



The Central Forces During and After the Formation of Iran Islamic Revolution

Girayalp KARAKUŞ

Dr. Lecturer, Amasya University Faculty of Sciences And Literature Department of History-Amasya/Turkey

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6240-5490>



ABSTRACT

In this study, the formation of the Iranian Islamic Revolution in 1979 and the attitudes of the central powers in the post-revolutionary world to the regime were examined as a result of the massification of the reactions against the militarist modernist understanding of the Pahlavi dynasty of Iran, which had strong foundations as a Shiite doctrine. The study includes three sections: general information, theoretical framework and historical background. It is also important in our study that the Islamic Republic of Iran, after the revolution, moved away from the Shah period state policies and positioned themselves according to the Shiite state understanding.

Various academicians, journalists and foreign works were used as sources. The aim of this study is to examine the Islamic Revolution of Iran, one of the most important revolutions in the 20th century, in historical, sociological and epistemological terms and to bring a different perspective to the interpretations made about this revolution in the scientific world.

Key Words: Iranian, Islam, Khomeini, France, England, America

1. INTRODUCTION

With the fall of the Berlin Wall, revolutionary experiences have been relatively discredited. But a revolution in the name of Islam is rejected for other reasons. Women who are forced to cover come to mind. The Islamic regime in Iran is linked to social and cultural conservatism, which is incompatible with the word revolution. At this point, to what extent can it be correct to use the word political and Islam? But the features that can be seen as religious can be intertwined with politics after a while. We can say that the Iranian Revolution, like the French Revolution, has its own internal dynamics. Iran, like France, has institutionalized revolutionary activities. Shia Iran, on the other hand, gives priority to "mourning for martyrs" with its strategy of sustaining revolutionary feelings like France. In other words, the political and the religious are intertwined.

Master writers like Ali Shari'ati succeeded in synthesizing Marxism and Islam. He succeeded in proving to the whole Islamic world that by being a leftist, we could adhere to traditions. The Islamic Revolution did not come about with a sudden explosion of tradition, but rather the result of the reformulation of religiousness. One end of the revolution in Iran was based on nationalism. Shiism and nationalism were identified with each other. In short, the revolution strengthened the nation-state.

In today's world, when the enthusiasm of a young society fascinated by utopian Islam has passed, discontent has begun to emerge gradually. In order not to lose this enthusiasm, the Iranian government is constantly trying to motivate the society with revolutionary symbols. But it will be difficult to say that these quests are successful.

In the aftermath of the revolution, Western states are generally disappointed. Because both France and England were unable to obtain the benefits they expected from the Revolution and the administration that controlled it. The ulema class, which took control of the revolution, separated the world into demons and oppressed countries and declared the West as the devil.

2. THE FORMATION PROCESS OF THE IRANIAN ISLAMIC REVOLUTION

When we investigate the reasons of the Iranian Revolution, we see that there is not a single reason. It can be said that many economic, cultural, religious and political factors were effective in the revolution.

In this context, Keddie argues that Shiite Islam is less effective than the social, economic and political factors in the Revolutionary process, and Abrahamian, with his thesis "Distorted and Unequal Development," argues that political and human rights and individual freedoms cannot be made in the areas of economic, commercial and industrial breakthroughs during the Shah period. Therefore, they think that social tensions are fueled by an uneven development and that these developments prepared the end of the Shah. Arjomend also revealed the Revolution of the conflict between the Shah's bureaucratic forces (elite, military and civil bureaucracy, employers and renters class) and the hierarchy (traditional hierarchy, traditional ulama, clergy supported by artisans and small business owners) in relation to the Iranian Revolution. In fact, he argues that this struggle is no different from classical political strife and that there has been no qualitative change in the Revolution and Iran, and that the crowned Shah is replaced by urban ulema. In other analyzes of the Revolution in Iran, the researchers, trying to put forward the relationship between economic problems and the Revolution, are trying to analyze the Revolution from the contention between the modern bourgeoisie and the working class within the framework of the Marxist class struggle. Researchers like Parsa and Moaddel argue that economic conditions and relationships of interest are the determining factors of the Revolution process, not religious doctrine in its approach to the Iranian Revolution. In the analysis of Algar on the Iranian Revolution, Khomeini's charismatic personality and the revolutionary discourses of Islamic doctrine are the most important factors of the Revolution process without mentioning economic conditions and relations of interest. This is the emergence of modern history through a rare and genuine social revolution in which Iran, one of the closest allies of the West, has been able to overcome the great American influence with this Revolution. (Okyar 2014: 122)

