

## **EXPLORING AND EXPLAINING THE ECONOMIC POLITICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN IRAN AND THE SOVIET UNION IN THE SECOND PAHLAVI ERA EMPHASIZING THE SYSTEM THEORY**

Kimia Zare<sup>1</sup>

Habibollah Saeedinia<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** Iran and Russia have common interests, especially in political terms, because of the common borders and territorial neighborhood. This has led to a specific sensitivity to how the two countries are approaching each other. Despite the importance of the two countries' relations, it is observed that in the history of the relations between Iran and Russia, various issues and issues have always been hindered by the close relations between the two countries. The beginning of Iran-Soviet relations during the Second Pahlavi era was accompanied by issues such as World War II and subsequent events. The relations between the two countries were influenced by the factors and system variables of the international system, such as the Cold War, the US-Soviet rivalry, the Second World War and the entry of the Allies into Iran, the deconstruction of the relations between

the two post-Cold War superpowers, and so on. The main question of the current research is that the political relations between Iran and Russia influenced by the second Pahlavi period? To answer this question, the hypothesis was that Iran's political economic relations were fluctuating in the second Pahlavi era and influenced by the changing system theory of the international system with the Soviet Union. The findings suggest that various variables such as the structure of the international system and international events, including World War II, the arrival of controversial forces in Iran, the Cold War, the post-Cold War, the US and Soviet policies, and the variables such as the issue of oil Azerbaijan's autonomy, Tudeh's actions in Iran, the issue of fisheries and borders. Also, the policies adopted by Iranian politicians, including negative balance policy, positive nationalism and

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, Department of History, Persian Gulf University, Bushehr, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Faculty Member, Persian Gulf University, Bushehr, Iran

independent national policy, have affected Iran-Soviet relations. In a general conclusion, from 1320 (1942) to 1357 (1979), the relationship between Iran and Russia has been an upward trend towards peaceful coexistence. But expansion of further relations in the economic, technical and cultural fields has been political rather than political.

**Keywords:** Political Relations, Economic Relations, Cultural Relations, Iran, Russia, Pahlavi II.

## **Introduction**

Iran and Russia have common interests, especially in political terms, because of the common border and territorial neighborhood. This has led to a specific sensitivity to how the two countries are approaching each other. Despite the importance of the two countries' relations, it is observed that in the history of the relations between Iran and Russia, various issues and matters have always been hindered by the close relations between the two countries. Iran needs to cooperate with the great powers of the world in order to raise its position in the world. Russia is one of the

841  
countries with a special status in the history of political relations in Iran, given its geopolitical commonality with Iran. Considering Russia's importance in Iranian foreign policy, studies on Iran's relations with the country are also of particular sensitivity. The beginning of Iran-Soviet relations during the Second Pahlavi era was accompanied by issues such as World War II and subsequent events. Therefore, it can be admitted that the relations between the two countries were related to the systemic variables of the international system, such as the Cold War, the US-Soviet rivalry, World War II, and the entry of the Allies into Iran, the deconstruction of the relations between the two post-Cold War superpowers. Has been affected. With this in mind, it can be admitted that the relationship between Iran and the Soviet Union during the Second Pahlavi period has been influenced by internal and external factors, and, given this category, the history of relations between the two countries during the mentioned period has been uplifted. Iran needs to cooperate with the great powers of the world in order to raise its position in the world. Russia is one of the countries with a special status in the history of political

relations in Iran, given its geopolitical commonality with Iran. Considering Russia's importance in Iranian foreign policy, studies on Iran's relations with the country are also of particular sensitivity. In addition to academic use, this research can be used by the enthusiasts and other researchers. The necessity of this study is also to examine the evolution of the international system and its impact on Iran-Russia political relations in the second Pahlavi period. This article can provide the audience with an overview of the ups and downs in the relations between Iran and Russia during the second Pahlavi era.

### **1. Research background**

The number of resources written about Iran and Russia is very small, and in relation to the issue under discussion, so far, no independent scientific research has been made. But in some of the sources it is briefly mentioned, the most important of which are:

A: Russian and British in Iran (2001) Hossein Nazem: This book was written by Hossein Nazem. In all the chapters of this book, Russian and

842  
English competition in Iran has been addressed. The author has used archival documents from Russia, Britain and the United States. For this reason, its use has been instrumental in furthering the research. The author further explains the presence of Russia in Iran and the extent to which Russia has gradually penetrated Iran in its bid to compete with Britain.

B. Iran-Soviet Trade Relations and the Formation of Economic Movement in the Early Pahlavi Period (2002) Torabi Farsani: This article examines the economic relations between Iran and the Soviet Union. According to the research, the change of political regime in Russia and the creation of new conditions in the trade relations with Iran led to a crisis in trade with Russia. Hence, Iranian businessmen responded with numerous reactions, including writing protest letters to the government, the parliament, newspapers and business institutions, and finally the establishment of an organization called the Economic Movement. This organization reflected the inner coherence of this class and was a possibility for the demands of the merchants who were confronted in the

constitutional movement. This work is noteworthy because it examines the history of economic cooperation between the two countries and the problems encountered in this regard.

