WEAVING IRAN INTO THE TREE OF NATIONS

Nationalism insists on the uniqueness of each nation. So, too, does the study of nationalism. For example, Ernest Renan, a cheerleader of nationalism, used the imagery of each nation “hold[ing] one note in the concert of humanity.” Elie Kedourie, who abhorred the excesses of nationalism, similarly identified its essence as a commitment to “the excellence of diversity.” Whether focused on political borders or social solidarity, the concept of the nation necessarily marks insiders with a special status, distinct from all others.1

At the same time, scholars have long recognized the homogeneity implicit in the global multiplication of nationalisms: each nation is unique, just like all the others. A century ago, Gilbert Murray noted the irony that “in almost every nation in the world from the Americans to the Chinese and the Finns, the same whisper from below the threshold [of consciousness] sounds incessantly in men’s ears. ‘We are the pick and flower of nations: the only nation that is really generous and brave and just.’” In recent years, scholars have begun to emphasize the shared qualities of nationalisms—not just the expression of local claims in “internationally recognizable terms,” writes Craig Calhoun, but also the construction of each nation as “a token of a global type . . . equivalent to other nations.”

This equivalence is situated within a global framework, Michael Billig has argued: “if ‘our’ nation is to be imagined in all its particularity, it must be imagined as a nation amongst other nations. The consciousness of national identity normally assumes an international context, which itself needs to be imagined every bit as much as does the national community.”2

Studies of globalization, starting from contrary premises, have reached similar conclusions. One of the founding observations of the field was the rise of global cultural homogeneity—“elements of commonality,” in the cautious phrase of Wilbert E. Moore, who helped to found this field.3 Yet a number of recent theories of globalization have come to emphasize the contemporaneous, and seemingly paradoxical, rise of national and other particularistic identities worldwide. The two phenomena are related, these theorists argue, because the insistence on such identities is itself a product of globalization.4

Despite the considerable theoretical attention devoted to the international isomorphism of particularistic identities, few studies have sought to explore evidence of the global within the national.5 But it would it be a mistake to conclude from this oversight that the link is inherently implicit. In at least one country, Iran, references to the global
underpinnings of nationalism have been numerous and overt. This paper collects evidence from three registers: visual material from a carpet woven in Kerman, Iran, in 1907; textual material from modernist and conservative political, literary, and religious figures in Iran in the late 19th century and early 20th century; and cross-regional material from the modernist Islamic movement of the same period. These varied forms of evidence point consistently toward the conclusion that concern for national distinctiveness may be expressed in terms of global conformity. Iranian nationalism looked to the world as the embodiment of social and political ideals and sought to remodel Iranian institutions to stake a claim to membership in the world of nations. Membership was only partially achieved in the early 20th century, but the development of the membership claim helped to forge images of national identity for Iran, casting the country as unique, just like every other country.

A TREE OF NATIONS

A rug hangs in the Carpet Museum of Iran, in Laleh Park, Tehran, showing Muhammad ‘Ali Shah (r. 1907–1909) at the top of a large tree, surrounded by Queen Victoria, Sultan Abdülahmid II, President Grover Cleveland, and dozens of other political leaders (Figure 1). Created in Iran in early 1907, just after the promulgation of the Iranian constitution and Muhammad ‘Ali’s accession to the throne, the carpet weaves the shah into a world of leaders. The design flatters the new monarch by placing him at center stage, larger than the other figures, but it also implies that the ruler is one among many in the imagined community of rulers.

According to its inscriptions, the carpet was woven “in the workshop of master weaver [ustād] ‘Ali Akbar Kirmani, . . . at the request of Mr. Muhammad Riza Khan, . . . on the orders of Commander ‘Abd al-Husayn Mirza Farmanfarma in the year 1324,” the lunar year ending 13 February 1907. Kirman, where Farmanfarma was governor in the 1890s and again from mid-1906 until March 1907, underwent a carpetmaking boom during this interval, as did other regions of Iran. In the mid-1890s, a visiting British consul noted: “there is but little trade at present in any of the Kerman carpets,” many of which “are taken by the Governor and sent as presents to the Shah, the Sadrazam [prime minister], and other notables and friends.” A decade later, Kirman’s carpet trade had developed into an extensive export sector, “the staple industry of Kerman and its chief mainstay,” feeding European and North American demand that had been spurred in part by the display of carpets at world’s fairs and museums. Master weavers such as ‘Ali Akbar of Kirman retired with great wealth, while women and child workers at the looms earned pittances and developed a variety of health problems.

The 1907 carpet drew on a long Iranian tradition of pictorial carpets, especially images of kings and legends. Kirmani weavers, beginning in the mid-19th century, developed this tradition into a sideline of foreign-derived pictorials, “spectacular . . . curiosities depicting kings of England, Emperors, figures from the Bible, etc.” Farmanfarma apparently took an interest in promoting these designs. Two examples from 1895, inscribed with Farmanfarma’s name, displayed several Chinese men conversing on one carpet and, on the other, the ancient Gallic warrior Vercingetorix. In 1909, Farmanfarma commissioned a particularly famous carpet that included an adaptation of the painting Les fêtes vénitiennes (The Venetian Feasts) by Jean-Antoine Watteau (1684–1721),
completing a full circle of cultural references, since Watteau’s painting itself included Iranian-inspired costumes. This carpet, later donated to the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, contained virtually identical inscriptions to the 1907 carpet, including the names of Farmanfarma, his deputy Muhammad Riza Khan, and the master weaver ʿAli (Akbar) Kirmani. Farmanfarma was not the only sponsor of foreign-themed carpets: Mirza Husayn Khan (ʿAdl al-Sultanah), a Kirmani landowner and government official, commissioned a carpet picturing representatives of the “races of the world.” Unknown patrons commissioned another carpet, woven in several versions between 1907 and 1919, that offered “a picture of world leaders who have performed great accomplishments,” including Moses, Cyrus (sometimes Darius), Confucius, Muhammad, ʿUmar, Napoleon, and George Washington among the fifty-four personalities depicted.

The first British consul in Kirman, Percy Molesworth Sykes, an enthusiastic promoter of the local carpet industry, objected to such designs, preferring the “ancient” patterns of “conventional flowers” that “make almost any other carpet appear tawdry and common.” European designs, “at my instance, were given up, and by rigorously insisting on adhesion to the old patterns, as well as by opening out new markets, I have assisted in bringing the industry to a thoroughly healthy condition, the carpets only requiring to be more widely known to become the fashion, especially for drawing-rooms and dainty boudoirs.” In this way, an agent of global economic integration encouraged Kirman to preserve and profit from cultural isolation. By contrast, Farmanfarma and other Qajar nobility were sponsors of cultural hybridity, the mixture of foreign-identified themes with locally identified practices. By 1905, at the end of his decade as consul in Kirman, Sykes was once more bemoaning the adoption of “hideous semi-European patterns.”