One of the most important reasons of the Iranian Revolution was that the bureaucratic elite moved away from the lives of the people and obstructed the demands of the people. Moreover, the Shah's proms, festivals and performances that he made to pacify the ulama in the dream of a Western-style country provoked the public. The Iranian Revolution has become a symbol of a revival of the Iranian people for socio-cultural reasons. According to Edward Said, the Iranian Revolution is extraordinary. Because the two groups that are very difficult to come together, the ulema and the people, have made an alliance. (Said 1995: 99)

During this period, the Shah's dictatorial practices, inconclusive economic policies and the declaration of the traitor to those who were not members of the Shah's Resurrection Party in 1975 were among the factors that accelerated the revolution. In addition, a large part of Iranian society was a member of the Jafari branch of Shiism and the 12th Imam was lost, that led to seeking a leader in the society. The position of ulema has gained importance in this environment. As a result of this factor, different segments of the society were able to act in accordance with a single goal. (Okyar 2014: 123)

Another reason for the formation of the revolution is that there is no ruling elite in the country that can be a partner to the administration outside the Shah. As a result of the Shah's one-man policy, neither the army nor the police were able to act on behalf of the state when the Shah fled the country. In fact, the army preferred to stand by the Shah until the last moment, but the fact that the army did not want to confront the people prevented more serious events.

The demographic structure and infrastructure of the Pahlavi regime before the 1979 Revolution were in line with the country's unstable economy. The class structure, split between the merchant class and the poor and the ruling elite and the modern middle class, was ultimately plunged into

complete chaos during the revolution. With the inclusion of local elitism of secular left and liberal politics of the political populism of Ayatollah Khomeini's promising radical Islamism based on the political tendencies inherent in Shi'ite Islam, the revolution was ultimately led to complete confusion. In fact, the Iranian economy started to improve for the period between 1953-1973, especially with the increase in oil prices. In this economic-political approach, there have been significant changes between cities and the countryside in Iran. While the rural continually became poorer, there was a meaningless urbanization in the cities. The people in the country especially flocked to Tehran. Since the national bourgeois interests were damaged in the transition phase of Iranian economy to capitalism, it undermined central government. With the deterioration of the infrastructure, the clergy began to react more. In particular, after the White Revolution, the ulema began to react to the central government. The bourgeoisie, while exercising certain economic rights, reacted because its political demands were not met. (Dabashi 2008: 160)

There are scholars who talk about the effect of three actors on the success of the 1979 Revolution. (Shah, President Carter and Khomeini). We cannot deny the influence of these three actors, but we can say that the claims eventually turned into useless speculation. Because ultimately, there was a revolution and only Khomeini was able to do what he wanted. Both the Shah and Carter were wrong in their calculations. Encouraged by the CIA-backed 1953 coup, the US failed to succeed this time and even faced a hostile regime. Starting from Khomeini's 1963 uprising, we cannot consider the 1979 Revolution only in terms of religion. In particular, analysts ignore the nationalist features of the Revolution. However, no matter which historical model we give, we can say that the revolution rapidly became Islamized after the hostage crisis. A group of Islamists who participated in the process of revolution succeeded to lead the revolution in the direction they wanted by defeating the other groups and called it "Islamic Revolution". In January 1978, an article was published in the newspaper "Ittilaat", which attacked the ulema and Khomeini. The article is written by a person whom the Shah trusts and approves. However, the article is replied by the more independent newspaper "Kayhan". According to the article published in the court's newspaper, Khomeini was allegedly an English agent, a poet (according to the Shi'ite scholars, the poem was haram) and not an Iranian (because his grandfather was born in India). (Baquer 1999: 186) After the article, thousands of religious students revolted in Kum. The police opened fire and killed several students. Khomeini praises the courage of the students from Paris and calls for further action. Ayatollah Şeriatmedari, one of the most important mullahs of the period, condemns the police. These events are considered the beginning of the revolution. At this point the Shah increases his pressure thoroughly. The higher the pressure, the more actions are taken. After 40 days of mourning, markets and universities close. In Tabriz, the police again opened fire on the crowd and killed more people. (Axworthy 2016: 318) Most of the slogans and landscapes in the tremendous demonstrations that led the Shah to abdicate in January 1979 and Khomeini's return to Iran in February of that year were essentially Islamist in character. However, nationalist and socialist elements were equally present in the protests. Along with Khomeini, who wanted to establish a united front against the Shah's claim, there were also nationalist, socialist and even non-clerical Islamist elements such as the People's Mujahideen.

During this period, there was no political organization in Iran other than the Shah's party. There were two forces opposing the Shah's reign: the First People's Bouncers and the People's Mujahideen. The second is the clergy led by Khomeini. Khomeini was a revolutionary leader who was supported both inside and outside the country after 1963 in addition to his superior knowledge of fiqh. Although Kerim Sancabi, the leader of the National Front, opposed Khomeini's Islamic Republic project, he did not get enough support due to Khomeini's respectable personality. On the other hand, neither Kerim Sancabi nor the National Front received the necessary demand from the people during the revolution.