C: Iran and Iran's Problem (2008) by Lord Cresen: This book, published in two volumes, was written by Lord Cresen. Lord Cresen has entered Iran as a political agent before he becomes the viceroy of India, and has written his observations and memories. His carefulness in expressing the details of Iranian life and paying attention to issues of other foreign governments in Iran has led her book on the study of Iran in the nineteenth and twentieth century. Since the competition between Russia and England has been mentioned, this book has been used in this study. This book is one of the most accurate sources of information on the internal and geographical situation of Iran, especially the intense political struggles of two powerful Russian and British governments during the reign of Nasir al-Din Shah Qajar. In the words of the author of "Lord Cresen", who pledged himself to be the Great Political Regiment of England: the book is the

843

result of almost three decades of almost continuous work and a traveler for six months in the land of Iran and a previous trip to its neighborhoods and from it So it is also the continuation of the correspondence with the officials who are the authoritative resident of that country.

## **2. The system theory of international relations**

This view is mainly applied to the international system of the world, and therefore, it is less effective in direct analysis of foreign policy than other perspectives. The main application of this view is to examine foreign policy in its widest context, to identify its patterns, and to compare them with the foreign policy patterns of other states. In addition, all theories can easily be linked to it. The similarity of "regular systematic" and "systemic system" words may somewhat be confused. From the point of view, when we systematically examine the nature of international issues, even in the face of unfamiliarity with the name of this view, we use it unconsciously; for example, it is "Mr. Jordan" Molier that he received throughout his life [unconsciously] prose

works. However, system analysis is not limited to the mere development of some common sense-based concepts, in the form of difficult words; its emphasis on the coherence of all factors and events is important as a general orientation.

The concept of "system" in "international relations" is taken directly from the same concept in the "general theory of systems". This theory seeks to find a fundamental link between all areas of knowledge. Given this fundamental goal, studies in this area are often multidisciplinary and therefore potentially entail many inspirations and inspiration for those "international relations" theorists that have recently entered the field of systems (Joseph 1997: Pp. 79-48).

This theory defines the "system" as a systematic set of interconnected components. In the vast literature on this subject, three types of system or system are discussed: one is the "ideal" system with its distinctive features and the other one is the existing international and historical systems in the past and present, and the third is the combination of these two types. These texts tend to focus on the most sophisticated systems-now the global

system-but some also focus on analyzing subordinate systems such as the regions or political systems of each country. The advantage of using the term "international system" instead of the traditional terms of the "family of nations," "international community," or "global community" is that it seeks to "scientific" and identify variables and patterns, while the old concepts without Attention to this has been used gloomily (Joseph 1997: pp. 79-48).

The attitude of system thinkers to the world is based on the four foundations:

1. Organic thought; the concept that places the organism at the center of the human perception project.
2. Holistic; ie, every phenomenon is considered as a living entity, order, open-environment, self-regulated, and purposeful, and instead focuses on and focuses on the components of phenomena.
3. Modeling; ie, the system thinker tries to match actual perceptions of real phenomena rather than breaking into the entire contractual component.
4. Recognition Improvement; so that a systematic thinker and researcher understands that;

(A) Living in an organic system and continuously in the process.

B) The recognition of man from a whole, through the observation of the processes within which it occurs, is obtained not by observing the components of the whole.

C) What a person observes is not reality itself, but his perception of reality (Rezaeian, 1370: p. 11).

Of course, system thinking is not in contradiction with analytical thinking; in fact, these two methods are complementary, not alternatives. Nevertheless, as system thinkers have discovered, the study of the interconnected grids of components of a system is more useful than their analysis (Rezaev, 1370: p. 11).

The political system consists of the structure (the mode of communication and the integration of functions) and the process of political life. Thus, the analysis of the processes and the nature and conditions in which the responses of the system to absorb and digest functions are a fundamental problem of political theory. In this regard, the following points should be noted:

1. The assumption is that political actions and reactions in society (both domestic and international) constitute a "behavioral system" in general.

2. The political system is not located in the vacuum, but is surrounded by physical, biological, social and psychological environments. Without considering these environments, one can not understand the behavior of a political system in order to remain stable and change.

3. As a consequence or necessity of the second point, the political system is an open system; the components of the political system must operate in conditions that have created events and influences derived from the whole environment.

4. Observing a resilient system (due to environmental degradation) means that the systems have the power to withstand turbulence and can adapt themselves to the existing conditions. This is done by the mechanisms in which the rest of the systems adjust their behavior and, if necessary, change their internal structure and even their goals (Khoshvaght, 1375: p. 32-31).

In general, it should be noted that the value of a systemic perspective

is that it enables us first to analyze the behavior of states in the context of its environment or appropriate environments, and secondly, instead of focusing in vain on a country, also pay enough attention on its interaction with the external environment. In foreign policy analysis, constant attention to systematic variables and systematic study is essential. Imagination of international phenomena as a system is itself the cornerstone for achieving legality. According to this theory, the main variables of all international systems can be significantly divided into three large categories: first, the action of governments as the main components of the system; second, the structure and functioning of the system, which originates from the interaction of its units; and Third, environmental factors that limit both the operation of the units and the operation of the system (Joseph 1997: 48-79).

