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At 2.30 p.m. on Tuesday 16 June 1934, the train carrying Reza Shah and the
group of eighteen attendants, army officers and diplomats whom he had brought
with him on his official visit to Turkey, arrived at the Ankara train station.¹ The
welcoming ceremony in honour of the Shah and his entourage, as the train made
its way into the station, was carefully and elaborately choreographed. Turkish and
Iranian flags hung from the walls and pillars of the train station, a centrally placed
honour guard took turns playing the respective national anthems,² and a large
crowd was assembled all around the train station to welcome what the Turkish
press had dubbed 'Büyük Misafirimiz' (our great guest).³ By all accounts Reza
Shah's reception at the train station, like much of his 26-day Turkish sojourn,
was a grand affair. As Abbas Masudi, the 25-year-old founding editor of the Tehran
daily Etila'at, whom Reza Shah had invited on the trip to record the historic
visit, described in one of his telegraphed dispatches back to Tehran: 'the entire
population of the city has crowded onto the streets of the capital to welcome
the shah.'⁴

The elaborate and public nature of the welcoming ceremony at the Ankara
train station reflected the new political climate of the emerging inter-war Middle
Eastern state system. In the aftermath of the First World War, the Wilsonian
dogmatists of national sovereignty and international diplomacy had produced an
increasingly formalised international system of nation-states. The demise of the
Ottoman, Habsburg and Romanov empires — and the establishment of the League
of Nations — led to the century's first springtime of nations and the emergence of
a wave of new states seeking recognition within the new international order. In
the context of the Middle East, Turkey and Iran were the two states that sought
recognition most readily within the emerging international political system. Both
emerged from the final peace settlements of the First World War, after Turkey's
war of independence, as sovereign states, and embarked on diplomatic policies to
maximise their presence in world politics. Iran, as a neutral party to the war, was
afforded 'original member' status in the League of Nations upon ratification of the
League's covenant in November 1919. The Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919 – which was part of Lord Curzon's 'Indian obsession' envisioning a 'chain of vassal states' along the so-called 'northern tier' from the Mediterranean to the Pamirs – was first signed, then suspended, and finally rejected in 1921 by a now more assertive national government conscience of and eager to preserve the nation's sovereignty and position in the world. Similarly, Iran's northern neighbour, Russia, having invaded Iran in 1911, then withdrawing and renouncing its economic and capitulatory privileges after the victory of the Bolsheviks in 1917, only to return again in 1920 to help the short-lived Gilan Soviet Socialist Republic, finally, in 1921, formalised its recognition of Iran's independence with the signing of the Soviet–Iran Friendship Agreement. The relinquishment of the capitulations – which had been so potent a symbol of the nineteenth-century imperial order – was also a sign of Iran's growing independence and formalised sovereignty; after the 1918 Soviet renunciation of the capitulations, Britain, Belgium, Austria, The Netherlands, Italy and Sweden, all in turn, negotiated bilateral agreements with the new state of Reza Khan, terminating their capitulatory rights.

Turkey, for its part, had emerged from the crucible of the Great War to sign a series of bilateral treaties with the Soviet Union, France, Britain, Italy, Romania, Yugoslavia and Greece. Turkey's admission into the League of Nations in 1932 was comparatively late given the recognition of the Turkish state since the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, but is perhaps explained by the strained relations of the Ottoman legacy and the Treaty of Sèvres (August 1920), a treaty accepted by the Sultan in the aftermath of the war but which was deemed detrimental to Turkish 'national' interests by the Ankara government of Mustafa Kemal. Increasingly, during the inter-war period, and especially as the world once again moved towards war by the mid-1930s, the diplomatic manoeuvring of Turkey and Iran became a way for the new states to assert their sovereignty while simultaneously negotiating their place in an ever-more dangerous international system. The multilateral Balkan Pact of 1934, signed by Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Romania, and the 1937 Sa'dabad Treaty between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan, were the culmination of this inter-war project of asserting the sovereignty of these new states in the international political arena.

The official visit by Reza Shah to Mustafa Kemal's Turkey in June and July of 1934 thus took place within this broader context of inter-war Middle Eastern diplomacy. In one sense the visit was not unprecedented, however; both Naser al-Din Shah (r.1848–1896) and Muzaffar al-Din Shah (r.1896–1907) had made official visits to the Ottoman Court, and to this extent the thaw in Turko-Iranian relations – after the legacy of the religious wars of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – had already begun almost a century before Reza Shah's ceremonial arrival at the Ankara train station. In another sense, however, the 1934 visit suggested something decidedly new. The flurry of diplomatic activity following the First World War and the equally quickened pace of diplomacy in anticipation of the Second World War suggested that the nature of international relations had changed by 1934. The old imperial system had begun to wane, and the newly institutionalised context of international diplomacy now assumed a global system of freely interacting nation-states. Diplomacy in this new context was not only the legalistic language used by the high bureaucracies of interacting states; diplomacy now also served an important public, performative and symbolic role. In an age when the political structure of the League of Nations affirmed the presence of the international system, and the growing importance of a transnational print culture – not to mention the growing importance of radio, television and film – persistently reaffirmed the presence of that system, diplomacy now took on an important representational function as the way in which nations simultaneously declared their individual sovereignty and positioned themselves as part of the global chorus of nation-states. Membership in this global chorus now became the benchmark of national sovereignty, and the institutionalisation of the international sphere thus opened up a transnational cultural space in which national sovereignty could be performed. The goal of performing national sovereignty was clearly intended to gain recognition by the international sphere; and at its base this recognition stemmed from a political metaphysic which took as its operative assumption the presence of an international comparative field of standardised political territories.