Meanwhile, according to a report prepared by the Planning and Budget Organization, the share of the richest 20% of the urban population from income increased to 63% between 1973-1975. The class gap in society was most evident in the capital, Tehran. To the north of Tehran there were villas, palaces, a handful of rich mansions living in mansions, and in the south, slums that lacked all kinds of infrastructure services. Seeing that the increase in oil revenues did not reflect on them, the people chose to show their anger by demonstrating on the streets. (İlknur 2009: 134) Speaking with the revolutionary identity of Islam, Khomeini was seen as a savior for these groups. Khomeini, who interpreted the class contradiction of Marxist terminology by adapting it to Islam, provided great support for himself.

The limited number of Shah's political organizations and trade unions did not address the problems of the people, which led the poor to control the mosques and the clergy. Because mosques in Shiism were the places where all problems could be discussed. The advice of the Shiite mujtahids was not limited to religious matters, which led to the strengthening of the religious reflexes of the people.

The tension in society led to the rapid radicalization of the intellectuals, tradesmen and the ulama class. Now a certain section of society argued that there was no other way but armed struggle. First, on the Socialist left, TUDEH and the former youth fronts of the former National Front formed the "People's Bouncers Organization". The sympathizers of Ali Shari'ati, the true ideologue of the Iranian Revolution, also founded a guerrilla organization called the "People's Mujahideen".

The Mujahideen of the People and the Bouncers of the People carried out some acts of violence. While the boycotts were going on in the country, the SAVAK organization affiliated to the Shah was also engaged in some illegal activities to intimidate the opponents. The suspicions of the suspected elimination of the Merdum Party Leader and the killing of Khomeini's son in Najaf led him to focus on SAVAK.

In all his speeches, Khomeini kept the Pahlavi family united with the devil. In his words, "the father and the son" had laid the foundation for all the evils that had happened to the country. According to him, the Pahlavi dynasty was corrupt, hostile to Islam and opened Iran to the exploitation of foreign countries. Explaining things like this, Khomeini wanted to cut off all ties with the past. (Djalili 2011: 118)

The entire world was amazed, with leaders who did not expect such success in almost a few months against a regime that was considered one of the most stable regimes in the region until the 1979 revolution and a well-equipped army. The Iranian Islamic Revolution, which developed as a reaction to modernity, gained an important place in the general evolution of the Middle East.. (Roy 2013: 26) The Iranian Revolution set an example for the people who were overwhelmed by the dictators. This revolution was avenging for young people who were bored of oppression, and a rebellion against militarist modernization for the ulema.

Khomeini had ideologically constituted the legal, political and cultural infrastructure of the revolution before it was made. The concept of Velayet-i Fakhri legitimized the understanding of the clergy to come to power. This understanding was first supported by the clergy and the conservative Bazaar group.

One of the peculiarities of the Islamic Revolution (undoubtedly separate from the Persian Revolution and the Bolshevik Revolution) is that the institutionalization of the revolution was not realized by the activity of a single party.

During the overthrow of the Shah regime, the elements that took over the administration differed qualitatively. Liberals such as Mehdi Bezirgan, leftists, groups representing the Bazaar, intellectuals in exile (Beni Sadr), former followers of Mossadegh (like Sancabi), or radical groups such as the People's Fedaias... Of these elements, the conservative merchant class did not have any program.

These elements supported Khomeini in order not to strengthen the left view. The middle class, excluded from political life, has never been organized.

The strategic mistakes made by the US administration also played a major role in the success of the revolution. The Shah's mismanagement and his inability to produce rational policies due to the lymph cancer he caught were effective in the success of the revolution.

In 1978, the Reks Cinema was set on fire in Abadan, where oil refineries are located. 347 people died. The Shah said the Islamists were behind it. However, it was claimed that cinema was burned by Shah's agents among the people. The Shah dismissed the government to avoid the hatred of the people. The newly appointed prime minister said Khomeini will be allowed to return to the country. But Khomeini explained that their goal was not to return to the country, but to overthrow the Shah's regime.

After this event, the demonstrations in which the middle class and the tradesmen participated generally included the government's monetary restriction policies and factory workers. September 8 will be called Black Friday, and deaths have increased the hatred of the Shah. Now, the Khomeini's "Shah must go" rhetoric has been expressed among the people. Most of the opponents started to support Khomeini. As the situation deteriorates, political prisoners are released and the Restahiz Party is closed. The Shah appears on television, explaining that there will be free elections and that past mistakes will be compensated. (Abrahamian 1982: 510)

In December, violence started again. 135 activists in Kazvin died as a result of passing over tanks. 1 million people gathered in Tehran square on Ashura. Street gangs appeared in Ashura. The Shah began to observe that the army was no longer reliable. Because thousands of people escaped from the army to avoid confronting the people. President Carter's support for the Shah has declined. Many Americans left the country because they were attacked. The Shah lost control and left the country on January 16, 1979. Khomeini returned to the country on February 1st.