Thus, in the present paper, the study of Iran's economic-political relations is inspired by systematic theory, and the relationship between the two countries is discussed within the framework of developments and events of the international system. In other

words, the influence of the variables of the international and domestic system, including the governing structure of the international system and its resulting developments on the relations between Iran and Russia, are considered

### **3. Variables affecting the relations between Iran and Russia (1320-1357) (1942 to 1979)**

In order to investigate the relations between Iran and Russia, it is necessary to point out that in this regard, various factors and variables are influential, some of which are influenced by the events of the international system, and some of them are from internal events in Iran during the second Pahlavi period. Further, these factors have been investigated.

#### **3.1 Influence of the occupation of Iran by the Allies**

On 03/06/1320 (August 25, 1941), British troops raided Iran from the south and west of the country. At the same time, the Soviet military forces quickly occupied all the provinces of Azerbaijan, Mazandaran, Gilan and northern areas of the Khorasan province. The Soviet government referred to

Articles 5 and 6 of the Iran-Soviet Union amity contract on 07/12/1299 (February 26, 1921) in order to legitimize the occupation of Iran (Azghandi, 1382: p. 370).

And, by resorting to these two articles, legitimized their actions. With the occupation of Iran by the Russians, Iran's relations with the Soviet regime, which was severely hostile to Reza Shah's reign in the last years of the reign, entered in a new phase of conflict and opposition (Azghandi, 1382: p. 371-370).

Hostile actions such as the bombing of the suburbs of Tehran and Mashhad by the Soviet air forces, the Red Army's establishment in Qazvin, the disarming of police and gendarmerie forces by air forces in various cities of the country, the seizure of Iranian trucks by Red Army soldiers and the capture of some Iranian Officers by the Soviets, increased the concerns of the Iranians and the Britains and led them to react (Azghandi, 1997: p. 104).

After these problems, the drafting of a tripartite treaty was prepared by Iran, Britain and the Soviet Union, and on the second day of the month Dey of 1320 (December 23,

1941), it had presented to the thirteenth parliament. Finally, the Bill on the Alliance was ratified on 08/11/1320 (January 28, 1942) in nine articles (chapter) and three annexes after one month with 80 votes out of 93 of MPs and one day later on 09/11/1920 (January 29, 1942), at the Palace of Foreign Affairs, was signed by the Soviet Ambassador Andreiovich Smirnov, the Secretary-General's of Soviet Union, and Sir Reyder Bolard, Britain Minister, and the Foreign Minister of Iran, Ali Soheil. Mohammad Ali Foroughi issued an order to Iran's Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 12/11/1320 (February 1, 1942), and the British occupation forces and salvage dumped partly Tehran and the suburbs. At the same time, Byzaghi sent a telegram to Churchill and Stalin on the treaty, and Mohammad Reza Shah, by sending a letter, informed Roosevelt's from the talks and provisions of the treaty (Azghandi, 1997: p. 107). According to the fifth chapter of the treaty of Iran, allied forces of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom were required to withdraw their troops from Iran after the ending of conflicts with the US governments, but the Soviets were denied to take them out of Iranian



territory, and this lead to exacerbate the hostile relations between them (Azghandi, 1997: 179). Iran's grievance with the United Nations made Iran's relations with the Soviet Union darker, and with the summons of Maximov, the Ambassador, and Yaghoubov, the deputy ambassador of the Soviet Embassy in Iran, the situation became worsened (Azghandi, 1997: 180).

### **3.2 The Impact of American Presence on the Relationship between the Two Countries**

After World War II, the Cold War was ruled out. And the two US and Soviet superpowers competed in Iran. The rivalry made the Shah of Iran, who from one hand felt the fear of communism infiltration as a potential threat, and on the other hand, didn't have the power to balance the power with the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, to chose the United State as a supporter. Iran, after the Second World War, was found to have a geostrategic importance in the framework of the interest of the United States and the West with the aim of controlling the Soviet Union, and this was the origin of the US policy toward

848

Iran and even the conducting of the Coup d'état of the 28 of Mordad of 1332 (August 19, 1953), with the participation of Britain, to dismiss Mossadeq's government. Truman also based on this, introduced his "theory of incarnation" inclusive of America's decision to defend its own strategic interests and its allies against the threats posed by the Soviet Union (Droodian, 2003: p. 151).

Americans actually realized that if Iran, as one of the leading countries get into the Communists hands, all the economic and political interests of the West in the region will be at risk and threatened by the Soviet Union. On the other hand, Iran supported the US presence to reduce the influence of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom (Azghandi, 1997: 104).

