideological assumption that an existing collective memory had been forgotten by the modern masses. It was also presumed that the secular elite carried the responsibly to (re)awaken that memory. The French language semi-official Iranian newspaper Le Journal de Téhéran rhetoricly wrote in its first leading article on March 15, 1935, titled “Our Goal”:

We forget, or we seem to have forgotten, all our past historical brilliance, our struggle against Babylon, Athens, Sparta, Rome, and Byzantium; and we seem not to want the memory of our military deeds and our humanitarian and civilizing principles to remain alive. We forget the services that we have provided to the entire humanity….Today we want to remind the civilized world of that which we have been, that which we are at the present time, and that which we want for tomorrow, which will depend on our past and our present…. [The] descendants of the same nation that has given birth to Avicenna….Under the energetic actions of a man of genius [i.e. Reza Shah] Iran has been revived. We have aborted all the problems of modern life….Following its ancestral roots, Iran has once again revived and remains always the nation which has demonstrated the ability to assimilate with the certainty of catching-up with the lost years. Nothing can prevent a nation to arrive at its goals, and those goals are waiting for us.77

The editorial was written by none other than Said Naficy, professor of history in the Faculty of Letters at Tehran University, collaborator of Hasan Pirnia in his History of Ancient Iran, and an active member of the SNH. As the literary editor of the

newspaper, Naficy went on to say that Iranians have an equal right among “civilized people” because they are among the “architects of that civilization which human-kind glorifies today.” Architectural icons were pivotal to the larger task of reminding and reviving the nation. Therefore, the completion in 1939 of Tehran’s archeological museum—Muzeh-ye Iran-e Bastan—and the adjoining national library were to handsomely contribute to the project of memory (Fig. 6). Designed by André Godard and Maxime Siroux respectively, the style of the buildings after the last Sassanian palace in Ctesiphon spoke plenty about revivalistic intentions through architecture where architectural choices had more to do with politics—that is politics of identity and power—than with those of aesthetics. To the question whether “Reza Shah inaugurated the buildings himself,” the architect’s partner and wife, Yedda Godard replied, “Oh, no! He walked around it to see what it could possibly represent, but never entered it.” Adding, “He had a strange attitude...always afraid of being ridiculed.”

Museums and libraries are metaphors for a state’s ability to exercise control over that which it in turn upholds as historic knowledge and cultural heritage. They are also temples of memory, effective tools to revive the imagined national spirit. In Iran, too, these two institutions cataloged and categorized the nation, framed it, mapped it, and in the end made it legible.

The third point of the SNH’s by-laws, similarly, embraced the concern with collective memory: it was charged with the entire debate on historic monuments, their construction, preservation, destruction, and shifting meaning. It read: “the recording and classification of those works the preservation of which as national heritage is necessary”, a statement which underlined a thoroughly political agenda. The Society was endowing itself with the responsibility to “preserve” and “restore” selected structures, while giving itself the right to destroy and eliminate some others.

Qualifying something—as art, as “cultural property,” as worth being taken care of—necessarily implies disqualifying something else, something that might have been qualified and is being ignored or something against which the qualities of the elected object are being set off. The “defaming comparisons” that we have identified as a technique of disqualification often really serves this double purpose. The polemical dimension of this phenomenon further implies that what is qualified by someone may be—and often is—disqualified by someone else. And vice-versa. “Wars of images” and of interpretations come to mind. Seen in this perspective, appraisal and rejection, conservation and destruction represent two sides of the same coin.

Selected past relics were re-read as acts of historic heroism, simply pushing the leftovers to the sideline of history. The material culture of any society signals a historic
process; its omission—let alone its destruction—ruptures that development. “[T]he consensus obtained by ‘heritage’ obliged using roundabout methods and definitions of destruction…” The SNH’s self-imposed duty to handpick “historic monuments,” also gave it the license to eliminate that which it chose not to select.

The first symbol of modernism was the destruction of the historic fortifications. In this arbitrary process of selective elimination/preservation, Tehran’s fortified walls and gates never made the list, for by 1940, all but one were removed without trace. Under the mayor of Tehran, Karim Aqa Khan Buzarjomehri, the wall and eleven gates of Qajar Tehran were destroyed from 1932 to 1937. They were seen neither as “historic” nor “monumental,” but rather as standing tributes to Qajar power. These explicitly visible elements of Tehran’s public architecture often caused embracement in Iran’s secular elite, especially during visits by European diplomats and tourists, because they were seen by both parties as signs of backwardness and lack of modernity. The twelve gateways, furthermore, symbolized the locations where the old regime had controlled the traffic of people and objects in and out of the city. Their demolition both enabled the physical expansion of the urban fabric and the eradication of the last traces of the ancien regime from the capital. This act was considered symbolic of the shah’s determination to modernize Iran. At the heart of the city, approximately two-thirds of Qajar Tehran was razed, most of which consisted of the residential quarters and service areas of the royal domain. Some of the demolitions were replaced by new structures; others were left vacant. Rapid reform in a pre-industrial country could only allow so much construction; the new Ministry of Finance was erected on the site of the Qajar royal harem, with profound symbolic meaning. While the Nayeb al-Saltaneh palace gave way to the Justice Ministry, the main barracks and royal stables were transformed into the Ministry of Trade. That which was preserved, namely the Talar-e Almas that later became the Golestan Palace and the Shams al-Emareh, were cleaned up by the destruction of the surrounding “secondary structure.”