One of the most striking aspects of the great demonstrations that led to the 1979 Revolution was the intense involvement of women in the forefront of the revolutionary movement. In the Marxist and Islamic guerrilla movements in the cities, women also held leadership positions. It is necessary to try to understand this situation through the patriarchal hatred of traditional Iranian culture. The Shah's constant use of language to humiliate women has provoked reactions. In an interview with Shah's Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci, he addressed the women as follows: "You are equal before the law, but don't be offended for saying so, you are not so in terms of talent. Not even a great cook. You did not produce anything important, nothing! ... You are scheming and malignant. All of you..." (Fallaci 1977: 272)

The Shah was giving him a holy mission similar to George W. Bush's. Therefore, this situation was also criticized by the intellectuals. The Shah told Oriana Fallaci:

"When a king doesn't have to answer to anyone about what he says or does, he inevitably remains alone. But I'm not alone, because there's a power behind me that no one else can see. My mystical power. Then I get messages. Religious messages."

However, the repressive politics of Shah and his attempts to legitimize his luxury life by attributing a divine power to him caused great reactions in the public and inevitably the Shah was overthrown.

After explaining the reasons and the formation of the Iranian Islamic Revolution in 1979, we will explain the roles of the central forces in that period.

3. THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION IN THE REVOLUTION

As of the period, the Shah's anti-communist attitude, the military power he was trying to build in the Gulf and the Indian Ocean, and his efforts to become the US gendarmerie in the region, had inevitably caused discomfort in the Soviets. (Akinci 2005: 54) This development is a clear declaration that the military and operational power Iran possesses is a great and dangerous obstacle to Soviet interests and policies.

In this respect, perhaps it will not be wrong to say that the Communist Soviets' biggest instrument of influence in Iran is communist groups, young people studying in Russia and of course the TUDEH party. Because the communists with Russia behind them are eager to destroy the Shah. Because the Shah is pro-American. Because the Shah sees communism as a Russian threat to Iran and tries to destroy it. Therefore, the leftist and communists have set out to form a common front in the tough struggle with the Shah with external support. (Gungorge 1983: 48) All of these are materially and spiritually supported by the Russians. Just as the Russians provide all kinds of financial support to the communists in Iran, they also make provocative propaganda every day with a secret radio called 'Peyk-i Iran'.

The Russians have supported and applauded the movements against the Shah in Iran from the beginning. As it is known, the Soviet Union was the first to congratulate Khomeini and his administration after the Shah fled and Khomeini returned to Iran. The Soviets then sought to exploit Iran's negation of US relations with America. In any case, they expressed their support for the post-Shah administration in Iran. (Bozgeyik 1981: 245)

The Pahlavi dynasty broke off its relations with the Soviet Union when the events of 1951 revealed that the Soviet Union had a hand. The Soviet Union had only an iron and steel factory in Iran. The Shah had chosen the United States as his ally. In this case, through the Marxist TUDEH, the Soviet Union supported the entire left wing in the country materially and spiritually against the Shah (Çelebi, 2012:77).

Iran is a major source of income for Russia both geo-politically and economically. For this reason, the Soviet Union had to treat Iran well for a while. The Soviet Union thought that whoever succeeded the Shah would be in their favor. However, the Islamists who came to power after the Shah did not develop good relations with the Soviet Union (Çelebi, 2012:77)..

4. FRANCE AND ITS ROLE IN THE REVOLUTION

France's influence on the formation of the Iranian Revolution is noticeable. It can be said that France has been pragmatic by adopting a national interest policy in its approach to Iran and by reading the changing conjuncture well, it has managed to protect its interests even in the areas dominated by the great hegemonic powers.

In this respect, we can say that France made significant contributions to its financial power, especially in Iran before the Revolution. The following concrete data on the economic efficiency of France in Iran are noteworthy.