The symbolism of the Kirman carpet of 1907 encapsulated this hybridity. It followed the Persian tradition of producing images of the shah for the shah—since Farmanfarma presumably ordered the carpet as a personal gift to the monarch—complete with kingly accoutrements expressing recognition of and fealty to royal authority. In addition, it followed recently established tradition—adopted from abroad in the previous century—by treating the shah’s image as representative of the country, as on coins, a practice introduced to Iran by Fath ʿAli Shah in the 1820s, and royal-portrait postage stamps, pioneered by Nasir al-Din Shah in 1876. The carpet presented the shah in a pose and outfit conforming to the European-inspired norms adopted by Muhammad Shah in the 1830s. At the same time, the carpet broke with tradition by juxtaposing the royal portrait with foreign images—not just Iranian material presented in foreign styles, but images appropriated from abroad and transcribed into an Iranian medium.

The images that inspired the Kirman carpet of 1907 were almost all borrowed from half the globe away, and from fourteen years earlier. With only a few exceptions, the political leaders pictured were all in office in 1893. The exceptions present further clues to the source of the imagery: three U.S. presidents (George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Ulysses S. Grant) are displayed with Grover Cleveland and Benjamin Harrison, who were both in office in 1893, just below Muhammad ʿAli Shah. At the root of the tree is “[Christopher] Columbus, the discoverer of America” and “the queen [Isabella] who protected Columbus, the discoverer of America.” In the water below the tree, the three ships from Columbus’s first transatlantic voyage can be identified by anybody who attended grade school in the United States in the 20th century.
FIGURE 1. Untitled carpet (1907). Photograph courtesy of the Carpet Museum of Iran; drawing by Lynn Owens. For legend to Figure 1, please see Appendix.
The weavers faithfully reproduced the iconography of the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, held in Chicago in commemoration of Columbus’s first voyage across the Atlantic Ocean. The cult of Columbus developed to vast proportions in 19th-century North America. One of the instigators of this cult, the author Washington Irving, contrasted Columbus with earlier Arab navigators who lacked “the judgment to divine, and the intrepidity to brave, the mysteries of this perilous deep.” By the late 1860s, the cult was so widespread, Mark Twain joked, that stone fragments collected by American tourists from Columbus’s birthplace “would suffice to build a house fourteen thousand feet high.” The Columbus cult grew to include a national holiday in his honor, and virtually every school in the United States teaches about the voyage of the Niña, the Pinta, and the Santa María.

The World’s Columbian Exposition made Columbus’s voyage the centerpiece of yet another emerging cult: the cult of international society. Since ancient times, scholars and visionaries have periodically appealed to the idea of the world as a single place, with occasional blooms of long-distance networks of education, writings, and commodities. A new burst emerged in the 19th century, following in the tracks of European colonial expansion. International organizations began to claim large regions of the world, or even the entire world, as their field of action. Universalizing social movements—from socialism to eugenics, to pick just two examples—began to coordinate their activities across continents, meeting periodically at international congresses to share the latest developments and strengthen weak ties.

Iran did not have a full-scale exhibit in Chicago. Nasir al-Din Shah, when asked by the U.S. ambassador to appoint a commission for the fair and allocate it a budget, agreed only to the first of the two requests, naming the U.S. ambassador himself to head the commission. The Iranian regime had sponsored buildings at three previous world’s fairs: Paris in 1867 and 1878, and Vienna in 1873. However, private individuals sponsored the Iranian concession at the 1893 fair in Chicago: a “Persian Palace” (labeled “F” in Figure 1) in the commercialized “Midway” area of the fairgrounds, with artisanal workshops downstairs and a café upstairs. To boost attendance, the café followed the precedent of recent world’s fairs in Paris, which offered female erotic dancers as part of their (mis)representation of Islamic culture, spurring a fad of danse du ventre throughout Europe and, from there, to Istanbul, at the same time that traditional “belly dancing” was on the decline in the Middle East. The Persian Palace in Chicago presented dancing French women dressed in Iranian costumes, whom the
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(male) Iranian workers considered inappropriate and went on strike to protest. The concessionaire changed the women into Parisian clothes, but this did not much mollify the workers. American critics also considered the dancing lewd, and the exposition’s director-general, George R. Davis (bust number 80 in Figure 1), tried unsuccessfully to shut it down. As in Paris, the Persian Palace and similar performances along the Midway launched a North American craze for “belly dancing” and other faux–Oriental entertainment.

In contrast to the Persian Palace, the Ottoman government had an official building inside the fairgrounds, plus an elaborate “Turkish village” in the Midway featuring a mosque, a bazaar, a theater, a restaurant, a tent said to have been the property of an unidentified shah of Iran, and a bedouin camp. The Ottoman commissioner at the fair worked to maintain a stately presence. “As this is an event at which all the civilized nations of the world are represented,” he wrote to the Ottoman Ministry of Trade and Public Works, “and even obscure states such as the Kingdom of Johore from the Malaca peninsula, and some small Central American republics whose very names are unknown, make great sacrifices to show themselves, it would be unthinkable for the Sublime [Ottoman] State not to do the same.”

Iran’s small, scandalous entry was enough to earn the country a place in Chicago’s conception of the world. A bearded man with a tall red hat and an Iranian flag is included, for instance, in a newspaper illustration showing a crowd of people from different countries shown advancing on the fairgrounds under the headline, “All Nations are Welcome to the World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago 1893.” “There are exhibits from Persia, from Burmah, from Congo and from Mashona Land, the home of Rider Haggard’s heroes, from China, and even from close-shut Korea,” wrote the president of the Chicago exposition, appealing to exoticism to demonstrate the globality of the event:

In fact, in this great muster of the nations, there is scarcely an absence to be noted. They are all here, each with her own story, each with her lesson, each doing her share in the great work of fulfilling the prophet’s aspiration, the poet’s dream, the statesman’s strong desire to usher in the time when—

“The war-drums throb no longer, and the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.”

Similarly, the carpet of 1907 includes Iran in the “great muster of the nations.” The tree depicted in the carpet includes the leaders of fourteen named countries, five Latin American figures identified only as “leader[s] of the countries of America” (sadr-nashin-i mamālik-i Amrīkā), and—crowded amid the branches of the tree—the governors of forty-nine U.S. states and territories, plus the mayor of Chicago, all as of 1893 and all pictured next to their country or state building at the World’s Columbian Exposition, with a few exceptions. Leader and building stand synechdochally as representatives for polity.

The U.S. governors and state buildings are arranged in rough geographic order. Florida’s building, for example, is perched in a peninsula formed by two branches in the lower right of the tree. Yet the weavers had no need for familiarity with North American geography. Rather, they reproduced, with tremendous precision, a broadside published in Chicago at the time of the exposition. This broadside was a collage of busts and
buildings, along with the tree image and a bird’s-eye view of the exposition grounds. The carpetmakers made only a handful of changes in the design. Muhammad ‘Ali Shah’s dominant location in the carpet was devoted, in the broadside, to crossed U.S. flags and a Liberty Bell. Nasir al-Din Shah traded places with Tsar Alexander III of Russia, giving the Iranian monarch the corner location. Muzaffar al-Din Shah was added in place of Khedive ‘Abbas of Egypt, who was moved down to the spot occupied by Queen Victoria of Britain, who was moved up to replace the Chinese emperor (labeled “Tung Chu,” possibly a cross between Tung Chih [r. 1862–74] and Kuang Hsu [r. 1875–1908]), who was removed entirely. One person, the viceroy of India, was simply omitted, though India’s building at the exposition was retained.