In a dialectical relation, the very notion of preservation also sanctioned an array of destructions with relative ease. “The false discourse on the preservation of heritage, which was born during the Renaissance, aims at concealing the real destruction and disfigurements” of monuments. The destruction of the original tombs of the historic figures by the SNH must be seen in the light of attempts at rapid modernism, with their architectural implications; the uneasy presence of tension between construction and destruction; of a visionary future, impossible to build. Rosita Forbes, who visited Tehran in 1931, described the streets as “slightly Hollywoodesque, for the new streets

80Gamboni, *Destruction of Art*, 331.
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Recultivating “Good Taste”

looked as if they had not quite settled where they were going, and the rows of new
houses, one room deep, were all frontage.⁸⁵ Similarly, having been impulsively
erected, the SNH monuments would start to fall apart or sink in only months after
their inauguration. Ferdawsi’s tomb had to go through thirty years of repair and
reconstruction until it could stand on its own feet. Despite the intentions of their
designers, the main function that these projects ended up fulfilling was to make a
semblance to a lasting modernist utopia. The Reza Shah regime was not unique in its
iconoclastic attempts in the name of Iranian modernism. Complete architectural
elimination was that which such modernists did everywhere in the name of the “bright
future” that would never come. This rapid modernity is defined by a tension between
architectural destruction of old things to make way for the architectural construction
of new things; the juxtaposition is the essence of its tense nature.

The SNH intended to achieve its revival of “artistic spirit and taste” by a careful
and long-term practice of public instruction. New civic spaces occasioned ideal
settings for such instructions. As Pope had prophesied in 1925, “by instruction and by
example” the masses were to be acculturated and their “fascination cultivated.” While
a budget for public works was virtually non-existent under the Qajar dynasty, the
budget of the Ministry of Culture and Education under Reza Shah increased six-fold
between 1925 and 1935.⁸⁶ Unlike the Qajars, who depended on religious charitable
endowments for such works, the Pahlavi state initiated these structures and took it
upon itself to instruct the public. As noted, selected historical figures were to stand as
symbols of racial, national, and cultural superiority and their new tombs as the
aesthetic manifestation of the resulting superior ethics. On March 27, 1935 Le Journal
de Téhéran indorsed its first leader, titled “The Progress of Public Instruction in Iran”:

Iranians aim at instructing themselves and it is for this reason that our country has
produced gardens for poets like Ferdawsi, Sa’di, Hafiz, Khayyam, scientists like
Razi and Avicenna, and great men of politics like Nezam al-Molk and Amir Kabir.
Even our kings have been excellent poets. However, until these last years, [public]
instruction was the leisure of the privileged few because there were no cultural
organizations vast enough or numerous enough to enable the majority of the
empire’s inhabitants to learn how to read and write.…In the cultural domain, as in
all other domains, it was destined that it would be Shahanshah Pahlavi who would
think of doing something, and that something would be grandiose. In effect, it is
since the 1921 coup that public instruction has started to develop in our country.⁸⁷

⁸⁶Archives of Ministere des Affaires Etrangeres, Asie-Oceanie Janvier 1918-Decembre 1929, Perse
#129, E387-1, 163, August 20, 1935, Tehran, Iran. See also S. A. Arjomand, Turban for the Crown: the
Téhéran 6 (Tehran, Farvardin 6, 1314/March 27, 1935): 1.
The article lists in statistical detail the names and locations of schools, universities, and sport and public facilities initiated under Reza Shah. It concludes that “the progress of [public] instruction in Iran is continuous and is evidence for a brilliant future for our nation, precisely as stated by the Annual [journal] of 1866: ‘original Aryans, like us Europeans, [Iranians] possess every aptitude for civilization’.” Architecture, from the outset, came to play a vital role in this “grandiose” effort to acculturate the nation; it occasioned a self-sustained regime of cultural invention. Progress was to be achieved through relentless practices of public instruction in “gardens for poets,” universities, libraries, and museums—projects that the SNH embraced wholeheartedly. The material order of the body-in-space reflected a moral order of the mind-in-memory. Spaces that acculturated the nation were projections of its “brilliant future.” In the museums and monuments, the order that was represented was order itself where things stood for further meanings.88