“The French Renault company is very active in Iran and, together with the Japanese Mitsubishi, is one of the two most selling motor vehicle dealers in Iran. In addition, France started 50 industrial companies in Iran from 1974 to 1977 and signed contracts worth about 20 billion francs. Apart from this, about 200 French groups work in Iran. In addition, 49% of Iranian Credit Bank is in French hands. France is another country that operates in the banking sector with Russian, British, American, Dutch and Japanese. On the other hand, the Shah's tremendous amount of arms purchase agreements are an important source of income for France.” (Kerim, 1979: 197)

Britain and France were the countries that had the highest share in arms trade. Especially in armored vehicles France had a big share. In an interview with the German Spiegel Magazine, the

Shah responded to a question about weapons procurement in which he firstly revealed which nations Iran was trading with:

"We are dependent to the extent we are allies. Our weapons aren't just American. We buy weapons from the Soviets, Britain and France...." (Güney 1979: 203)

On the other hand, France's other interests were nuclear activities in Iran. In particular, countries such as Britain, France, Italy and Spain supported Iran's nuclear arming to stabilize the Soviet nuclear power.

According to the quote from Mustafa Kibaroglu; *"In 1970, Iran ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and in 1974 adopted the Guarantee Treaty of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). In the 1970s, Iran sought to establish a series of nuclear power plants with the support of France, Belgium, West Germany and South Africa, as well as the United States. The Nuclear Technology Center established in Isfahan University by France and the Nuclear Medical Center established by Belgium in Karaj can be considered as the facilities owned by Iran in the mid-1970s. Under the leadership of the US, Iran signed nuclear fuel agreements with the US in 1974, with Germany in 1976 and with France in 1977. In 1975, it acquired a 10% stake in Eurodif, a consortium of Spain, Belgium, France and Italy, ensuring that the company would take full advantage of its nuclear technology and receive a share of enriched uranium. In 1974, agreements were made with Germany for the construction of 1200 MW nuclear power plant in Bushehr and for the construction of 900 MW nuclear power plant in Bender Abbas with France."* (<http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ASAM-AmerikaOzel.pdf> Last Accessed: 14.10.2019)

All these relations continued because of the fear that the Soviet pressure would increase. Therefore, France and other forces did not intervene in the Shah's activities until the last moment. However, France was at the forefront of the most secretive countries in the process of Khomeini's reign.

Since France understood that the Shah regime could not continue for a long time, it assumed a primary role in introducing Khomeini to the world public. France saw the hatred of the Iranian people and their love for Khomeini and did its best to consolidate the leadership of Khomeini. Thus, France, Germany, Britain and the Soviet Union sought ways to gain a share from the revolution.

The idea that makes it possible for France to implement this strategy is that the French culture in Iran has been influential on the intelligentsia and the ruling class. France has also become a refuge for Iranian political criminals. Besides, very important names such as Ali Shariati and Mehdi Bazergan are people who are educated in France and are familiar with the French system and values. Also very influential figures like Beni Sadr escaped from the Shah's persecution and came to France and joined the formation there. (<http://servetarmagan.wordpress.com/category/uncategorized/> (Last Accessed: 15.10.2019))

Khomeini, the most important name of the uprising, was also in France. France, who wanted to turn the situation in its favor, tried to influence Khomeini. The main aim of France was to maintain its commercial privileges during the Shah period. In this way, Khomeini had the opportunity to easily publicize his thoughts to the world public. Paris was now the center of all Shah opponents. (Fekri 2011: 178)

Khomeini secretly introduced his own voice recordings from France to Iran, which enabled the revolution to gain spirit. Therefore, the Iranian Revolution was in a sense called the "cassette revolution".

French media outlets were also brightening Khomeini in the public, and Khomeini was interviewing different newspapers every day. In an interview with France's Channel 1 television in 1978, Khomeini answered the question, "Can you explain what the state you define as an Islamic

government?” as “Islamic government is democracy itself”. In the discussions about the quality of the regime after the revolution, he strongly opposed the democratic concept proposed to be added before the name of “the Islamic Republic of Iran”, which he determined alone. “The future government of Iran is the Islamic Republic of Iran, neither one word more nor one more Word less” is an indication of the ambivalent views of him about the dominance of majority. (Poorbagher 2007: 138)

As it is understood from Khomeini's interview, the fact that the post-revolutionary events are known by France is revealed (Çelebi 2012: 79).

The fact that Khomeini and the opposition cadres were in France led to other elements to come to this country. Islamist students established the Muslim Students' Union. Armed organizations had the opportunity to organize freely in France. With the help of all this centralization, Khomeini became a priority in the revolution (Çelebi 2012: 79).