We do not know who brought the broadside to Kirman, but the motivation for weaving it into a carpet hardly seems mysterious. Muhammad ‘Ali’s accession to the Iranian throne on 31 December 1906 made him the country’s first constitutional monarch, his father having signed the constitutional declaration shortly before dying. Pro-constitutional forces had frequently stressed the idea that a constitution would allow Iran to take its rightful place among the “civilized” countries of the world. Now, they argued, that moment had arrived: “[s]ince the day when the Decree of the blessed King of Kings [Muzaffar al-Din Shah], may God illuminate his proof, received the honor of issuance, and the establishment of the National Consultative Assembly was commanded, Iran has been included among the constitutional (mashrûṭah) states which possess a constitution (kunstiftûsiyûn).” The carpet reflected this ideology in full color.

Observers at the time characterized this transition as a “turn toward the global wave” (in gardish rū bih auj-i ‘ālam). Habl al-matin (The Firm Cord), an influential Iranian newspaper published in Calcutta, India, reproduced a story from an unnamed European newspaper on this subject, with apparent approval. The constitutional revolution, according to the story, was evidence of “the mind-boggling progress of this ancient and upright nation and state. Now it is clear that the pride of this people was the product of self-deception, counting the whole world as insignificant in their view. They considered their own principles and laws the best principles and the most stable laws, and they did not view change and alteration as allowable.” Now, the article continues, “the sun of civilization has shone upon them, and the battery of events has awakened them.” As a result, “this nation-state... has set its foot to the path of progress and will not sit down again until it takes first place.”

MODELING MODERNITY

First place and last place were common themes in Iranian discourse of the early 20th century, as elsewhere at this time. By the end of the 20th century, it was second nature to rank order the world on various axes—for example, the World Bank’s influential annual ranking of countries by gross domestic product per capita. But a century earlier, this was a novel conception. Part of global consciousness involved the linear mapping of societies, either up and down or fore and aft. An early example is the 1893 World Almanac’s ranking of countries by population, beginning with the British Empire and China and finishing with the Orange Free State and Hawaii.
Some Iranians had access to similar compendia, though none was produced in Iran until decades later. Muhammad ‘Ali Furughi (Zuka’ al-Mulk), a political-science instructor and newspaper editor, noted in 1906 that Iran was next to last in the world in per capita trade, ahead of only China. And rank ordering was on the minds of many who did not have access to statistics. “In this day and age the situation has become such that one must assert one’s presence and keep up with one’s peers. If one shows negligence once, one can fall fifty years behind in one’s affairs,” wrote a reformer in the 1870s. An Iranian newspaper of the early 20th century expressed concern that “this sacred homeland, begotten of holies, remains behind other countries, and has fallen backwards.”

Another newspaper exhorted Iranians along the same lines: “oh, you stragglers of the caravan of civilization! And oh, you laggards of the road of world progress!” “Cast a glance around you, and behold how the world has become civilized,” an Iranian preacher railed in 1906. “All the savages in Africa and negroes in Zanzibar are marching towards civilization, knowledge, labor, and riches.” “Australian apes administer their huts in accordance with some unknown system of law,” wrote a newspaper in Tehran, “but the unfortunate people of Iran are waiting for Gabriel to descend from heaven again before they become human and demand the rights of humanity.” As in Europe and North America, racism was commonplace.

The 1907 carpet renders the rank ordering graphically: with the exception of Iran and the Ottoman Empire, the top row is devoted to European and North American countries, while other regions are represented primarily along the sides. As noted earlier, the weavers moved Britain’s Queen Victoria (bust number 3) from a mid-level position on the side of the carpet, where the original source image had placed her, to a top-level position, in place of a Chinese emperor. The Chinese and British buildings were left in their original locations. Compare the carpet with another representation of the world of nations, also dating from 1907: the painting The Representatives of the Foreign Powers Coming to Salute the [French] Republic as a Sign of Peace (Figure 2) by Henri “Le Douanier” Rousseau of France. Europe and North America dominate the scene, with eight of thirteen identifiable flags and seventeen of twenty-three persons. Five of the six non-Europeans are depicted as small and marginal. “Equality” is missing from the series of vases in the foreground labeled “Liberty” and “Fraternity”—instead, Rousseau offered “Peace” and “Labor.”

Both of these images reflect the perception, then as now, that international society was constituted primarily by Europe and North America. Most of the international conferences were held there; the ideology of globality was most highly developed there; and the most powerful states in the world were based there. The institutions and ideals of modernity presented themselves as universal in scope—all peoples could and should eventually adopt them, though some would take longer than others—but they were not universal in origin. They emerged in a particular geographic location and were associated with that region’s military ascendancy.

Even non-European models had become powerful, it was widely thought, because they had adopted European ways. Japan was the prime example for Iranians and many others, especially after its military forced Russia out of Korea and Manchuria in 1904–1905, the first time in centuries that an Asian country had so soundly defeated a European country. “Three thousand Japanese youths are busy studying today in Paris,” according to an Iranian student in Europe, “and not one of them can be found in coffee houses...
or is seen in a majlis-i sayr va tamāshā [dinner theater?], or spending one dinar out of place, and with complete contentment they pursue the study of science. But the Iranians spend their time in wasteful places unrelated [to study] and have become the proverbial spenders and squanderers.”64 Japan’s Western-style constitution, too, deserved credit in Iranian eyes: “because of constitutionalism (mashrūtagī), Japan turned great, so that it defeated such a large enemy [that is, Russia]. . . . Constitutionalism is the condition of justice and equity.”65 An Iranian newspaper featured a cover portrait of “His Highness Mutsuhito, the mikado and king of Japan, who personally overturned the 2,000-year-old customs and conventions of his country and stepped into the field of civilization, recognizing that the constitution and parliament would assure the survival and solidity of his monarchy.”66 Muzaffar al-Din Shah also acknowledged the connection. A confidant recalled that the king, strolling on a palace veranda, “came close to me and slowly asked, ‘Does Japan have a parliament?’ I said, ‘For the past eight years.’”67

Notwithstanding the example of Japan, the discourse of modernization in Iran, as elsewhere, was thoroughly Eurocentric—embarrassingly so to 21st-century sensibilities. Not all went as far as the leftist intellectual Muhammad Amin Rasulzadah, who argued that “our sole solution is to accept European principles willingly”—specifically, science and industry—since the house of Iran is too “old and decayed” to be repaired and would otherwise be rebuilt by foreign conquerors;68 or Hasan Taqizadah, the nationalist intellectual who paradoxically urged “the adoption and promotion, without condition or reservation, of European civilization, absolute submission to Europe, and the assimilation of the culture, customs, practices, organization, sciences, arts, life, and
the whole attitude of Europe, without any exception save language; and the putting aside of every kind of self-satisfaction, and such senseless objections as arise from a mistaken, or, as we prefer to call it, a false patriotism. The most obvious instances of “Westoxification” were easily mocked, such as the young, Western-educated Iranians who adopted European-style clothing for no reason other than its association with Europe. In the words of the 19th-century Iranian diplomat Majd al-Mulk, “The Iranian chameleons who have returned home from St. Petersburg and other cities and for whose sake the state had to suffer great losses, of all the sciences at their disposal [they] have learned two things: contempt for the people [of their own country] and dishonor to their nation.”