In the aftermath of the Great War, and with the institutionalisation of the international system, public diplomacy now became the means by which emerging states sought to position themselves within this global representational network of reciprocal recognition. Institutionalist accounts of the international system have observed that this global representational network can produce a systemic effect resulting in a striking isomorphism across and between actors in the system. In the words of sociologist Connie McNeeley,

The world polity consists of a complex set of assumptions, rules, and standards that underlie international global activity and discourse, and rests on the notion of a world culture as the institutional context in which broader relations and behavior can be examined. This world culture refers to a framework of definitions, rules, and principles that are institutionalized at the world level and, by implication, are held to be applicable throughout the world. Thus, the existence, the organizational structures, and the legitimacy of nation-states evolve in the transnational cultural environment and the organizational forms and practices of states typically respond to the cultural and organizational imperatives of the international system.

In the context of the Middle East, this more abstract formulation can be historicalised to locate the inter-war period as the moment when the national sovereignty of individual states (and emerging states) became intimately tied to the now universalised political and cultural standards of an increasingly formalised international political system. Henceforth, the 'framework of definitions, rules and principles' that were 'institutionalised at the world level' became the prescriptive representational forms in which emerging states sought to clothe themselves in order to achieve recognition by the international system. In this sense the diplomatic history of the inter-war Middle East is important, not only for its place as...
part of the legal and political narrative of the region, but also for its place as part of the emerging narrative of modern culture in the region, as the moment when a new representational apparatus was deployed by Middle Eastern nation-builders. The 1934 visit by Reza Shah to Turkey was important precisely in this cultural and representational sense. The prolific staging of public ceremonies, commemorations and spectacles during the official visit – and at least as importantly, the media coverage of those events in the popular press – worked to publicise the adoption of the new Wilsonian model of national politics by the two emerging states. Flags, anthems, cheering crowds and symbols of the nation followed the two heads of state throughout the almost month-long visit by Reza Shah to Kemalist Turkey. In the urban environments of Ankara, İzmir and Istanbul elaborately choreographed public rituals allowed Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal to perform to the nation and in the process circulate a new set of national symbols with which to define themselves, their relationship to each other, and their place in the world. Domestically, the official visit was intended for the national publics of each state. Staged during the most robust period of their respective nationalisation projects, the official visit was an occasion for Turkey and Iran to transmit those newly forged national symbols to their respective publics. In addition, despite the relative thaw in Turko-Iranian relations since the late nineteenth century, the legacy of Ottoman-Qajar and Sunni-Shi'i conflict meant that the official visit also served a didactic purpose for each state in popularising a new policy of inter-state friendship and co-operation. At the same time the official visit was also intended for an international audience. The press coverage of the visit reached the European and American newspapers, coming perhaps ironically during precisely the same week as the 1934 Venice meeting between Hitler and Mussolini – also widely publicised in the world press. The presence of European and international diplomats at the official ceremonies and receptions is also recorded in the Turkish and Persian accounts of the visit. In this sense the official visit was situated in the context, and against the backdrop, of an international stage on which global diplomacy was performed. The performance of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal on that stage in June and July 1934 was ultimately intended to show the world that the two states were competent in presenting and representing themselves according to the now-universalised standards of the international system.

Marking boundaries

The first major ceremony during the official visit was the border-crossing of Reza Shah’s motorcade into Turkey. The border-crossing ceremony took place on 10 June 1934, eight days after Reza Shah and his retinue had set out from Tehran, passing through Qazvin, Tabriz and Maku along the still-unpaved road of the Turko-Iranian frontier. The border-crossing ceremony itself took place along the Maku–Erzerum road at the precise point where the two states had delineated their common border. At that site a Turkish military delegation headed by General Ali Said Pasha, commander of Turkish military forces in eastern Anatolia, was present to welcome the Shah and his entourage. In addition, an elaborate triumphal arch had been erected in preparation for the Shah’s motorcade. The arch was adorned with Turkish and Iranian flags, and an honour guard from each state was present and positioned on opposite sides of the arch. As Reza Shah’s motorcade stood poised to cross the border, the honour guards first approached each other and, facing each other beneath the arch, took turns playing their respective national anthems. They then moved aside and made way for the Shah and his entourage to pass beneath the arch and cross into Turkey on foot. The border-crossing ceremony suggests how important the public marking of political boundaries had become for each state. In fact discussions over the precise demarcation of the Turko-Iranian border had been the subject of extensive bilateral negotiations since the mid-1920s. Overall the border had remained remarkably stable since the 1947 Treaty of Erzerum, negotiated under British and Russian sponsorship to clearly delineate the Ottoman–Qajar frontier. In the aftermath of the First World War and with the new emphasis on territorial boundaries as one of the defining characteristics of nations in the world system, the concern with precisely surveying, demarcating and publicly declaring the boundaries of each state gained renewed attention. Kurdish national aspirations were another common concern of Turkey and Iran, encouraging both states to assert their national sovereignty in the disputed Kurdish regions. Inspired by both of these interests, negotiations between Turkey and Iran regarding the border began in 1926 and continued until 1932 when the demarcation of the border was finally resolved, adjusting the border to make the policing of the territory easier for each state.