Another data on the role of France in the revolution is presented in the information claimed in a five-part dossier published on the Iranian Analysis website. The file includes an interview with Dr Ibrahim Yazdi, who was once close to Khomeini but later excommunicated and imprisoned by him and subjected to torture, and deals with the roles of France, the United States, Britain and Federal Germany in the Revolution. Yazdi's interview gives details about the role of France in the Revolution (Çelebi 2012: 80):

Most of the interview focused on questions about the Guadeloupe (Gudelop) summit. Those who follow the Iranian revolution are familiar with this name. This summit was an important turning point for Western powers to support the rise of clergy in Iran. The conference, which was attended by the heads of four Western imperialist powers (America, England, France and West Germany), convened in the first week of January 1979 on the French Caribbean island of Guadelop. The agenda was the political crisis in Iran, where the world uprising and the popular uprising about to overthrow King Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, who was brought back to power in 1953 by the CIA and Britain. A representative of the French government asked Khomeini to report on the situation in Iran, reflecting the views of him and those around him. Khomeini immediately gave approval. The report was submitted to the French Government by his deputy, Sadık Kutbuzade, who was responsible for political affairs while he was residing in Paris. While in Paris, Qutbuzade was the third person to conduct Khomeini's political affairs with Yazdi and Abdul Hasan Beni Sadr. As Yazdi said, this report had a huge impact on the results of the Guadeloupe summit. But its content was never revealed and apparently destroyed (Çelebi 2012: 77).

From this point of view, it has been concluded that the legislative, executive and judiciary cannot be regarded as conservative in the newly established republic. Contrary to popular belief, after the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran, France had the opportunity to continue its interests. He helped Khomeini during the Revolution process at the first hand. This can be seen as a result of France's good reading of world politics. As a matter of fact, France is one of the few countries that has succeeded in softening the harsh character of Khomeini and turning it into its favor. France, which continued its pragmatist policy against Khomeini, who showed his true character after the revolution, did not have any difficulty in obtaining stability from chaos. However, France continued to host the opponents escaping from the Shah before the revolution, as well as those who escaped from Khomeini after the revolution. In addition, France has managed to re-enter the country by analyzing the position of the Khomeini regime, which has made it increasingly difficult. This, in spite of everything, can be interpreted as the success of a foreign policy that has brought advantage and interest to the French even today. The unique political system of the Islamic Republic of Iran has made it a unique state both in its region and in the international system. Iran, which has maintained a theocratic regime under the name of the Islamic Republic, has found its place in world

politics under many different administrations for centuries. The extent to which Iran, as a regional power in its current form, will resist the internal and external attacks is highly questionable.

5. THE ROLE OF BRITAIN AND THE US IN THE REVOLUTION

Britain's interest in Iran is based on World War I. With the development of capitalism, the need for raw materials emerged in developed countries. Iran's oil and gas attracted the attention of the central powers.

After World War II, due to the increasing interest in oil in the world, the colonialism activities carried out especially by the British companies in the Middle East caused the whole world to turn their eyes to this region and to create a share that they wanted to share. (Atasoy 2008: 55)

In Iran, oil could be extracted easily and at the least cost. In addition, Iran's geo-political position was the main factor in Britain's interest in this country. Because the road to Britain's colonies in Asia passed through Iran. Influencing Iran was important to the Russian and German threat (Çelebi 2012: 64)

For these reasons, Iran has been subjected to the invasion of Britain and Russia many times. As a result of these invasions, Iran had to make obligatory agreements. Britain and the United States were worried about the success of the Soviet Union through the TUDEH and the communists studying in Russia, returning to the country and bringing the spiritual class into their ranks. Based on this concern, Britain and the USA deposed Reza Pahlavi, who was not a partner with them, and replaced him with his son Mohammed Reza Pahlavi. The Soviets responded to this move of Britain by organizing politics and society and forming alliances within these structures. This policy, combined with the internal dynamics of Iran, eventually led Mossadegh to power. The biggest promise of Mossadeq was to nationalize British Petroleum, which exploited the country's resources. He fulfilled this promise. But the United States and Britain overthrew Mosaddeh with a CIA-backed coup. After this time, the nationalist movements in Iran strengthened. A great resentment against the United States and Britain was born (Çelebi 2012: 64).

In fact, the United States pursued different purposes. Their main goal was to reduce Britain's influence in Iran. However, after Mossadegh came to power, the fire of full independence was against the interests of the USA. (Zepezauer, 1996: 35) As a matter of fact, after the coup, the United States was gradually dragged into a position to seize Britain's role in Iran, and in parallel with its weakening power, the United Kingdom moved to support the US in the region and to maximize its interests.

Izzeti explained the aims of Britain and the USA on Iran as follows:

“Britain's decision to withdraw from the East of Suez in 1970 further increased Iran's strategic value in terms of the security of the Gulf region. The United States, which refrained from intervening directly in Third World countries due to the psychological impact of the Vietnam War, adopted the Nixon Doctrine, which envisaged a double-column security policy for the Gulf region. Accordingly, Iran, which has a long border with the Soviets, sufficient population and income to become a military power, which dominates all the northern shores of the Gulf, and develops good relations with the Western world and Israel, will become the region's new military power and the security of the Gulf. It will be supported by the economic opportunities of Arabia.” (İzzeti 2003: 78)

The Shah was protecting his own security with the help of the United States and Britain. In return, it gave extensive commercial privileges to Britain and the United States in the exploitation of the country's resources. In addition, Britain was protecting the security of India and its colonies in South Asia as well as commercial concessions. As it is known, the Iranian Revolution came step by step, especially with the support of France and the passing over of England and the United States.