Yet respect for global norms, and particularly their European manifestations, went beyond the circles of Western-educated radicals. This discussion uses the example of constitutionalism, though analogous evidence can be provided for other modern institutions, such as science. Three senior religious scholars of Najaf, Iraq—Muhammad Husayn (Tihranî), Muhammad Kazim al-Khurasani, and ‘Abdullah Mazandarani—sent an open telegram in late 1908 noting that Muhammad ‘Ali Shah’s abrogation of the constitution involved “the lamentable suppression of the glorious word of God and other Islamic rites, which even the un-Islamic states respect.” The following year, Ahmad Shah’s message of welcome to the second Parliament urged the Parliament and cabinet to “commit themselves first of all to [bringing] the administrative order and its forms of organization gradually into accord with the principles of civilized countries.” Ayatollah Muhammad Tabataba’î told the first sessions of the Iranian Parliament that European institutions were the root of all good things: “I’d never seen the constitutional countries myself. But what I’d heard, and those who had seen the constitutional countries told me, the constitution is the cause of the security and flourishing of the country.” Similarly, Ayatollah ‘Abdullah Bihbihani praised European legislation and urged Parliament only to be subtle about isomorphism: “I have a request to make. Never argue that in such and such a country they have done this or that, so let us do likewise! For the common people would not understand, and we would be offended. We now have laws, and we have the Qur’an. I do not mean that you should not mention this; you certainly should. But if you analyse the matter, you will find that what they [the foreigners] have done is based on wisdom and derived from the laws of the shari‘a.”

Anti-modernists such as Shaykh Fazlullah Nuri derided such positions as inauthentic: “this National Assembly, liberty and freedom, equality and parity, and the principle of the present constitutional law [are] a dress sown for the body of Europe (Farangistân).” Nuri, the chief clerical opponent of parliamentarism in Iran at the time, charged that constitutionalists “want to make Iran’s Consultative Assembly the Parliament of Paris... We see today that in the Majlis-i Shura [Consultative Assembly] they have brought the legal books of the European parliament[s] and have deemed it necessary to expand the law... whereas we the people of Islam have a heavenly and eternal Sacred Law.” The Imam Jum‘ah of Tehran rejected a plan in Parliament on the grounds that “the people of this country are not like the people of other countries.” Similarly, Aqa Shaykh Isma’îl Mahallati argued that liberty in Iran “will be liberty from all kinds of oppression and injustice as understood by the religion of Islam, not by the religion of Buddha and the country of Japan, or by Christianity (madhhab-i Naṣārî) and the European countries... Those laws will differ according to the particularities of the countries and...
the differences in religions, so that [the laws] are not mysterious to the people [of each land].”79

But even Muhammad ʿAli Shah, who derided constitutionalism as ruinous anarchy and sought to reassert absolute monarchical power, adopted global references: “I have announced to all states that Iran is constitutional (mashrūṭah) and is to be counted among the constitutional states (duvval-i kunstūṣiyān).”80 And, of course, Muhammad ʿAli Shah made use of European institutions when they suited his purposes, most glaringly a Russian military unit, the Cossack Brigade, that shelled Parliament and dispersed its members and supporters on his behalf. One might also see global references in Muhammad ʿAli Shah’s frequent equation of the terms “Iran” and “the nation” (millat), words that, over the course of the 19th century, had come to represent an identity equivalent to the identities of European and other nations.81 “Whatever one may think of it, one sees that these are not the same people as last year,” wrote a Tehran newspaper. “Everyone you see is speaking of Iran.”82 “Everyone” included the monarch.

IN SEARCH OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

Nationalism claims that each nation has a unique, ancient genius. Conformity in diversity is often enforced by nationalist hostility to elements of local culture that are shared with other nations and thus considered to be insufficiently distinctive. For example, the Pahlavi regime and associated academic organizations worked to purge certain Arabic-derived words from the Persian language, beginning in the 1920s, and to replace them with “pure” Iranian words.83 Calls for linguistic purification emerged during the 18th and 19th centuries, aiming to restore the “simple” Persian of classical texts.84 Over the course of the 19th century, these calls came to identify linguistic purity with global norms of national identity. Jalal al-Din Mirza, a Qajar prince educated at the first Western-style academy in Tehran, argued that his writings, using “the language of our ancestors which like everything else has been violated and plundered by the Arabs,” were modeled after the works of Europeans, the most “learned people on earth.”85 Mirza Aqa Khan Kirmani, a nationalist activist with similarly negative views of Arabs and Arabic, disagreed with the revival of dead languages, proposing instead to “gather the various Persian languages and stories and words from the tribes and villages of Iran and strive to revive them, so as to demonstrate the dignity of the Iranian race (jins)—a dignity that Kirmani compared negatively with “all of the neighboring nations and other states” that “are striving to reform public conditions in their own republics.”86 Indeed, this was the usual pattern for European nationalists of the 19th and early 20th centuries, who conducted intensive research into the folkways of the putative nation, which were then heralded as the basis for state sovereignty. Czech nationalists, for instance, were obsessed with identifying “pure” Czech language and customs, which the nationalists—many of whom were themselves cosmopolitan German-speakers—then adopted in stylized forms.87 Iranian nationalism did not act on Kirmani’s interest in popular folkways until the 1920s.88

A second pillar of Iranian national identity was the land’s pre-Islamic heritage. It was common for European states of the 19th and early 20th centuries, as part of the nation-building movement, to invent traditions—flags, anthems, rituals, and the like—that linked the contemporary nation with its ancient predecessors.89 In Egypt, too,
nationalists of this period embraced the legacy of their land’s ancient civilizations; even a conservative Islamic newspaper put pyramids on its masthead in 1913. So, too, did certain Iranian noblemen give their sons ancient Iranian names and applaud efforts to link the Qajar dynasty with ancient Iranian rulers. Farmanfarma, for example, sponsored the publication of Kirmani’s versified history of the ancients and commissioned a carpet of Ahura Mazda, the ancient god, as depicted in a French book reproducing a bas-relief at Persepolis. Muhammad ‘Ali Shah identified himself with a 6,000-year tradition of Iranian monarchy, 3,500 years more than Muhammad Riza Shah later claimed during his notorious celebration at Persepolis in 1971. Disorder, Muhammad ‘Ali Shah declared in 1908, “is weakening the foundations of the 6,000-year-old Iranian monarchy, and on the basis of extensive personal duty I do not consider it permissible to endure this in silence.” I have pledged, he stated the following year, to protect “this 6,000-year-old country that is our house and home (manzalah-yi khānah-yi maskūnī) and cherished homeland (watan-i ‘azīz). There is no remedy [for present problems] except the combined forces of national strength with state and royal strength; there is no way to care for and serve this compassionate mother [that is, Iran], other than the assistance and remedy-seeking of the whole family of this pure land (‘umīm-i ahl-i in khāk-i pāk).” Muhammad ‘Ali Shah’s words suggest that territory—home, homeland, land—was widely accepted “as forming the basis of statehood or of political identity and allegiance” in the early 20th century.