The June 1934 trip to Turkey by Reza Shah was the direct result of the successful conclusion of the 1932 border treaty. With the signing of the treaty in Tehran on 23 January 1932 – by Iranian Foreign Minister Muhammad Ali Furughi and his Turkish counterpart Tevfik Rüstü – the two states were now prepared to publicly affirm the terms of the new treaty as well as their newly formalised friendship. Reza Shah’s ceremonial crossing of the border was thus full of political significance. The ceremony of the border-crossing – and at least as importantly, the press coverage of the ceremony – thus worked, on the one hand, to reify the existence of the newly demarcated political boundary which separated the two states, while, on the other hand, projecting a message of international cooperation between the two nations. The tacit rules of the newly emerging world order called for the transformation of the soft boundaries of the pre-national age into the hard boundaries of a new international system in which consolidated nation-states exercised sovereignty over clearly demarcated territorial zones. The border-crossing thus projected a message that animated the political boundary shared by the two states and affirmed each state’s authority over that boundary. The 11 June 1934 issue of Cumhuriyet featured a front-page topographical map of the Turko-Iranian frontier with the newly delineated political boundary conspicuously demarcated – a full narrative of the border-crossing ceremony accompanied the graphic. In the Persian press there was a similar concern with providing a detailed public account of the border-crossing ceremony. The detailed reportage of Abbas Masudi – the editor of the Tehran daily Ettela’at who accompanied Reza Shah on
the trip - describing the border-crossing ceremony was sent back to Tehran via telegraph and published in the 28 Khurad edition of the newspaper. Press coverage of the border-crossing ceremony was as copious as the copious coverage of all the ceremonies during Reza Shah's almost-month-long visit to Turkey - was thus important in amplifying the political message of the officially staged ceremonies. After the border-crossing ceremony itself Reza Shah and his Turkish hosts spent several days in eastern Anatolia as they made their way to Trabzon, from where they were to take a ship to Samson and from there a train to Ankara. Press reports of the eastern Anatolian leg of the trip were copious and detailed. In Erzerum on 13 June, for example, Cumhuriyet reported the presentation of a specially commissioned medallion to the Shah. On one side of the medallion was a profile of Mustafa Kemal and on the other was that of Reza Shah. On the following day the motorcade arrived in Trabzon where they were greeted by Foreign Minister Tévik Rüstü and General Fekredin Pasha; the guests were welcomed with full military honours, including a 21-gun salute, as they boarded the naval vessel Yavuz and set out for Samson. Press reports of the journey were detailed in their descriptions of the ceremonies and symbols, and the crowds which followed Reza Shah and his Turkish hosts as they made their way from the border-crossing ceremony to Ankara.

Ceremonies in Ankara

The use of the press was an important means of transmitting the political message of the official ceremonies to a wider audience. The border-crossing ceremony itself, while attended by only a relatively small number of participants and observers, came to have an important political meaning through the coverage of the ceremony in the popular press. In addition to the press, however, other choreographed activities sought to directly mobilise public participation through officially staged ceremonies held in honour of the Shah. These ceremonies were held in the major urban centres visited by Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal during the official visit.

Among the most important of these ceremonies involving large-scale public participation was the official welcoming ceremony in Ankara. As Reza Shah's train made its way into the Ankara train station, Mustafa Kemal and most of the senior members of the Turkish government stood on the platform waiting to greet the Iranian delegation. Also in attendance was a large crowd of spectators, the size of which Abbas Masudi estimated in one of his dispatches back to Tehran as 'the entire population of the city'. The crowd had been encouraged to attend the welcoming ceremony at the Ankara train station; organised groups of participants were clearly in attendance among the crowd, including an honour guard which fired a 21-gun salute and played the Iranian national anthem, as well as several student groups from local schools, and members of the scouting movement who attended dressed in uniforms and standing in formation. As the Shah disembarked from the train and was greeted by Mustafa Kemal, the two walked together, passing the honour guard and scouts, and made brief speeches before the crowd assembled in front of the train station. From there they walked towards the waiting motorcade and climbed into the open-top car waiting for them. As their car drove from the train station and towards the Haklevi (People's House), where Reza Shah was to stay during his time in Ankara, the two heads of state were visible sitting next to each other in the back of the car as they drove past the crowds lining the streets of the capital.