Despite the Shah's purely surrendering policies, it is worth mentioning why the United States and Britain left the Shah alone while the revolution took place.

First of all, let's start from an article on the website of the World Association of International Studies at the prestigious Stanford University in the USA. Accordingly, the Shah was overthrown with Carter's knowledge and approval. Carter, who asked the Shah for great privileges for some businessmen with close proximity, received the negative answer. The Carter administration then took an official initiative, asking the Shah to negotiate an oil deal with US oil companies for \$ 50 a barrel for the next 50 years, otherwise he would cut his support. The Shah, who thinks that he will not fall so easily, resists by stating that it is impossible to realize this demand. In addition, the Shah's support for Ford against Carter in the previous US presidential elections was another dimension of the distrust between Shah-Carter. Meanwhile, the Shah's authority is rapidly weakening, and intelligence officials offer Carter 30 scenarios about post-Shah Iran. None of this will come true. (Çağlayan 2012: 217)

The article argues that Carter designed the hostage crisis with the Bezirgan government in order to be re-elected on the basis of some unnamed witnesses. Accordingly, on November 4, 1979, the Iranian students raided the US Embassy in Tehran, the three senior officials took refuge in the Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the mullahs were coordinated with the embassy officials to allow the destruction of some important documents. Carter hoped to win the vote by releasing the hostages in the presidential election in November 1980. However, Reagan, who had notified this in advance, prevented the release of the hostages.

Michael Rubin, one of America's neoconservatives, criticized US President Obama's decision to dialogue with Iran right after he came to work, contrary to popular belief, stating that the US and Iran continued to talk after the revolution, but said that this did not give positive results. According to Princeton professor Richard Falk, Washington welcomed the overthrow of the Shah after the revolution and was seeking a fresh start with the moderate liberals around Khomeini. American diplomats announced that they will continue their relations with the new regime. On November 1, 1979, Carter's National Security Adviser Brezinski spoke with Iranian Prime Minister Bazergan and Foreign Minister Yazdi to normalize bilateral relations in Algeria. Iranian students believed that Bazergan was selling the case and raided the US Embassy (there were other reasons for this) and took 52 American diplomats hostage and exposed the blindfolded American hostages on television for 444 days (Çağlayan, 2012:218).

According to another claim, the British and American oil companies competed behind the revolution in Iran. After the overthrow of Mossadeq, the oil monopoly in Iran was transferred to the Standard Oil company of Rockefeller. In 1979, the Shah, supported by Standard Oil, was overthrown by a British-backed coup. The Shah is replaced by British-controlled Khomeini. Thus, the sale of Russian oil to the world via Iran is stopped (Çağlayan, 2012:220).

The version of German author William Engdahl, who explained the Iranian Revolution through oil wars, is different. Accordingly, during 1978 the negotiations for the renewal of the 25-year oil agreement between the Shah and BP are negotiated. In October 1978, negotiations were interrupted, for the first time since 1953, Iran demanded independence. The Kayhan newspaper blamed Britain and the United States (thanks to the demand of enthusiastic oil buyers, such as Germany, France and Japan). He claimed that these countries provoked the Islamist opposition by sending agitators to Iran. (Çağlayan 2012: 221)

Robert Dreyfuss, the author of "Hostage to Khomeini", argues that behind the Iranian Revolution, like many other wars, there are British oligarchs and American supporters associated with such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in New York and the Royal Institute of International Relations in London. The large banks, oil companies and international industrial organizations that exploit the World (Çağlayan, 2012:223).

The first part of the book (Reminiscent of the September 12 coup of American officials' famous reaction of "Our boys did it") titled "The Revolution of Our Friends" begins with the statement that Carter's "I Believe that the Iranian government and the people will continue to be our friends, just a few hours after Khomeini's declaration of the Islamic Republic on February 12, 1979, and while street clashes continue". According to Dreyfuss, the US brought Khomeini to power (Çağlayan, 2012:218).

It is doubtful to what extent the US and Britain are directly active in the Iranian Revolution, but it is an acceptable fact that they indirectly contribute to the revolution. Since 1977, the United States and Britain have supported anti-Shah opposition. They were wrong that the next power would be close to them.