Some constitutionalists offered an alternative version of national identity, criticizing the current monarchy for failing to live up to Iran’s long-standing traditions of glorious kingship. A newspaper poem in 1908, for example, compared the autocratic rule of Muhammad ‘Ali Shah unfavorably with that of Nadir Shah, founder of the Afshar dynasty in the 18th century:

The state can befriend the nation. Never say it cannot, sob sob.
It can sympathize with the country. Never say it cannot, sob sob.
It can be like Nadir Afshar. Never say it cannot, sob sob.

Reaching farther back into history, the constitutionalist activist Malik al-Mutakallimin inverted the royal reference to a 6,000-year legacy, claiming this heritage for constitutionalism. “In our several thousand years of life, we have never been without law. And like other nations, we have [never] lived without religious law (shar ‘a) and religion. Before the appearance of the sacred religion of Islam, we were monotheistic and God-worshipping for thousands of years.” Another author invoked Iran’s pre–Islamic legacy even more enthusiastically and was jailed for insulting Islam:

The nation of Iran took precedence in the history of world civilization. From the beginning of history, it was counted among the great countries of the world in civilization and state power. But the worst event to destroy the preeminence of the people and independence of Iran was when the savage people of the Arabian peninsula, the Bedouins, and the lizard-eating Arab race invaded Iran. For 1,300 years now, the Iranian race has tried to remove the weight of their superstitions. Whenever a worthy descendant of Iran rises up and succeeds for a time, however partially, in rescuing the ancient nation from the onerous burden of bondage and slavery and the shackles of superstition, a stone falls again to block the path of Iran’s progress.
References to the world appear throughout these invocations of Iran’s ancient identity. Recovering national history is part of what proper nations do, argued Muhammad Hasan Khan (I’timad al-Saltanah), a modern-educated government minister of the 19th century, “for a civilized people and a great nation... no imaginable flaw is more severe than ignorance of the history of their country and a total forgetting of events of the former times.”

THE GLOBALITY OF AUTHENTIC ISLAM

The Iranian constitutionalist movement was particularly interested in the Iranian flag as a symbol of the nation. In 1907, the design of the flag was specified in the fifth article of the supplement to the constitution. Several years earlier, the first meeting of the Constitutionalist Revolutionary Committee adopted a previous version of the flag as an important icon:

Sayyid Jamal al-Din [Va’iz, a clerical activist] pulled out of his cloak an Iranian flag on which was written, in large letters, “Law—Justice,” and put it [on the table] next to the glorious Qur’an. Then each confederate went up respectfully, enthusiastically, ecstatically, and raised the glorious word of God with one hand, and the flag of Iran with the other. In front of God, represented by the Qur’an, and the homeland, understood to be manifested in the flag of Iran, they pledged to keep the secrets of the group and to strive united in heart and soul for the achievement of law and justice and the downfall of the oppressive and unjust regime.

One might view the flag and the Qur’an as a marriage of the two symbols of nation and faith. But Mahdi Malikzadah, the author of this account and son of one of the key organizers of the constitutionalists’ meeting, urged readers to view the two symbols separately. The nation was said to be represented only by the flag, and not by the Qur’an. This reluctance to identify the nation with Islam was elaborated later in the meeting. Malikzadah’s father, Malik al-Mutakallimin, argued that Islam was—at least, institutionally—on the side of the monarchy, not the nation. “Power in this country is in the hands of two classes, the state officials and the religious scholars, and up to now they have colluded with one another to rule the country.” This concern may have been overstated, since religious scholars had on numerous occasions over the previous century resisted various policies of the Qajar regime, if not the existence and structure of the regime itself. In any case, the constitutionalists so mistrusted Islamic scholars that they hoped to win them over “without letting them know of our real goals,” according to Article 7 of the bylaws ratified at the meeting. Article 10 urged activists not to publish material “related to the laws of Islam, or anything that would hand the weapon of excommunication (takfîr) to ill-wishers.”

Other constitutionalists were even more careful not to identify the nation exclusively with Islam. A second group of activists, the Secret Society, stipulated in Article 2 of its bylaws, “Disciples of four religions can be accepted in this organization: first, those who are under the word of the community (dar taht-i kalamah-yi jama‘ah) of ‘There is no god but God, and Muhammad is the prophet of God’; second, the community (tâyifah) of Zoroastrians; third, the Jew; fourth, the Christian (Naṣârî)—on condition that they be of Iranian origin and Iranian race (Irânî al-asl va-Irânî nizhâd).” This list includes multiple faiths in the “Iranian race.” Indeed, the roundabout reference to
Muslims, avoiding the terms “Muslim” and “Islam,” may have been intended to include Azali Babis, the persecuted sect considered heretical by Islamic authorities. Several Azali Babis were active constitutionalists.\footnote{111}

Nevertheless, constitutionalists frequently held up early Islamic history as a model for the contemporary Iranian nation, both privately and publicly. Virtually all of the movement’s public documents, even when they chastised religious leaders, appealed to Islamic ideals and precedents, beginning with Mirza Yusef Khan (Mustashar al-Daulah), whose influential tract *Yik kalama* (One Word; 1870) held up French-style law—“law” being the one word referred to in the title—as both the solution to Iran’s contemporary problems and the true expression of Islam. “I have found proofs and verses from the glorious Qur’an and the hadith for all the means of progress and civilization,” Mustashar al-Daulah wrote to a colleague, “so that they [shall] no longer say that such and such thing is opposed to the principles of Islam, or that the principles of Islam prevent progress and civilization.”\footnote{112} Similarly, an early meeting of the Secret Society engaged in a lengthy discussion of Imam Husayn, concluding that he was the first person ever to organize a secret revolutionary group to overthrow an evil ruler.\footnote{113}

The insistence on Islamic precedent went hand in hand with the adoption of foreign models of constitutional rule. The connection lay in the trope of “revival,” also called rebirth or renewal.\footnote{114} There was a happy coincidence, certain religious scholars held, between the original ideals of Islam and modern European institutions. By adopting European models, one could at the same time be true to one’s faith. This was the argument of Ayatollah Muhammad Husayn Na‘ini, assigned by several leading Shi'i religious scholars in 1908 to write a defense of constitutionalism:

> [Europeans] appropriated the principles of civilization and politics implicit in the Islamic holy books and traditions, and in the edicts of ‘Ali [son-in-law and fourth successor of the Prophet] and other early leaders of Islam, as they have justly acknowledged in their earlier histories, as they have admitted that learning such principles and sciences conducive to such spectacular advances in such a short period of time would be impossible for unaided human reason. Therefore the progress and perseverance of the West in translation, interpretation, and application of these principles on the one hand, and the concomitant regression of the people of Islam and their subjugation at the hands of unbelievers [the Mongol conquerors] resulted in such a state that Muslims gradually forgot the principles of their own historical origins and even supposed that abject subordination is a necessity of Islamic life. Therefore they thought that the commandments of Islam are contrary to civilization, reason, and justice—the fountainhead of progress—and as such, they equated Islam with slavery and savagery.\footnote{115}

Various other texts by religious scholars in support of constitutionalism and other reforms also praised global standards in addition to Islamic ideals. For example, Sayyid ‘Abd al-‘Azim ‘Imad al-‘Ulama’ Khalkhali wrote:

> In this age, especially in our time, sovereignty is founded on justice, fairness, and the principle of equality, as is obvious from the Europeans. As a result of contacts with foreign countries and of association with civilized nations, and of studying political books and articles, reading foreign and domestic journals, acquiring knowledge of the relationship between the civilized rulers and their respective subjects, and being informed of the desirability and benefits of constitutional government, the eyes of the Iranians have been opened, their ears alerted, and their tongues
unleashed. They do not tolerate tyrannical actions or unruly behavior. They now have their opinions about internal and external affairs, have become a “people of loosening and binding” [those who are called to consult in the affairs of state, according to longstanding Islamic jurisprudence], supervising their mutual affairs, and capable of acceptance or rejection.\textsuperscript{116}

And Ayatollah Tabataba’i pronounced:

God commands that men follow the path of justice. The prophets and saints have called men to justice. Justice and equality are the first duty of humanity, and survival of the [human] race depends on justice. In the Qur’an and the stories of the innocent ones [Fatima, ‘Ali, and the twelve Imams], there is an insistence on justice. “God enjoins that you render to the owners what is held in trust with you, that when you judge among people, do so with justice. Noble are the counsels of God, and God hears all and sees everything” [Qur’an, sura 4, verse 58]. “Oh, believers! Be responsible to God and bear witness to justice. Do not let [your] hatred of others turn you toward injustice. Be just, as this is closer to piety. Fear God, as God knows your actions” [Qur’an, sura 5, verse 8]. Today, the non-believers and foreign nations have adopted the path of justice. We Muslims have deviated from the path of justice.\textsuperscript{117}

Appreciation of global norms, as embodied in European practices, was not limited to Iranian Shi’ism of this era. Some of the most influential Sunni Muslim writers of the early 20th century expressed great admiration for European models on matters such as constitutionalism. “The greatest benefit that the peoples of the Orient have derived from the Europeans was to learn how real government ought to be,” wrote Rashid Rida of Egypt. “Do not, O Muslim, say that this type of government is one of the basic foundations of our religion, so that we have simply inferred it from the Qur’an and the life stories of the rightly guided caliphs, and not as a result of associating with the Europeans and being acquainted with the conditions of Westerners.”\textsuperscript{118}

Similarly, Muhammad Iqbal of India wrote that democracy “is the most important aspect of Islam regarded as a political ideal. It must, however, be confessed that the Muslims, with their ideal of individual freedom, could do nothing for the political improvement of Asia.” Only the British Empire deserved credit for this improvement. “Democracy has been the great mission of England in modern times. . . . England, in fact, is doing one of our own great duties, which unfavorable circumstances did not permit us to perform. It is not the number of Muhammadians which it protects, but the spirit of the British Empire that makes it the greatest Muhammadan Empire in the world.”\textsuperscript{119}

Both Rida and Iqbal stressed that contact with Europeans has encouraged Muslims to respect global norms of governance. This privileging of external models may be surprising, given these authors’ later reputations as proponents of Islamic authenticity, but it was hardly unusual among Islamic modernists of the early 20th century. Ziya Gökalp of Ottoman Turkey, for example, argued that “Islam is not contrary to a modern state, but, on the contrary, the Islamic state means a modern state. But how did it happen that the modern states came into existence only in Christendom?”\textsuperscript{120} Rizaeddin ibn Fakhreddin of Russian Tatarstan opined that “civilization in its real meaning” had not yet “appeared in the Muslim world,” due to the loss of the inventive and entrepreneurial spirit of the early Islamic era. Had this spirit not been lost, he continued, “schools, teachers and students in these schools, scholars and artisans, inventors, factories, architects, engineers, doctors, and professors—all those people the Europeans have today would have come
from the Muslim world.” Al-Imam (The Leader), a prominent Islamic journal of Southeast Asia, called on Malays to “to arise and emulate [civilized] humanity,” to adopt “a ‘parliament’ [word transliterated from English] under the direction of the people.”

Global imagery was itself a global phenomenon at this time. Iranian modernists were aware of this widespread movement to adopt global norms and linked themselves to modernists elsewhere. Their newspapers reported on developments in other countries—indeed, some of the leading Iranian newspapers prior to 1907 were published in Calcutta, Istanbul, Cairo, and London. These journals frequently urged Iranians to join other nations in becoming both global and authentic, as in a letter from Russia published in Habl al-matin. “Oh respected Muslims, take hold of the firm handle of the true faith and adopt the peoples of Russia as a model so that you may attain your goals.”

In an instance of Iranians watching outsiders watching Iranians, Iranian newspapers in Calcutta and Tehran ran Persian versions of an Arabic “Letter from Tehran” that had been published in al-Manar, the Islamic newspaper based in Cairo. Iranian modernists reached across the Shi’i–Sunni divide on other occasions, as well. For example, a Tehran newspaper praised Sayyid Jamal al-Din al-Afghani as “among the first to raise the issue of constitutionalism and freedom,” using his adopted Sunni identity (Afghani) rather than his Iranian Shi’i identifier (Asadabadi). At least one Iranian modernist religious scholar urged Shi’is to codify Islamic law, citing the precedent of the Sunni Ottoman Mecelle-i Ahkâm-ı Adliye (Compendium of Judicial Statutes) of 1876, which equated itself with the civil legal codes of the “civilized nations.” Iranians urged Sunnis to imitate Shi’is, as well. Three hundred million Muslims are watching, one newspaper wrote. “In this way one can say that the movement of the Iranians is preliminary to the movement of all the Muslims of the world.”