The press accounts also documented the details of the official reception held in the Shah's honour on the evening of the Iranian delegation's arrival in Ankara. At approximately 8 p.m. on 16 June 1934, after driving through the capital and seeing virtually all the public sites of the city decorated in Turkish and Iranian colours, Reza Shah and the Iranian delegation arrived at Çankaya, the Ankara home of Mustafa Kemal. The gala dinner reception in honour of Reza Shah was attended by forty-eight invited guests, many of whom were foreign diplomats stationed in the Turkish capital. The dinner was the first opportunity for the two heads of state to spend time together, and by all accounts they quickly developed a genuine camaraderie. Reza Shah's familiarity with Azeri Turkish allowed the two to speak for the most part directly to one another without the use of an interpreter. Newspaper coverage reported the highlight of the evening as the exchange of toasts between Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah. Cumhuriyet quotes Mustafa Kemal as making the following toast in honour of the Shah:

"With the greatest pleasure we welcome the leader of our brother nation, Ahazurat Humayun [Reza Shah], upon his arrival in Turkey. The entire Turkish nation is honored by His Majesty's presence. Whenever in history these two nations have been at odds they have experienced the most difficult periods of their existence. However, whenever they have worked together they have made progress. The Turkish republic considers good relations with Iran to be central to its politics... Turkey and Iran have had elevated civilizations for thousands of years and today with great steps they are moving forward... and the friendship which day by day between these two brother nations advances, with the presence of his majesty here... and without doubt this will be welcomed by world civilization... and our nations will go down the road of peace and be part of the global peace which is our hope."

The public declaration of friendship between the two states echoed through the newspaper coverage of the toast. The invocation of 'history' and 'world civilization' by Mustafa Kemal further dramatised what was perceived as the momentous nature of the official visit and underscored the national and international audience to which the message was directed. In reply to Mustafa Kemal's toast the Shah then rose from the dinner table at which were seated members of his entourage, senior Turkish leaders and foreign diplomats, including the British ambassador, and raised his glass to honour the Turkish president:

Great friend and dear brother, the honorable president of the great Turkish Republic. The kindness with which I have been received by the Turkish
nation has left a lasting impression on me. From the first day of my reign I have felt the need for friendship with Turkey and for this reason I am happy to see that the closest relations now exist between Turkey and Iran. These two neighbors and brother nations can move forward toward progress and civilization. In honor of this friendship I raise my glass.\(^{49}\)

The press coverage of the toasts stood alongside the coverage of the welcoming ceremony at the Ankara train station. Both of these public displays of bilateral cooperation were reported in the 17 June 1934 issue of Cumhuriyet. The welcoming ceremony at the train station was a public urban display that choreographed the articulation of Turkish and Iranian symbols while also managing the incorporation of the crowds as consumers of those symbols. The ubiquitous presence of Turkish and Iranian flags, the playing of the respective national anthems and the visible public presence of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal standing juxtaposed before the crowd or sitting together in the back of the open-top car as it drove past the admiring gaze of the crowds lining the streets of the capital, all worked to tie together symbol and ceremony in an urban choreography of bi-national co-operation. Further, the press coverage of the welcoming ceremony and the official reception in honour of Reza Shah, and the exchange of toasts between Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal, worked to further the political message of the ceremonies. The visual symbols of friendship, which had been articulated during the afternoon ceremony at the train station, were now supplemented by the text of the speeches made at the official reception. The text underscored and amplified the visual message of the urban ceremony.

Other important events during Reza Shah’s stay in Ankara were the other receptions given in his honour by Teyfük Rüstü (Foreign Minister), İsmet İnönü (Prime Minister) and Kazem Pasha (Speaker of the Assembly).\(^{50}\) There was also a reception held for Mustafa Kemal at the Iranian Embassy in Ankara.\(^{51}\) Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal also attended a specially commissioned opera performed in their honour at the newly constructed opera house in Ankara. The opera was entitled Özsoy (pure lineage) and was a celebration of Turko-Iranian friendship, based on a version of Ferdowsi’s mythical story of the brothers Tur and Iraj from the Shahname.\(^{52}\) The two heads of state also made a public visit to a sports club where they observed gymnastics, sports and equestrian competitions.\(^{44}\) Among the events which received the greatest press coverage, however, was Reza Shah’s visit to the Turkish Grand National Assembly, where he listened to a major foreign policy speech by İsmet İnönü on Turko-Iranian relations. With Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal sitting in attendance together in the upper gallery of the Assembly, İnönü described the state of Turko-Iranian relations:

\begin{quote}
We welcome you your majesty. The people who have shown such warmth to the shah have done so knowing that they are showing kindness to the nation of Iran. The Turkish nation which has just come out of a contentious period recognizes that Iran has obtained its own independence with greatness and struggle. We resolve that now that both
\end{quote}

nations are strong and stable they will reach the path of progress and knowledge and will attain these to the fullest extent. All of these ceremonies impress on the international community that this is our goal since all of this is stated with feeling and conviction.\(^{53}\)