The very existence of these sets of monuments signal the arrival of a new era; one that was constructive and modern, one that was simultaneously popular and national. In fact, the SNH’s very by-laws and its subsequent undertakings bear witness to the vision of the political elite in defining and disseminating concepts such as heritage, monument, preservation, history, and taste mainly along western lines. It redefined relationships between monument and pilgrimage, structure and urban fabric, form and meaning. They also demonstrate that despite complete reliance on a western paradigm, the SNH promoted local causes and resisted imperialism, hence revealing the contradictions and complexities of rapid modernization. Accordingly, article three of the regulation explicitly privileges the Iranian citizen despite the fact that such an acute sense of national belonging was vague and sporadic in 1920s Iran. Through this article the document gave an ultra-national twist to the Society and its subsequent identity, hinting at the view that only Iranians can “truly” appreciate and protect Iranian cultural heritage. It privileged the homogeneous Iranian in order to create it. All the while, the article facilitates the employment of Western experts to classify and index that order.

Ultimately, the SNH’s grand project was a cultural regime of modernity. Artistic domination, exclusivity, and violence were written into its modernizing schemes; acts of architectural destruction were integral to its models of construction. Teymurtash’s remark that “Everything had to be started over again,” is evocative of the elites’ need to compulsively erase the present to shape the future.89 It is also suggestive of a specific perception of time, of its finality, as well as of new origins and beginnings. What is more, the very act of belonging to the SNH was in itself a confirmation of perceiving “time” and “taste” in that specific way; of understating “progress” and “modernity”; or of wanting to revive the national zawgh; a sign of cultural distinctiveness and excellence; a difference of “taste.” This cultural regime of modernity was exteriorized

---

not only in the aesthetic choices during lectures and on monuments, but also in personal demeanor. For example, during his two-day stay in Paris in November 1931, Teymurtash made a special request to the French government to “organize a visit to l’Exposition Coloniale”90 and on his way back via Moscow he stopped by the Lenin Museum. A similar example of such “cultural signs” is the group photograph taken around 1928 during the annual horserace in Gorgan (Fig. 7).91 The subtle yet profound meaning generated by Pahlavi caps is only eclipsed by the modern cameras in the hands of Teymurtash and his colleague. Both were public texts of modernity. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that all of these “men of taste” as describes by Arthur Pope, were part of the Society; for not only did the SNH take it upon itself to acculturate the masses but it was also a modern institution that, in and by itself, signified “high culture” and “good taste.” Its sociopolitical impact and the ideological influence of these men would resonate well into the 1980s where the project of taste and culture would be co-opted and its parameters redefined by the political elite of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

---


91 This remarkable photograph is being published here, I believe for the first time, by the kind permission of Firuz Mirza Firuz’s son, Mr. Shahrokh Firuz.
Fig. 1: The SNH’s first logo, reused for the 2500-year anniversary of ‘Persian Empire’ in 1971. Source: The Shahnameh of Ferdowsi, the Baysonghori Manuscript (Tehran, 1350/1971) title-page.

Fig. 2: SNH’s second logo, post-1934. Source: I. Sadig, Ferdowsi (Tehran, 1945) front-page.

Fig. 3: SNH’s third and final logo, with the elevation of Avicenna’s modern mausoleum at the central top; an Achaemenian palace on the left; the Sassanian palace at Ctesiphon on the right; and cuneiform and Arabic inscriptions on the lower ends. Source: SNH 4, Discovery of two historic seals in Hamadan (Tehran, 1927), front-page.

Fig. 4: The tower of Ibn Sina’s modern mausoleum, designed by Houshang Seyhoun, Hamadan, 1952. Inaugurated by Mohammad-Reza Shah on April 29, 1954. Source: Grigor, January 2000.

Fig. 5: General view of Ferdawsi’s modern mausoleum, designed by André Godard, Tus, 1934. Inaugurated by Reza Shah on October 12, 1934 and by Mohammad Reza Shah and Queen Farah on April 30, 1968. Source: Grigor, January 2000.

Fig. 6: Archeological Museum of Iran designed by André Godard, Tehran, 1936-1939. Source: Grigor, December 1999.

Fig. 7: Reza Shah’s Cabinet members and other high-ranking officials during a horserace event in Gorgan, 1928 c. Central figure with camera is Court Minister Teymourtash, on his right Finance Minister Firouz Mirza and on his left Justice Minister Davar. Source: Library of Prince Firouz Mirza Firouz by the permission of Shahrokh Firouz.