The Importance of Nationhood

The Columbus carpet offers a beautiful microcosm of the prevailing discourse of globalization in early 20th century Iran. It literally wove Iran into the tree of nations, while numerous political, literary, and religious figures did so figuratively. Invoking Iran’s pre-Islamic past, as well as its Islamic and multi-religious identities, these authors sought to create a national identity equivalent to other countries’ identities. Equivalence, they felt, would solidify Iran’s claims to membership in the world polity, with all the rights commonly associated with membership. “When Iran has a parliament,” one statesman wrote, “the other states of the world will take steps to remedy the encroachments and trespasses of [Iran’s] neighbors.” Similarly, a newspaper editorialized, “A civilized state that [conducts] its internal affairs on the basis of legality has equal relations with other states, and is never trampled upon by foreigners.”

These wishes matched the prevailing understandings of the day. In international law, countries were considered to have rights only if powerful European states accepted them as being “civilized” enough to belong to the “Family of Nations.” Notwithstanding the aspirations of Iranian nationalists, Iran enjoyed only semi-sovereign status in this system in the early 20th century. “Persia, Siam, China, Abyssinia, and the like were certainly civilised states, and Abyssinia is even a Christian State,” an important treatise on international law noted in its 1905 and 1912 editions, but “their civilisation
has not yet reached that condition which is necessary to enable their Government
and their populations in every respect to understand and to carry out the command
of the rule of International Law.” As a result, “such States are International Per-
sons only in some respects—namely, those in which they have expressly or tacitly
been received into the Family of Nations.” One of the ways in which Iran was
expressly received into this family was its participation in the Hague International
Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907, along with only a handful of non–European
states.

In public, powerful countries sometimes recognized Iran as a member of the
“civilized” world. For example, George Nathaniel Curzon, the influential British colonial
official, asked in 1892, “Is Persia about to enter, nay, has she already entered, the comity
of civilised nations, or does she still sit a contented outcast without the gate?” In
1911, Curzon answered his question in the affirmative, to the delight of Iran’s British
supporters, noting that Muslims, being monotheists, were qualified for membership in
international society: “[t]he Mahomedan countries of the world are as much entitled
as the Christian countries to the full benefits of the law of nations (cheers). With them
equally with European peoples, treaties ought to be kept (loud cheers).”

However, in practice Iran was accorded only limited benefits of the law of nations
at this time. As is well known, Great Britain and Russia disregarded Iran’s sovereignty
only months after the country gained a constitution, signing an accord that divided
Iran into spheres of influence. The accord renounced British prerogatives in the north of
Iran and Russian prerogatives in the south, claiming these areas as regions of Russian and
British “special interest,” respectively, even as the accord explicitly pledged “to respect
the integrity and independence of Persia.” The accord was transmitted to the Iranian
Foreign Ministry several weeks after its signing, with an understated cover letter ac-
knowledging that “this agreement has treated matters that may be of interest to the Persian
government.” At the same time, Britain used the discourse of Iranian sovereignty as a
cover, when convenient. Within a year of dividing Iran into spheres of interest, the British
ambassador instructed consuls in Iran to avoid assisting the constitutional movement, if
asked to do so, and to offer the explanation “that England, as a Constitutional country,
must always look with sympathy on a constitutional movement; but that it was not
fitting or right that she should interfere in the internal affairs of a free and independent
people.” Again in 1911, soon after Curzon’s speech, the British government used
similar language to justify acquiescence in the Iranian coup d’état that Russia was
supporting. “We certainly cannot encourage [a] coup d’état,” wrote the British foreign
minister, “but [we] have no more intention of interfering with a Bakhtiari coup d’état
than with previous coups d’état in Persia.” Ironically, the British government was at the
same time engaged in preventing a coup d’état by Muhammad ‘Ali, the former shah.
In 1919, Curzon negotiated a treaty with Iran whose goal, he told colleagues in London,
was to maintain “British supervision” and “general political dominance” in Iran. The
tsarist government in Russia, for its part, schemed openly to subvert the sovereignty of
Iran, sending troops toward Tehran and making public demands that even the Russian
ambassador considered specious. The Russian foreign ministry rebuked the ambassador
for his objections. Throughout the constitutional period, the Ottoman government
continued to send troops across the Iranian border with impunity in search of suspected
brigands.
In short, Iranians could weave their country into a figurative tree of nations, but it took somewhat longer to bring this image to life. Eventually, Iran came to be accepted as a unique but isomorphic unit in the community of nations, just like all the others. It was granted founding-member status in the League of Nations and the United Nations. It was occupied several times by foreign powers but never colonized. Monarchs were overthrown, and the country’s name changed, but Iran’s sovereign status in the world system remained. These developments cannot be attributed entirely to the intertwined ideologies of globality and nationalism, but they could not have come to pass without persistent mobilization in Iran around the global idea of nationhood. This mobilization stands as evidence that ideologies of national distinctiveness may rely explicitly on a basis of cross-national similarity.
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APPENDIX