After İnönü made his speech the speaker of the National Assembly then went to the podium and announced that the Turkish Grand National Assembly had just telegraphed the Iranian Majlis with a declaration of friendship.\(^{54}\) The visit to the Turkish Assembly, and İsmet İnönü’s speech, received wide coverage in the press. The Turkish dailies contained excerpts from the speech along with photographs and descriptions of the event. The speech itself made reference to all the important political points which the official trip was trying to publicise. İnönü’s point connecting warmth shown to the Shah with an expression of kindness towards the nation of Iran worked at once to reinforce the status of the Shah as a national representative while once again expressing bilateral friendship between the two states; his point describing the ‘greatness’ and ‘struggle’ of Iran’s fight for independence worked to tie Turkey and Iran’s recent political history into a common project of ‘national liberation’; the reference to ‘the path of progress and knowledge’ and the ‘international community’ suggested that the audience of the speech, as the official visit itself, was not only Turks and Iranians, but also the international political system. Once again the text of the speech worked to reinforce, amplify and make explicit the visual message of the public ceremony. In this case İnönü’s speech was a public declaration of Turkey and Iran’s mutual project of nationalisation and modernisation, and their acceptance of the rules and standards of the international state system, as well as an assertion of their status as equal members of that system.

Of all the ceremonies held during the Ankara leg of the official visit the military parade held at the Ankara sports stadium on 18 June 1934 mobilised the greatest degree of public participation. The military parade took place on the second day of Reza Shah’s stay in Ankara. The staging of the parade at the sports stadium allowed for a very carefully controlled and choreographed public spectacle. Several thousand spectators were assembled to watch the elaborately arranged procession of soldiers, honour guards and scouts in honour of Reza Shah.\(^{55}\) A special viewing platform had been erected in the stadium for Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal from which they could observe the procession while also being conspicuously positioned before the crowd. Also in preparation for the parade the stadium had been decorated with Turkish and Iranian colours and an assembled marching band played patriotic music. As the ceremony began Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal had not yet entered the stadium, which was nevertheless full of spectators listening to the patriotic music and waiting for the arrival of the two heads of state. With the crowd assembled in the stadium, an open-top car carrying the two heads of state then drove into the arena and made one complete trip around the track encircling the field, before stopping in front of the platform where the two heads of state were to take their places.\(^{48}\) The dramatic entry into the stadium and the drive around the track in the open-top car presented the two
heads of state to the thousands of spectators assembled in the stands. With Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal sitting next to each other on the platform, and patriotic music playing in the stadium, the two flagpoles situated beside the viewing platform where the two heads of state were positioned raised the Turkish and Iranian flags. The parade itself now began and continued for about an hour. Each group of soldiers that passed the viewing platform saluted the two leaders. The choreography of the ceremony, the presentation of symbols, and the public nature of the event worked to use the military parade as another public declaration of bi-national friendship before a carefully assembled group of spectators.

The military parade was important for one other reason as well. In the Persian press coverage of the parade the presence of female scouts was of special notice. Female participation in the scouting movement, along with Reza Shah’s visit to co-educational public schools, left an important impression on readers of the press coverage of the parade in Iran. The coverage in Ettela‘at and especially Abbas Masudi’s detailed descriptions of the social reform programmes in Turkey – such as co-ed schooling, female scouting and un-hejabed women – familiarised Iranians with those reforms and made them seem less radical when Reza Shah initiated similar reforms upon his return from Turkey. Again, as with all of the ceremonies staged during Reza Shah’s visit to Turkey, the performative and participatory elements of the ceremony were enhanced and supplemented by the way it was represented in the press.

Ahmet Agaoglu’s articles in the Turkish press

The didactic nature of much of the newspaper coverage was also present in the Turkish press. Most significantly it is present in the series of articles written by Ahmet Agaoglu (1869–1939) in Cunhuriyet during Reza Shah’s official visit. Agaoglu was born in the Russian-dominated southern Caucasus and travelled widely during his life throughout the Caucasus, the Ottoman Empire and Europe – where he studied under the noted nineteenth-century philologists James Darmesteter and Ernest Renan – before returning to the Caucasus and eventually the Ottoman Empire, where he became one of the leading ideologues of Turkish nationalism. In the Kemalist period he served as head of Atatürk’s press office and director of the Agence Anatolique press service, was an important figure in the drafting of the 1924 Turkish Constitution and eventually became a deputy in the Grand National Assembly. By 1934 he had retired to Istanbul where he continued to teach and write, and lived out his final years as a well-respected public figure. The series of articles he published in Cunhuriyet between 15 and 24 June 1934 thus played an important role in framing Turkey’s new relationship with Iran.