The entry of the Shah into the Western bloc's military and security alliances and the signing of bilateral alliances with the United States placed him in opposite of the Soviet Union. The economic recession and severe military and security weakness caused the Shah's regime to be strongly dependent on the United States. The Americans who sought to seize Iran's oil and create a security belt around the Soviet Union

were fighting Britain's policy on the pretext that the British government and the oil company were responsible for the poverty and misery of the people of Iran, and this continued to bring about the development of communism in Iran. The United States of America declared the Truman Principle of Fourth Truman on 30/10/1327 (January 20, 1949), which aimed primarily at confronting communism and, in fact, infiltration in the countries of the world, and in particular the former colonies, within the framework of the new global politics of America, through donations and Technical was formed to the backward countries of the Third World. In opposite to the Moscow leaders, the United States has been identified as the greatest threat. It was said that the United States was working to create a set of regional bases in order to bring pressure on the Soviet Union and attack on socialism. Soviet leaders viewed Iran in this overall picture. The United States was determined to control Iran to plunder its natural resources and exploit its neighbors with the southern republics of the Soviet Union. Thus, with the strengthening of Iranian-American military ties and Tehran's behavior

849

adapted to the needs and requirements of the Cold War, Moscow expressed its deep dissatisfaction and strongly objected to this cooperation (Kollaei et al., 2007: 72-73).

### **3-3 Privilege of North Oil and Increasing Tensions between Iran and the Soviet Union**

Another important factor affecting the relations between Iran and the Soviet Union was the problem of the northern oil privilege. The story was that, in the month Esfand of 1322, two British and American delegations came to Tehran from the Sokoni-Vacum companies and American Singler oil companies and the English-Netherland Royal Dutch Shell Company, requesting oil prices in the southeastern regions. Negotiations and even the presence of the representatives in Tehran were kept confidential, and no one was aware of the forearm's talks with only a few senior officials. As soon as the Soviet Union became aware of the oil talks through their agents, they also began work and, in Shahrivar month of 1323 (Februray 1944), appointed a delegation headed by Sergei Kraftaradze, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, to apply for

the North Oil privilege. The Soviets argued that they did not have any share of Middle Eastern oil and all the oil resources in the region were available to the British and Americans. Therefore, they also have the right to demand oil revenues in northern Iran, near their borders. Former Prime Minister Saed, who had been negotiating with representatives of American and British companies yesterday, refused not only to accept the Soviet proposal, but also refused to discuss the proposal of the Soviet delegation (Hooshang Mahdavi, 2005: p. 92). The decision of the government was considered to be an act against the Soviet Union, and the head of the Soviet delegation described it as an approach with the aim to disturbing the relations between the two countries (Maraghehei, 1373: p. 181).

### **3-4 Autonomy of the Azerbaijan and Kurdistan Provinces**

Autonomy of the provinces of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan is considered as one of the most effective indicators on the relations between the two countries. After the advent of the northern oil, the Soviets devised a new map for obtaining petroleum credits in northern Iran, which

850  
was the cause of the problem of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan ((Hooshang Mahdavi, 1384: p. 96). Thus, the Soviet authorities had been working since the end of the Second World War in order to create a precondition for the establishment of a separatist movement in Azerbaijan, in order to achieve its long-term goal of deconstructing Iran and linking Azerbaijan to the Azerbaijani Republic of the Soviet Union and reaching the northern oil. (Ahmadi, 2013: p 91)

In 21/09/1324 (Dec. 12, 1945), coincided with the domination of the Democratic sect on Azerbaijan and the declaration of autonomy, Hakimi presented the parliament with an ambiguous report about the current situation in Azerbaijan as a prime minister, made his decision to travel to Moscow to negotiate with The head of the Soviet government announced (Official Gazette 22/9/1324). Finally, Hakimi's ineffectiveness in resolving the crisis led to his resignation. In general, the crisis of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan after the end of the World War had a negative impact on the relations between Iran and the Soviet Union.

### 3-5 Qavam-Sadchikov Agreement

Ahmad Ghavam, who was appointed as the prime minister after Hakimi, stated in his first political statement that in the current situation the implementation of any domestic reform program was to resolve the problems in the foreign relations, for this reason, he intended to travel to Moscow to express goodwill and friendship. Traveling (Azghandi, 1382: p. 180).

In this regard, Qavam, along with a group of prominent politicians and journalists, visited Moscow on 29/11/1326 (February 18, 1924), during which time he met with Stalin and Molotov, the secretary of state and other political and higher officials. The Qavam negotiations in Moscow during this trip were centered around three issues: (1) the oil problem; (2) the autonomous states of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan; (3) the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Iran (Azghandi, 1382: p. 181). During the period when Qavam stayed in Moscow, at the last night, Stalin took a friendlier approach and agreed to modify his demands and conditions in the agreement - if the Iranian government agrees with the grant of the North

851

Petroleum Prize. Instead of concessions, Qavam agreed to establish a joint Iranian-Soviet company to exploit the northern oil and negotiated an agreement to sign an agreement between the two countries with an ambassador which will sent to Iran by the Soviet Union. According to Stalin's request, Ghavam promised to take a peaceful approach to the Democrats of Azerbaijan and to withdraw Iran's complaint from the Security Council (Amini, 1381: p. 62).

In the final conclusion of these negotiations, it can be said that meeting of Qavam and Stalin and Molotov (Soviet foreign minister) in this trip had no meaningful conclusion for the parties (Azghandi, 1382: p. 181).