Legend to Figure 1

People  
(1) Muhammad ʿAli Shah [of Iran, 1907–09], our monarch and sacrificer for our spirits;  
(2) ʿAbdūlhiyām [II], Ottoman sultan [1876–1909];  
(3) Victoria [English queen [1837–1901; image replaces Tong Zhi or Guang Xu, emperors of China, 1862–74 and 1875–1908];  
(4) Franz Josef I, emperor of Austria [1848–1916];  
(5) Muzaffar al-Dīn Shah [of Iran, 1896–1906; replaces Khedive ʿAbbas II];  
(6) Alexander III, emperor of Russia [1881–94; image switched with Nasir al-Dīn Shah];  
(7) Nasir al-Dīn Shah [of Iran], 1278 [1861–62; r. 1848–96; image switched with Alexander III];  
(8) Oscar II, king of Sweden [1872–1907];  
(9) [Tatanka Iyotanka (Sitting Bull), chief of the Lakota, c. 1868–90];  
(10) Abraham Lincoln, U.S. president, 1861–65;  
(11) [Ulysses Grant, U.S. president, 1869–77];  
(12) [Pomiuq, “prince” of the Labrador Eskimos, c. 1882–97];  
(13) [Lord Aberdeen] Canadian governor-general, 1893–98;  
(14) [George Washington, U.S. president, 1789–97];  
(15) [Grover Cleveland, U.S. president, 1885–89, 1893–97];  
(16) [Benjamin Harrison, U.S. president, 1889–93];  
(17) [Levi Knight Fuller, governor of Vermont, 1886–88, 1892–94];  
(18) [John Butler Smith, governor of New Hampshire, 1893–95];  
(19) [Edwin Chick Burleigh, governor of Maine, 1889–93];  
(20) [Victor George, Earl of Jersey, governor of New South Wales, 1891–93];  
(21) [Roswell Keyes Colcord, governor of Nevada, 1891–95];  
(22) [John E. Rickards, governor of Montana, 1893–97];  
(23) Leader of the countries of America [Joaquín Crespo, president of Venezuela, 1884–98];  
(24) [John H. McGraw, governor of Washington, 1893–97];  
(25) [Eli C. D. Shortridge, governor of North Dakota, 1893–95];  
(26) [Knute Nelson, governor of Minnesota, 1893–95];  
(27) [George W. Peck, governor of Wisconsin, 1891–95];  
(28) [John Tyler Rich, governor of Michigan, 1893–96];  
(29) [Robert Emory Pattison, governor of Pennsylvania, 1891–95];  
(30) [D. Russell Brown, governor of Rhode Island, 1892–95];  
(31) [Luzon B. Morris, governor of Connecticut, 1893–95];  
(32) [William Eustis Russell, governor of Massachusetts, 1891–94];  
(33) [William John McConnell, governor of Idaho, 1893–97];  
(34) [George T. Werts, governor of New Jersey, 1893–96];  
(35) [Roswell Pettibone Flower, governor of New York, 1892–95];  
(36) Leader of the countries of America [José J. Rodríguez Zeledón, president of Costa Rica, 1890–94];  
(37) Wilhelm II, emperor of Germany [1888–1918];  
(38) [Sylvester Penoyer, governor of Oregon, 1887–95];  
(39) [Charles Henry Sheldon, governor of South Dakota, 1893–97];  
(40) [Horace Boies, governor of Iowa, 1890–94];  
(41) [Carter Henry Harrison, mayor of Chicago, 1879–87, 1893];  
(42) [John Peter Altgeld, governor of Illinois, 1893–97];  
(43) [Claude Matthews, governor of Indiana, 1893–97];  
(44) [William McKinley, governor of Ohio, 1892–96];  
(45) [Robert John Reynolds, governor of Delaware, 1891–95];  
(46) [Frank Brown, governor of Maryland, 1892–96];  
(47) ʿAbbas II, khedive of Egypt [1892–1914; image replaces Queen Victoria];  
(48) [Henry Harrison Markham, governor of California, 1891–95];  
(49) [John E. Osborne, governor of Wyoming, 1893–95];
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(50) [Arthur Lloyd Thomas, governor of Utah Territory, 1889–93]; (51) [Lorenzo Crounse, governor of Nebraska, 1893–95]; (52) [William Joel Stone, governor of Missouri, 1893–97]; (53) [John Young Brown, governor of Kentucky, 1891–95]; (54) [William A. MacCorkle, governor of West Virginia, 1893–97]; (55) [Phillip Watkins McKinney, governor of Virginia, 1890–94]; (56) [Elias Carr, governor of North Carolina, 1893–97]; (57) [Davis Hanson Waite, governor of Colorado, 1893–95]; (58) [Lorenzo Dow Lewelling, governor of Kansas, 1893–95]; (59) [William Meade Fishback, governor of Arkansas, 1893–95]; (60) [Peter Turney, governor of Tennessee, 1893–97]; (61) Leader of the countries of America [Rafael Núñez, president of Colombia, 1880–82, 1884–94]; (62) King of Japan [Mutsuhito Meiji, 1867–1912]; (63) [Nathan O. Murphy, governor of Arizona Territory, 1892–93]; (64) [Abraham Jefferson Seay, governor of Oklahoma Territory, 1892–93]; (65) [Murphy J. Foster, governor of Louisiana, 1892–1900]; (66) [John Marshall Stone, governor of Mississippi, 1876–82, 1890–96]; (67) [Thomas Goode Jones, governor of Alabama, 1890–94]; (68) [William Jonathan Northen, governor of Georgia, 1890–94]; (69) [Benjamin Tillman, governor of South Carolina, 1890–94]; (70 and 71) Leader[s] of the countries of America [Floriano Peixoto, president of Brazil, 1891–94, and Louis Mondestin Florvil Hyppolite, president of Haiti, 1889–96]; (72) Leader of France [Marie-François Sadi Carnot, 1887–94]; (73) [L. Bradford Prince, governor of New Mexico Territory, 1889–93]; (74) [James Stephen Hogg, governor of Texas, 1891–95]; (75) King of Spain [Alfonso XIII, 1886–1931]; (76) Governor of Ceylon [Arthur Elibank Havelock, 1890–95]; (77) The queen [Isabella of Castile and Aragon, 1474–1504] who protected Columbus, the discoverer of America; (78) [Christopher Columbus, discoverer of America [1451–1506]; (79) Leader of the countries of America [José María Reyna Barrios, president of Guatemala, 1892–98]; (80) [George R. Davis, director-general of the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893]; (81) [Mrs. Potter Palmer, president of the World’s Columbian Exposition Board of Lady Managers]; (82) [Harlow N. Higginbotham, president of the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893]; (83) [Thomas W. Palmer, president of the World’s Columbian Commission].

Buildings

(A) Austrian Village; (B) Chinese Joss House; (C) Ottoman Empire; (D) Temple of Luxor; (E) Russia [switched with Persian Palace]; (F) Persian Palace [switched with Russia]; (G) Sweden; (H) American Indian Village; (I) Esquimaux Village; (J) Canada; (K) India [image of H. C. K. Petty-Fitzmaurice, Marquess of Lansdowne, viceroy of India, 1888–94, omitted]; (L) Montana; (M) Vermont; (N) New Hampshire; (O) Maine; (P) New South Wales; (Q) Venezuela; (R) Washington; (S) North Dakota; (T) Minnesota; (U) Wisconsin; (V) Michigan; (W) Pennsylvania; (X) Rhode Island; (Y) Connecticut; (Z) Massachusetts; (AA) Costa Rica; (BB) Idaho; (CC) Oregon; (DD) Wyoming; (EE) South Dakota; (FF) Iowa; (GG) Illinois; (HH) Indiana; (II) Ohio; (JJ) New Jersey; (KK) Delaware; (LL) New York; (MM) Maryland; (NN) Germany; (OO) California; (PP) Utah; (QQ) Nebraska; (RR) Missouri; (SS) Kentucky; (TT) West Virginia; (UU) Virginia; (VV) Great Britain; (WW) Colombia; (XX) Colorado; (YY) Kansas; (ZZ) Arkansas; (AAA) Japan; (BBB) Combined territories (Arizona, Oklahoma, New Mexico); (CCC) Louisiana; (DDD) Brazil; (EEE) Haiti; (FFF) France; (GGG) Texas; (HHH) Florida; (III) Spain; (JJJ) Ceylon; (KKK) Guatemala; (LLL) In the workshop of master weaver [ustād] ‘Ali Akbar Kirmani;
At the request of Mr. Muhammad Riza Khan; On the orders of Commander ‘Abd al-Husayn Mirza Farmanfarma [1858–1939] in the year 1324 [1906–07].

Legend to Figure 2


**Flags** (A) England; (B) France; (C) United States; (D) possibly Haiti, with horizontal stripes turned diagonal; (E) unknown; (F) unknown; (G) unknown; (H) Italy; (I) possibly Japan, with colors inverted; (J) possibly El Salvador, with nine stripes reduced to three, swallowtailed; (K) possibly Austria-Hungary, with the green corner symbolizing Hungary removed, swallowtailed; (L) Serbia; (M) possibly Ethiopia, with stripes turned vertical; (N) Germany; (O) Iran; (P) Russia.