The articles did not specifically address Reza Shah’s visit to Turkey, but were rather intended as broad reflections on the cultural and historical ties which linked Turkey and Iran. For example, in the 15 June article Agaoglu begins by using the myth-history of Ferdowsi’s Shahname as a source for understanding the relationship between Turkey and Iran. He writes,

Until the period of Mustafa Kemal and Shahanshah Reza Khan Pahlavi Turkish–Iranian relations could be described by four words: pointless struggle and meaningless competition. Ferdowsi’s imaginary work is a lively monument to this age-old competition even before Islam. It’s worthy to note that according to Ferdowsi these two nations are from the same source. According to this genius the first Padeshah Feryadun had three sons. The first was Tur, the second Iraj, and the third was named Salm. He gave the first Turan, to the second he gave Iran, and to the third he gave the Tigris-Euphrates valley. The second two joined together against the first thus beginning this age-old competition.51

The myth-history of the Shahname had already become an important theme of the official visit. The staging of the specially commissioned opera Özsoy (pure lineage), based on the mytho-historical genealogy of Ferdowsi’s epic, was one of the public events which Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal attended during the Ankara leg of the trip. Agaoglu’s use of the Shahname to trace the national genealogy of Turkey and Iran served at least two purposes. First, the use of Ferdowsi was part of the broader project of secularising national culture in both Turkey and Iran. The appeal to mythology and folklore in tracing the origins of modern identity worked to replace the traditional Quranic-Abrahamic genealogy with a newly constructed official public memory grounded in a secularised version of a national past tied to history, culture and race. Second, and more immediately significant, the appeal to the mytho-historical genealogy of the Shahname worked to tie Turkey and Iran together into a common history. The concern with tying the two nations into a common history was intended to trivialise the legacy of conflict and competition, which in fact filled the annals of their political relations. Agaoglu accounts for this legacy of conflict by declaring,

In reality the only reason for this [history of conflict] was the drive towards imperialism and competition between dynasties. Thus two sister nations who were of the same race fought for centuries spilling each other’s blood.53

Agaoglu’s appeal to the genealogy of the Shahname allows him to bring Turkey and Iran into a single national narrative. The common mythical genealogy now embraces the common elements shared between the two nations rather than the historical legacy of conflict. In this sense Agaoglu is following the famous dictum of his mentor Ernest Renan when the latter wrote, “[F]orgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation”.54 Once framed in this way however, Agaoglu’s ‘forgetting’ allows him to imagine a common Turko-Iranian historical bloc. He writes,

In the beginning of the sixteenth century Turkey and Iran ruled much of Asia and Europe from the walls of Vienna to the gates of China, including India, and the entirety of this world was ruled by people belonging to the same race.55
The appeal to race is significant in that it echoes the dominant discourse of nationalism in the interwar period. The reference to the extent of world conquest by Agaoglu’s Turko-Iranian bloc also reflects the then-dominant standard of judging the strength of a nation by the extent of its pre-modern imperial dominions, the assumption being that nations higher up the presumed hierarchy of nations are those which have ruled successfully over others. In Agaoglu’s reading of history then, the legacy of conflict between Turkey and Iran is forgotten and replaced by a national narrative which enfames both states in accordance with then-dominant global standards.

Once this common narrative is put into place the more recent political history of reform in Turkey and Iran is even more closely woven together. Agaoglu, who himself was born on the Turko-Iranian frontier of the southern Caucasus, goes on to highlight the important role of the Azerbaijani element in Iranian politics. In discussing the 1905 Iranian Revolution he emphasises that some of the leaders of the movement had been Azeri-Irans educated at the Galatasaray, the Imperial Lycée which had produced the important cadre of Ottoman officers and reformers including Mustafa Kemal. He goes on to write,

Azerbaijan had a huge affect on the awakening in Iran. All of the leaders were in Istanbul. Among them Afghani, Kermani, Haji Mirza, and Shaikh Ameen are worthy of mention. When one reads their writings one cannot doubt that they were influenced by Namik Kemal, Zia Pasha, and Mithat Pasha. Especially Mirza Agha Khan was not shy about openly expressing that Iran and Turkey should join under a single government.

In the more recent history therefore, Agaoglu is careful to emphasise the common experience of the two states. In drawing the line between Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah he equates the 1907 Anglo-Russian agreement, which divided Iran into Russian and British spheres of influence, with the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres, which proposed a similar partition of Anatolia in the wake of the First World War. The recent history of Turkey and Iran is thus enfamed as a common struggle for national sovereignty. Agaoglu writes,

But in both cases this was the last straw and both countries were elevated to the struggle for liberation. In Turkey Ataturk came to the head of this struggle and in Iran our esteemed guest Shahanshah Pahlavi did the same.

Having begun from the myth-history of the brothers Tur and Iran, Agaoglu now concludes his narrative by highlighting the leadership of Mustafa Kemal and Reza Shah. The common project of nationalisation and modernisation which the two heads of state were then leading now becomes the culmination of Agaoglu’s broader history of Turko-Iranian relations. In this sense Agaoglu’s articles were important in popularising and giving legitimacy to the new policy of bi-national friendship between the two states. The series of nine articles were published beginning on the eve of Reza Shah’s arrival at the Ankara train station and continued daily for the next ten days, from the Ankara leg of the trip through to the visits to Izmir and Istanbul. The press coverage of the official visit was most intense during this critical period and Agaoglu’s more broadly conceived and historical articles were juxtaposed against the press coverage of Reza Shah’s daily itinerary of visits to sites, meetings with public officials and other public events. The historical weight of Agaoglu’s articles thus added context, as well as symbolism and significance to the official visit. After extending his narrative from the birth of Feraydun, as the primordial Shah, to the mythic brothers Tur and Iraj, and their subsequent history of conflict and competition, Agaoglu concludes his narrative by anticipating a new age of closeness between the two nations; he writes on the eve of the first meeting between Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal at the Ankara train station, ‘[t]omorrow the meeting will be a crowning of this brotherhood’.