But in the continuation of the negotiations, Ivan Sadchikov finally traveled to Tehran. After his arrival and the continuation of the negotiations, a joint statement was signed on behalf of Qavam and Sadchikov in Tehran, which was the result of the negotiation and agreement between Qavam and Sadechikov:

1- Parts of the Red Army from Sunday, 4<sup>th</sup> of Farvardin of the year 1325 (March 24, 1946), should get out of Iran in one and half month.

2- The contract for the creation of a mixed Iranian-Soviet oil company and its terms will be proposed from March 24, with seven months validity, for approval by the fifteenth parliament.

3. Concerning Azerbaijan as a domestic matter, a peaceful arrangement for implementation of reforms in accordance with the current laws and with the spirit of benevolence towards the Azerbaijani people will be given between the government and the people of Azerbaijan (Zhouqi, 1375: p. 214).

The contract of Qavam Sadchikov was considered as a historic victory. If in Moscow, the issue of oil was the first priority, Iran was the third priority. While the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet forces in Iran was the first priority. In order to show his goodwill to the Russians, Qavam took back Iran's complaint from the Security Council and took members of the Tudeh party in his cabinet. (Three members of the Tudeh party, Iraj Eskandari, Dr. Morteza Yazdi and Dr. Fereydoon Keshavarz, respectively Responsible for the ministries of commerce, medicine and culture). In the opinion of Qavam, there were no reason to ransom the Russians after the departure of the Soviet

852

forces. Qavam until the Mehr month of the year 1326 (1947) was able to solve the crisis of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan cleverly and consolidate the sovereignty of the central government throughout the country. The only remaining case was the creation of a mixed Iranian-Soviet oil company, which called for parliamentary approval, while Qavam delayed to provide the plan for approval to the parliament. Soviet Union also considered Qavam behavior as a return to hostile policy. Thus, the contract of Qavam-Sadchikov left short-term works in the relations between Iran and the Soviet Union (Azghandi, 1382: 183-182).

### **3-6 The Impact of Mohammad Mossadegh's Policies (Implementation of Negative Balance Policy)**

In the era of the Second World War, superpowers such as the Soviet Union and the United States were opposed to each other, Mosaddegh, who had studied in Switzerland, was heavily influenced by the Swiss neutrality policy in international conflicts. (Bastenegar, 1381: p. 254). Mossadegh believed that in order to prevent the expectations of foreign

countries from Iran and to reduce the pressure on their rivals, the Iranian government should, without unanimity, enter into disagreements, and do not pursue or oppose any one, and neutralize them. This policy, included another aspect of Foreign policy of Doctor Mosaddegh, which is in fact the complementary part of the negative balance policy. In addition to the negative balance of power, Dr. Mossadegh's foreign policy also had another very important dimension which known as Positive Neutrality and later the Non-Aligned Movement on that days (Bastenegar, 2002: p. 259). Negative balance policy is in fact the political principle of Mohammed Mossadegh and the logic of revising this and that or the neutrality policy among the major global forces based on the preservation of national interests. Also, the meaning of the negative word was the rejection of the forces and motivations that denied Iranian freedom in its own administration. On 11/09/1323, (December 2, 1944), Mosaddeq in a famous speech, addressed at the time of the issue of granting North Korea's privilege to the Soviet Union against the Fourteenth Parliament, explained the

853  
reasons for refusing to give such a privilege, and then set a policy that would later lead to a negative balance policy. It became known as saying: "Whenever we follow as a positive balance policy, we must give the North Sea oil rating for 38 years and establish a political balance in this way." Aside from the fact that the Iranian nation forever, and now the parliament does not agree with this, it is as if Moghtolleydi is satisfied with the balance to maintain his balance (Aghabakhshi, 1383: p. 447). Thus, the implementation of the policy Negative balance is considered to be an influential variable on the relations between Iran and the Soviet Union.

### **3-7 Policy of Patience and Expectation of the Soviet Union**

With the defeat of the Soviet government due to the non-approval of Qawam-Sadchikov's contract, the country began a massive campaign of war against Iran. The sharp edge of these attacks came to the attention of the British and Iranian agents who, with the rise of the nationalization of the oil industry, also became aware of the Americans. However, since influenced by domestic and international conditions

and with the support of the people and the parliament, Dr. Mossadegh assumed the formation of the cabinet and the fundamental principles of foreign policy became fundamental, the Soviet Union cut off anti-government propaganda and wary policies and patience for Iran and Mossadegh's government (Azghandi, 1386: p. 221). Although during the reign of Dr. Mosaddegh, the Soviet Union cut off anti-government propaganda against Iran, but because of conflicting assessments of the nature of Mossadegh's regime, he did not provide the necessary protection against Britain and the United States, and even refused to pay Iran's debts to Mossadeq government.