The United States and Britain had another interest. These two countries launched the green belt project against the danger of the Soviet Union. Iran was the key country in this project. In this context, there is information that shows the material and moral support of England and America in the realization of the Revolution and shows their communication with the Ulama group. In particular, the activities undertaken under the American Green Belt Project are generally conducted in a confidential and informal way. (Çelebi 2012: 2)

6. RESULTS

What is left of the Islamic Revolution? The Islamic Revolution is in a political dilemma. Although the system can make quick decisions in sight, we cannot talk about this stability in important choices. Conservative rulers acting on a religious level cannot respond to the demands of the elite youth. Like the Ottoman Empire, Iran has been invaded in various ways but has not been fully colonized. Its modernization has always taken place from within, in a trilateral relationship of reformist intellectuals, conservative clergy and absolute monarchy. The intelligentsia allied three times with the clergy about the abolition of the monarchy, but each time the clergy was at peace with the monarchic order. (1907, 1953 and 1979) But the class of intellectuals has always been the most unstable class in Iran. The current question is what now? It is unlikely that the clergy will decide whether the order will continue or whether it will unite with the intellectuals and make a second Iranian revolution. The Shah tried to play on an ethno-nationalist identity: a "Persia" that excludes the people and the clergy. The revolution brought Shiite Islam identity to the forefront. The Iranian Islamic Revolution condemns the West with a Third Worldist view. This understanding is seen in both Marxist and Islamist circles (Onat, 2013:249).

In Iran, on the one hand the understanding that the West sees them as human beings separated from their identity, cultural, local and autonomous roots and in need, weak, humiliated, externally dependent and imitated, prevails while some Iranian intellectuals oppose the complete rejection of the West.

With its unique system established with the revolution, Iran has shaken the balance of power in the Middle East and even in the world. Iran's anti-American-Israeli-British attitude with the start of the Revolution has greatly increased the activities of the Russians and Europeans in the region. Today, the Iranian regime, which is experiencing troubled days, sees China as the most reliable partner for its energy needs. Especially with the outbreak of the Arab Spring, the Iran-China-Russia equation gained importance.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamian, Ervand, (1982), *Modern İran Tarihi*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Akıncı, A. R. (2005) *Devrim Sonrası İran Dış Politikası*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi

- Amir Ahmad Fekri (2011). Iranian Revolution in the Process of Historical Development, İstanbul: Mızrak Yayınları.
- Atasoy, D. (2008) İran'da Şah Sonrası Nükleer Enerji Politikası, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul: Kadir Has Üniversitesi
- Axworthy, Michael, (2016), İran: Aklın İmparatorluğu, İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Bozgeyik, B. (1981) Bütün Cepheleriyle İran Meselesi, İstanbul: Yeni Asya Yayınevi.
- Çağlayan, Selin,(2012), İran Mehdi'yi Beklerken, İstanbul: Cinius Yayınları.
- Çelebi, Niyazi Okan, (2012),İran İslam Devrimi'nde Sovyetler Birliği, İngiltere ve Fransa'nın Rolü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara: Beykent Üniversitesi.:
- Dabashi, Hamid, (2008), İran: Kenetlenmiş Halk, İstanbul: Metis Yayınevi.
- Fallaci, Oriana, (1977), Interview with History, New York:Houghton Mifflin
- Güngörge, M. T. (1983) Humeyni ve İran İnkılâbı, İstanbul: Araştırma Yayınları.
- <http://servetarmagan.wordpress.com/category/uncategorized/>(access:15.10.2019)
- <http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ASAM-AmerikaOzel.pdf> (access:14.10.2019).
- İlknur, Miyase, (2009), İmam Mehdi'den Humeyni'ye İran, İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları.
- İzzeti, İzzetulah,. (2005) İran ve Bölge Jeopolitiği, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları. Sabriye Deliceoğlu (2006) Kuzey Irak'taki Etnik ve Dini Gruplar ve Bölge Politikalarındaki Etkileri, Yüksek Lisans Tezi İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi
- Mehmed, Kerim (1979). İran'da İslami Devrim, Düşünce Yayınları.
- Mohammed Reza Djaalili,(2011), İran'ın Son İki Yüzyıllık Tarihi, İstanbul: Bige Kültür Sanat Yayınları.
- Moin, Baqer, (1999), Khomeini: Life of the Ayatollah, Londra: Tauris.
- Okyar, Onur. (2014), İran ve Demokrasi, İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınevi.
- Onat, Hasan, (2013), İran İslam Devrimi ve Şi'ilik. e-Makalat Mezhep Araştırmaları Dergisi, 6(2), 223-256
- Roy, Oliver, (2013) İran: Bir Devrimin Tükenişi, İstanbul: Metis Yayınevi.
- Said, Edward, (1995), Entelektüel, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Zepezauer, M. (1996) CIA'nın Büyük Operasyonları, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.