From Ankara to Istanbul

It was during Reza Shah’s stay in Ankara that Mustafa Kemal asked him to extend his stay in Turkey. Originally the trip had been planned to culminate with the meeting between the two heads of state in Ankara. With the success of the reception in the capital, however, and the sense of camaraderie which had now been established between the two men, Mustafa Kemal sought to prolong the official visit in order to show western Anatolia to the Shah and to emphasise further the new tone of friendship which had now been established between the two states as a result of the trip. The expanded itinerary now took them by train – in what quickly turned into a choreographed whistle-stop tour of western Anatolia – to Eskisehir, and then to Izmir, and from there north to Balıkesir, Çanakkale, the Dardanelles and, finally, by boat to Istanbul.

The nine-day trip from Ankara to Istanbul gave the two heads of state extensive time to discuss the nationalisation and modernisation projects which both states were in the process of implementing. Hassan Arfa, one of the military commanders accompanying the Shah on the trip, recalls the train-ride to Izmir in which the parties sat together for long hours in discussion. Mustafa Kemal, Arfa recalls, ‘as usual drank and played cards, or talked a good part of the time. He was in great form’. Passing through the small towns along the way, they were greeted by large crowds assembled at the train stations. Despite arriving at midnight in Usak, a small town along the Eskisehir-Izmir railway, the train was greeted by a large crowd on the platform cheering for the two heads of state. As Arfa records in his memoirs, it was on this occasion that Mustafa Kemal, while leaning out the compartment window to greet the crowd, saw a turbaned mullah among the crowd standing on the platform. No doubt excited by the conversations of modernisation which had preoccupied the two heads of state during their hours together on the train, and just as likely by the spirits which had been consumed, Mustafa Kemal took the opportunity to make a public example of the man dressed in religious garb. Leaning from the train and pointing to the turbaned mullah he
shouted with great excitement to the assembled mob to ‘destroy him’, as clerics are ‘the enemy of the people’. Hassan Arfa describes what happened next:

Looking out of the window, I saw a mullah who had had the misfortune to have tried to shake Atatürk’s hand, throwing his white turban in the air, and then plunging into the crowd he disappeared with dexterity engendered by fear.

By December 1934 Mustafa Kemal would make a decree prohibiting all clerics from wearing religious clothing outside of the mosque. The incident thus became a spontaneous public declaration of secularism to the assembled crowd at the train station and a lesson to Reza Shah on how to pursue his own policy towards the clergy.

Upon their arrival in Izmir they were greeted by more public ceremonies. They made visits to a military installation, several factories and an air show in the city – all of which received extensive coverage in the press. From Izmir they then made their way to Istanbul, which marked the end of the trip before Reza Shah was to make his way back to Iran via the Black Sea. The trip to Istanbul was made by rail and ship so that Mustafa Kemal could show Reza Shah the site of his most famous military success at the Dardanelles. By 1934 the defence of the Dardanelles during the First World War had already gained legendary status as part of Turkish national memory, and the visit to the site by Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal – where according to the Turkish press ‘Kemal recounted the war story to Reza’ – now also played a symbolic and political role as the memory of that military success was invoked at precisely the same moment when the two states were establishing bilateral defensive agreements.

After seeing the Dardanelles the two next made their way to Istanbul by boat. The welcoming ceremony and all the events held in Reza Shah’s honour were again staged on a very grand scale. As the boat made its way into the Bosphorous Straits and towards the Dolma Bahçe Palace, Reza Shah was to stay during his time in Istanbul, a great portion of the city had assembled to welcome the two heads of state. In a city of approximately 300,000 inhabitants in 1934, about 10,000 of whom were Iranian expatriates, a large segment of the population had gathered along the edge of the straits to watch the arrival of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal. The geography of the Bosphorus, with the spectators watching from the edge of the straits as the boat carrying the two men sailed past, also helped to elevate and publicise the ceremonial quality of the reception. Much of the focus of the city’s attention was aimed at the boat bringing Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal into the city; Turkish and Iranian flags decorated the public spaces of the city as well as the boat as it made its way into the straits; a 21-gun salute was also fired over the Bosphorus to announce the arrival of the two heads of state.