### **3-8. The Law of Prohibiting the Granting of Petroleum Privileges to Foreigners**

As previously mentioned, several British and American oil companies demanded oil privileges in the southeast regions of Iran (Balochistan) in 1323 (1944). Members of the Tudeh Party in the parliament strongly opposed the granting of oil concessions. At the same time, the Soviet

854  
government also asked for a rating on petroleum in northern Iran, but this time the Tudeh Party supported the granting of the North Petroleum privileges to the Soviet Union. The Soviet government pressurized the government and parliament to impose a petroleum rating on the levant using leverage such as the Tudeh Party and its internal factors, as well as the Soviet armed forces, who were still present on the Iranian soil despite the end of the war. Finally, by adopting a bill in parliament that banned the government from negotiating with official representatives and, unofficially, the foreign governments abandoned the oil crisis without the decision and approval of the parliament. The plan was presented to the parliament by Dr. Mosaddeq and passed by a majority. The measure was a ban on the assignment of oil privileges to the Eastern and Western powers, which were adopted against the positive balance policy that granted the privilege of oil to the east and west. (Houshang Mahdavi, 1391: 429-438).

With regard to Mossadegh and the nationalization of Iranian oil, Mossadegh was considered by imperialism to be independent because of the fact that he did not want to take

Britain in the Middle East and also because of the nationalization of oil and the end of the British colonial presence in Iran, lost its share of North Oil and basically its possible historical balance. Mossadegh and the National Front were at stake in their strategy. In the same vein, instead of purchasing Iranian oil at a discount of 50 percent after its nationalization, the Soviet Union preferred to buy its oil from the West. The Soviet Union also refused to accept the request for assistance of \$ 20 million from Iran (Modir Shanehchi, 1377: p. 89). These are the effects of Mossadegh's independent sovereignty policy on the relations between Iran and Russia.

### **3-9 Improving Soviet Relations with the Coup d'état in Iran (1332-1342) / (1954-1964)**

With the coming of the coup d'etat government in Iran and the inability of the Soviet government to dominate the Middle East, in a completely bipolar atmosphere after the end of the Second World War, Khrushchev provided an initial ground for promoting relations with Iran. Accordingly, as the Russians strengthened their military capabilities to

855

compete with the Western superpower, they were trying to attract third-world countries such as Iran. The main goal of such a strategy was to prevent the region from becoming a safe area for the West in pursuing the "policy of containment" around the Soviet Union. Following such a policy that, despite the vast and growing relations between Iran and the United States and even Iran's engagement in the Baghdad treaty, Moscow, regardless of its grave dissatisfaction and concern, treats it with tolerance and hopes to find Influential ways to expand their ties with Iran. The result of such a policy was to conclude the 11/09/1333 (December 02, 1954) Agreement and to determine the settlement of border disputes and to demand 11 tons of Iranian gold (Etaat, 1375: p. 70).

The Soviet government, refusing to pay the 11 tons of Iran's gold, refused to pay to Dr. Mossadegh government, in 1334 (1955) delivered the consignment to the government of Zahedi (Hooshang Mahdavi, 1384: p. 242).

After the coup d'état and the reign of Zahedi, the Soviet Union extended its relations with Iran because



of Zahedi's government's ability to provide security and internal political stability, and in light of this stability of Soviet the debt to Iran, and the border issues were resolved. The signing of the Baghdad Treaty and Iran's membership in it led to a reduction in relations, and the Iranian parliamentary delegation returned to the Soviet Union to empty hands and accused the Soviet Union of communicating with the Tudeh Party against Soviet criticism (Arghandi, 1376: p. 265). The total collapse of Dr. Mossadegh during the coup d'état of 28<sup>th</sup> Mordad of 1332 (August 19, 1953) and Stalin's death spread Soviet relations with Zahedi's regime, indicating that the Soviets supported a government in Iran that could provide political stability.

### **3-10 Tensions between the Leaders of the Tudeh Party and Iranian Authorities**

The strategy of the Soviet Union was reflected in the positions of the Tudeh Party towards Iran. The Tudeh Party in Iran has always supported the positions of Russia. For example, the Tudeh Party newspapers launched a massive campaign to win over the

856

northern oil franchise, and even called the "People for the Intellectuals" journal of the north of Iran "Soviet security" (Hooshang Mahdavi, 2005: p. 92).

Under the rule of Mossadegh, the Tudeh Party was created in the autumn of 1331 (1952) in light of political freedoms and called itself the representative of the working class. In the new program, the Tudeh party called for the overthrow of the royal regime and the establishment of a republic based on democracy led by the working class. The Tudeh Party on Mossadegh believed that, although Mossadeq fought for nationalization of oil, but in support of the United States, the masses should not support the nationalization of oil. On this basis, the masses, during the period of Mossadegh's rule, promoted disturbances by provocations and demonstrations, and provided a platform for social insecurity (Keshavarz, 1379: p. 257). In general, the activities of the Tudeh Party have clearly and implicitly influenced Iran-Russia relations.