On the front page of Cumhuriyet on 26 Haziran 1934 two portraits of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal were printed inside a larger graphic which contained Turkish and Iranian flags. Inside the issue the programme of events scheduled for

Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal’s stay in Istanbul was published to help encourage public participation in the events. Also in the same issue, perhaps for the first time since the 1928 adoption of the Latin script, the newspaper had printed a front-page greeting written in Persian welcoming the Shah to the city. Inside the same edition Ali Nehat, a member of the literature faculty at Istanbul University, had composed a poem in honour of Reza Shah’s visit to Turkey. It too was printed in Persian, accompanied by a Turkish translation.

The three days which Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal spent together in Istanbul were full of public ceremonies and specially choreographed events. As they drove through the streets of Turkey’s most populous city in their open-top car they were continuously met by large crowds. Abbas Masudi, again reporting back to Tehran via telegraph, writes of the enthusiasm of the Istanbul populace for the two leaders. He writes, ‘everywhere Reza and Kemal go by car they are greeted by crowds lining the streets’. The schedule of their public events demanded that they cross the city to attend ceremonies and visit sites. Among the sites they visited were the Istanbul Museum, the Hagia Sophia, the Iranian Consulate, co-educational schools, an air show and a military parade just outside the city, the Naval School at Haidar Pasha, and the Supreme Military, Academy where once again, the newspapers reported, the Shah was told ‘the story of the war of independence’. At the Iranian Consulate there was a reception organised by the Iranian expatriate community of Istanbul. Standing before a large gathering of Iranian residents of Istanbul, Reza Shah is quoted as saying

The thing which has been so much a source of happiness for me during this trip has been the unity which has been shown between the Turkish and Iranian nations. Henceforth you must think of Turkey as your second nation and Turks as your brothers. Show them friendship. I am eager to put behind us during my reign the mistrust and conflict that has plagued our two nations and kept us separated. In place of this I want to create friendship in place of the conflict of the past caused by ignorance and religion. I am hopeful that henceforth these two nations will give each other their hand in harmony and have confidence in each other as they live and coexist in happiness and progress.

In Masudi’s coverage of the Istanbul leg of the trip, Reza Shah’s declaration of Turko-Iranian friendship received a great deal of attention. As with the coverage of the other important public events during the official visit, the text of Reza Shah’s speech at the Consulate amplified the symbolic meaning of the broader set of ceremonies staged in his honour.

The final large public event staged during the official visit was the firework display over the Bosphorus on the eve of Reza Shah’s departure from Turkey. As with the welcoming ceremony upon his arrival in Istanbul, the farewell fête for Reza Shah again made use of the Bosphorus as a central stage to choreograph the ceremony. In Ankara the military parade held at the sports stadium had served a similar purpose as a site of mass convergence for the public spectacle. In Istanbul
the creative use of the geography of the Bosphorus as a public stage worked to make the ceremony visible to an even larger segment of the city’s population. The public had been made aware of the festivities through press coverage and the publication of the programme in the Istanbul dailies. At around 7 p.m., people began coming out of their homes to gather along the Bosphorus. The streets lining the shore had been closed in order to focus the attention of the city on the festival as well as to make room for the crowds of spectators who had gathered to see the display. The largest concentration of spectators had clustered around the Dolma Bahçe Palace where Reza Shah was staying and from where he and Mustafa Kemal were to watch the spectacle. From that time until after midnight an armada of naval vessels formed a procession down the straits. The boats were adorned with electric lights in the national colours of Turkey and Iran. Amplified music also played the Iranian and Turkish national anthems from the decks of the passing vessels, and a major fireworks display accompanied the boats as they made their way past the spectators assembled around the Dolma Bahçe Palace. The farewell ceremony on the Bosphorus was the largest public event staged in Reza Shah’s honour.

As with the other ceremonies choreographed during the 26-day official visit to Turkey, the naval parade and fireworks display on the Bosphorus were designed to project a new message of Turko-Iranian friendship. The projection of this message during the Bosphorus ceremony was no doubt intended for the audience of urban residents in Istanbul. As the most populous city in the republic, the cultivation of popular opinion in the city would go a long way towards changing feelings of Sunni-Shi’i and Ottoman-Qajar distrust. The public nature of the ceremonies and the concern with ensuring popular participation and spectatorship during all of the public events suggests the basic concern of the official visit to publicise this new perception of Turko-Iranian relations.

Conclusion

The ceremonies also symbolised a more fundamental conceptual shift in the culture and politics of the inter-war Middle East. Beyond the declaration of rapprochement and of new-found friendship between the two states, the ceremonies were also assertions of sovereignty on the part of Turkey and Iran within a global context. The official visits announced the presence of Turkey and Iran as equal members of a post-war international state system. The ubiquitous public image of Reza Shah and Mustafa Kemal as national representatives, the emphasis during the ceremonies on such symbols as flags and anthems, and the choreography and liturgy of ceremonies based on an international model of inter-state diplomacy, made clear that the official visit conformed to a now-standardised national ceremonial form. As sovereign members of the inter-war state system Reza Shah’s official visit to Turkey was designed ultimately to show Turks, Iranians and the world that these two new states were free, sovereign and independent nations, conducting themselves according to the standardised cultural and diplomatic norms of the international political system.
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