### **3-11 Follow up of the détente policy**

Following the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the tensions and changes in foreign policy of the US

and the Soviet Union, Iran also made changes in its foreign policy and talked about peaceful coexistence, especially with the Soviet Union. The Soviet government, while dissatisfied with the membership of Iran in the Baghdad treaty, continued its efforts to improve its relations with Iran in implementing the peaceful coexistence policy. The Soviet goal of this policy was to stay away from the situation in Iran and leave empty for its English and American rivals. In contrast, following the actions of Mohammad Reza Shah to the land reform, the Soviet press, which by the summer of 1341 (1962) talked about the corrupt regime of the Imperials, suddenly changed their tone and praised the Shah and called him the pioneer of

857

the land reform, which, though the issues of Iran. It does not completely solve, but it is definitely a big step ahead. The cause of this fundamental change was due to international developments, which did not hide the king, whose goal is to limit Iran-Soviet relations in the near future to economic and technical cooperation and to block all ways of Soviet political influence in Iran. The Soviet Union was not allowed to go to the Soviet Union when it opened its doors to the countries of the world. Although the Soviet Union, in the face of the dangers the Shah raised against the outbreak of Marxist thoughts against its citizens, continued to strive to improve relations (Historical Documents Review Center, 1381: 11).



Document 1 - The coastal city of Yalta in the south of Ukraine was set up in 1344 (1965) to welcome the kingdom, which was before only yesterday towards the western bloc. Archive number: 124927-275.

## **Conclusion**

Studies show that during the period of 1320-1332 (1941-1953) WWII played a significant role as an influential variable in relations between Iran and Russia during the Pahlavi era. In this period, Russia as one of the allied forces entered the Iranian soil and refrained from expelling its troops from Iran. At this point and with the arrival of the allies, Iran was also inflicted heavy losses, and a large part of the damage was caused by the damage that the Soviet Union had imposed. Although Iran's policy in the Second World War was a policy of neutrality, the Soviet government tolerated Iran's neutrality before the German invasion of the Soviet Union, despite Iran's extensive relations with Germany, but after entering to the war, the accused Iran for cooperate with Germany and insisted that Iran cut off its relationship with Germany in favor of the Soviet Union. Another issues that has examined, was the influence of the

Tudeh Party and its members on the relations between the two countries. This is one of the most important factors in the implementation of Soviet Union policy in Iran. The founders of the Tudeh Party were Marxist and pro-Soviet. One of the major events attributable to the Tudeh Party, followed by the collapse of Iran and the Soviet Union, was the defeat of the Tudeh Party following the assassination of Mohammad Reza Shah on 15/11/1327 (February 04, 1949) by a person named Naser Fakhraei, which documents indicate that this person was known as one of the member of the Tudeh Party; after this incident, the Tudeh Party was dissolved. After this incident, the crisis between Iran and the Soviet Union became more intense. The collapse of the two countries after the incident caused even dispersed confrontations between Iran and the Soviet Union on the border between the two countries.

The northern oil was another factor affecting the relations between

Iran and the Soviet Union, which considered as one of the most important and fundamental reasons for the Soviet government to refuse to evacuate its forces from Iran. The problem of evacuating the Soviet forces and asking for the privilege of the northern oil and gas supplies of Azerbaijan during the Qomam period was pursued. Qavam pledged to create a mixed oil company in Iran and the Soviet Union in exchange for the abandonment of Iranian soil by the Soviet Union and the end of the Azerbaijani gas field. But after the withdrawal of the Soviet forces, Qavam was delaying its presentation to the parliament; this caused the Soviets to regard these policies as hostile. Another factor affecting the relations between Iran and the Soviet Union was the impact of the nationalization of oil. This issue became applicable when Mossadegh came to power. Though the Soviet press supported the Iranian national movement and published some material about it, and celebrated the struggle of the Iranian nation against colonialism, the newspaper of the people of the official organs of the Hub of Tudeh at the same time considered the motto of nationalizing the oil industry as a

859  
betrayal of the Iranian people. In addition to opposed the nationalization of the oil, the Tudeh party opposed Mossadegh and his government. The Tudeh Party separated its account from Mossadeq and expressed hatred in general about the "treacherous policy of all those who used the Iranian regime to disrupt Iran and the Soviet Union or implement anti-Soviet intentions." From the very beginning, the Tudeh Party, representing the Iranian people, who was in favor of a clear and explicit policy of full friendship with the Soviet Union, expected all future governments to separate and strictly observe the conditions for the friendship and friendship of Iran in order to implement the policies of the Iranian people. Mossadegh's negative balance policy was also one of the indicators. This policy, based on the refusal of a political and military alliance with the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to try to take advantage of their competition to maximize the interests of Iran, took steps to strike a balance between the emerging US superpower and the Soviet Union. During this period, the Soviet Union provided a policy of patience and anticipation without support from the

Mossadeq government, but in the late Mossadegh regime, relations between Iran and the Soviet Union became more friendly.

The formation of two blocs of the East and West and the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union and the competition between them as a systemic variable is considered as an interchangeable variable in the type of relationship between the two countries of Iran and the Soviet Union. After the coup of 28<sup>th</sup> Mordad of the year (August 20, 1951) the US adopted a new approach compared to Iran. The danger of the expansion of the influence of communism and the Soviet Union led the United States to turn Iran into an anti-communist pillar. The purpose of this policy was to create a defensive belt around the Soviet Union to prevent the spread of communism. On the other hand, the Soviet Union sought to gain more influence in countries such as Iran, because of its rivalry with the United States and the Cold War. In this context, in the bipolar space after the end of the Second World War, Khrushchev provided the groundwork for relations with Iran. Accordingly, as the Russians

860  
strengthened their military capabilities to compete with the Western superpower, they were trying to attract third-world countries such as Iran. But Iran's politics at this time was a positive nationalism policy. The economic political relations between Iran and Russia of 1357-1342 (1978-1963) were not only political but also economic, technical, cultural, and even military-friendly relationship. During this policy period, the Shah's policy was changed to an independent national policy. The policy was based on expanding relationships with neighbors and contributing to the security of the Gulf and the Middle East. One of the most important aspects of this strategy, and one of the most important results of this change in Iran's foreign policy, was the move of the country to destabilize and expand relationships with the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union. In fact, within the framework of the Independent National Policy, "the restoration of relations with Moscow was the main component of the foreign policy of Iran within the framework of unity with the West. In the field of cultural cooperation between Iran and Russia, it can be said that the cultural relations of Iran and the

Soviet Union in the last two decades of the Pahlavi era was the prosperity of cultural relations between the two countries. In 1956 (1977), there were also cultural contacts for the exchange of cultural and literary personalities, the gathering of library experts, the collection of books, the collaboration with the Museum of Armitage and the Museum of Ancient Iran, the Soviet film week in Tehran, and the Iranian film week in Moscow. Regarding the economic and cultural political relations between Iran and the Soviet Union in the 1940s and 50s (1960s & 1970s), it should be noted that despite the very good relationship in the fields of trade and culture, there were political conflicts between the two countries. In the final years of the Pahlavi era, the Shah resists the Soviet insistence on deepening political relations, and only wants economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

#### **References :**

Frankl Joseph, *Contemporary Theory of International Relations*, Vahid Bozorgi Translation, Tehran: Information Publishing, Second Edition, 1997.

861  
Rezaeiyan Ali, *Systems Analysis and Design*, Tehran, Iran, 1387.

khoshvaght, Mohammad Hossein; *Analysis of decision making in foreign policy*, Tehran, Office of Political and International Studies, 1996, p.

*The Treaty of Our Couple between Iran and Russia Concludes in Moscow on the eighth Hunt of 1299 AH*, see: Azghandi, Alireza, *History of Political Socio-Political Revolution in Iran (1357-1379)* Tehran: Position, 1382.

Azghandi, Alireza, *Iran's foreign relations 1357-1320*, Tehran, Gomes, 1997.

Azghandi, Alireza, *History of Political Socio-Political Transformations of Iran (1320-1357)* Tehran: Position, 2003.

Doroudian, Mohammad, *Inevitable War*, Tehran: Center for War Studies and Research, 2003.

Koolai, Elahe and Ebrahim Mottaghi and Davoud Aghaei, *neither Sharafi nor the western, Iran's relations with the Soviet Union and the United States of America*, Tehran: Kasimizan, 2007.

Hooshang Mahdavi, Abdolreza, *Iran's foreign policy during the Pahlavi era*, Tehran: Peykan Publishing House, 2005.

Maraghei, Mohammad Sa'ed, *Political Memoirs of Sa'ed Maraghei*, p. 181, in an

- effort by Bagher-e-Aqli, Tehran, Publishing House, 1373.
- th Announcement of the Fourteenth Parliamentary Meeting, Meeting 171, Official Gazette 22/9/1324.
- Amini, Alireza, History of Foreign Relations of Iran during the Pahlavi Period, Tehran, Contemporary Voice. 2002.
- Zoogi, Iraj (1996). Political and Economic Issues of Iranian Oil, Tehran: Pagan, 1996.
- Bastenegar, Mohammad, Mosaddeq and Hakimit Mellat, Tehran: Pen, 1381.
- Ghabakhshi, Ali and Minoo Afshari Rad, Political Science Culture, Tehran: Chapar, 2004.
- Modir shanechi, Mohsen, Iran's Foreign Policy in Economic Political Quarterly, July 13-14, August and August 1998.
- Etaat, Jawad, Geopolitical Attractions in Iran, Journal of June 15, 2013, No. 24, Winter, 1996.
- Keshvarz, Fereydoun, Political Memories; by Ali Dehbashi, Tehran, AI Publishing, 2000.
- Historical Documents Review Center, Iran-Soviet Relations, Tehran, Historical Documents Review Center, 2002.
- Torabi Farasani, Soheila (2002) Iran-Soviet Trade Relations and Economic Formation in the Early Pahlavi era, Autumn and Winter, No. 31-30, Scientific Research, Ministry of Science.
- Nazem, Hussein (1380) Russian and British in Iran (1900-1914), based on political documents of Britain, France, Germany, Translator of Faramarzpour, Tehran.
- Karzan, Lord (2008) Iran and the Question of Iran, translation by Ali Jawar Kalam, Tehran.
- Ahmadi, Hamid (2013)“Political Elites and the Question of Ethnicity and Democracy in Iran: A Critical View”, Iran and the Caucasus, Vol. 5, No. 17, 2013,p 91