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ABSTRACT

The Iranian student movement was partially a creation of the American government. The organizational structure of the Iranian Students Association was conceived by the American Friends of the Middle East in 1953. However, the United States had lost the battle for the hearts and minds of Iranian students by 1960. Within the first two years of that decade, the Iranian Students Association in the United States was joined by similar groups in Western Europe.

The Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations grappled with the question of how to react to these developments. The Kennedy administration questioned the shah’s ability to lead; they also listened to the concerns of Iranian students in the United States. This changed when Lyndon Johnson, determined to reassert American power through use of the military and the forging of questionable alliances, adopted a policy of blind support for the Shah of Iran. What began under the Johnson administration escalated when Richard Nixon was elected president.

Throughout these twelve pivotal years, the Iranian student movement became an integral element of the global student unrest of the 1960s. In the early part of the decade, they were, along with members of the Civil Rights Movement, in the vanguard of student protest. Iranian students questioned American imperialism before many, and mounted a vocal campaign against U.S. support for the shah’s regime in the mid-1960s. By then end of the decade, they were joined in the age of global protest by members of SDS, the Black Panthers, and many others, including German leftists. Despite this global call for a retreat from imperialism, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger issued the shah a black check to purchase all non-nuclear military hardware from the American arsenal on 30 May 1972.

The refusal of the Johnson and Nixon administrations to take the concerns of Iranian students studying within its own borders seriously was a major flaw in American foreign policy.
While Iranian students gained the attention, and the support, of various American and European youth organizations, along with some more liberal-minded politicians in the United States, they were unable to gain any major influence in policymaking circles in Washington after the Kennedy assassination in November 1963. This resulted in an increased amount of anti-Americanism that became apparent with the outbreak of revolution in Iran in 1978-79.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Confederation of Iranian Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISNU</td>
<td>Confederation of Iranian Students National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLN</td>
<td>National Liberation Front of Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Free Speech Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Immigration and Naturalization Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAUS</td>
<td>Iranian Students Association in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>International Student Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFSA</td>
<td>National Association of Foreign Student Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Near Eastern affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIMS</td>
<td>Organization of Iranian Muslim Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIPM</td>
<td>Organization of the Iranian People’s Mojahedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIPFG</td>
<td>Organization of the Iranian People’s Fada’i Guerrillas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTUS</td>
<td>Organization of Tehran University Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVAK</td>
<td>Sazman-i Ittili’at va Amniyat-i Kishvar (Iranian Secret Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Students for a Democratic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNSA</td>
<td>United States National Student Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American foreign policy with Iran during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations can be best understood by looking at the Iranian student movement abroad. Iranian student groups became politicized and well-organized in 1960. Over the next two decades they vehemently protested Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi’s rule in Iran and American support for his regime. As the Iranian student movement evolved into a powerful force, the relationship between the shah and Washington became more intimate. The interaction between the Iranian student movement, the U.S. government, and the Government of Iran created much tension. By demonstrating how American policymakers viewed the Iranian student movement, and how Iranian students viewed U.S. policy, it becomes clear that the Washington–Tehran alliance and the Iranian student movement held contrasting visions for the future of the Middle East. As a result, they viewed one another as threats to their respective objectives. These contrasting visions were embodied in the policies enacted by Iran and the United States, along with the many protests staged by Iranian students in the United States and Western Europe throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

The objectives of these protests frequently ran counter to the aims of American foreign policy. Iranian students had very strong opinions about Washington’s relationship with the shah as American imperialism in the Middle East became deeply entrenched between 1960 and 1972. The Kennedy administration considered alternatives to the shah’s rule and listened to the concerns of Iranian students in the United States. However, Lyndon Johnson was a staunch ally of the shah, and he set in motion a policy that took on greater importance under the Nixon Doctrine. By 1972, a series of decisions tied the success of American foreign policy in the
Persian Gulf to the Shah of Iran. These decisions were made in Washington despite of the vocal protests of Iranian students.

Skeptics may wonder why policymakers should consider the opinions of students while formulating policy, but it is important to note that Iranian students represented a large segment of Iranian society. A study done by the CIA in 1970 noted that Iranian student organizations “appear to be a conglomeration of communist sympathizers, National Front-oriented leftists, middle-of-the roaders, and religiously oriented rightists. They have no ideological cohesiveness; only opposition to the Shah united them.”¹ Regardless of their political or religious orientations, the ideological beliefs of most all Iranian students became increasingly radical as the 1960s progressed. This group of students can be seen as a microcosm of Iranian society that rose up against the shah by 1978. While it was the shah’s rule that created revolutionary fomentation, a quarter-century of U.S. foreign policy reinforced these feelings, and resulted in strong anti-American sentiment in the Islamic Republic of Iran beginning in 1979.

This study traces the development of the Iranian student movement from 1960 to 1972 and places it within the context of American foreign policy with Iran. The passivity of Iranian student associations abroad ended in 1960. Iranian students abroad enjoyed rights that were absent in Iran, especially the freedoms of speech, assembly, and press. Over the next twelve years, Iranian students challenged the legitimacy of the shah’s regime and American foreign policy. At the same time, Iranian students became an integral part of the student movements in the United States and Western Europe. However, In May 1972, President Nixon issued the shah

---

a blank check to purchase any non-nuclear military equipment from the American arsenal in order to act as America’s surrogate in the Persian Gulf.

The U.S. government monitored and consistently reported on the behavior of Iranian students as their protests became a global phenomenon throughout the 1960s. Instead of viewing Iranian student unrest as a sign of a flawed policy, Washington escalated its level of cooperation with Tehran. A study of the Iranian student movement clearly shows how American support for the shah alienated a large majority of the Iranian population and helped to make the country ripe for revolution. Many authors, such as Stephen Kinzer, have pointed to the overthrow of Mohammad Mosaddeq in 1953 as the major factor in creating revolutionary fervor in Iran.2 While the coup did produce a revolutionary sentiment that was both anti-shah and anti-American, it did not make revolution in Iran inevitable. James Bill contended that “although the American image was tarnished severely by its actions against Musaddiq, the United States had numerous opportunities to rethink and revise its policy towards the shah’s Iran in the quarter century before the revolution. Instead, however, America slowly tightened its relationship with the Pahlavi regime.”3 This paper corroborates Bill’s argument by showing that as Iranian student protests in the United States, Europe, and even in Iran grew very strong by the early 1970s, the United States pushed ahead with more support every year in favor of the shah’s single-handed rule in Iran. In many instances Iranian student demonstrations in the United States were within shouting distance of the shah’s entourage and American officials, yet they had no impact.

Scholars of international relations have recently begun to connect social unrest and foreign policy; prominent among them are Jeremi Suri and Paul Chamberlain. These scholars emphasize that the social unrest of the 1960s contributed to the rise of conservative international alliances during the 1970s. While Suri argues that détente was a conservative attempt by the major powers to maintain control in the wake of the social disturbances of the 1960s, Chamberlain posits that Washington and Cairo improved relations in the early 1970s due to a mutual fear of domestic unrest in their respective countries. However, this study does not see the relationship that was forged between Nixon and the shah as a conservative response to the Iranian student movement.

Since Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi’s rise to power in 1941, he had been illiberal. Therefore, his conservative actions of the early 1970s marked no real change in attitude from previous decades. While the rise of social conservatism in the United States may have been driven by the social unrest that occurred throughout the 1960s, it is hard to believe that American foreign policy with Iran from 1960 to 1972 was altered because of the protests of Iranian and American students. In a news conference on 26 September 1969, President Nixon responded to a question about student protests by saying, “Now, I understand that there has been and continues to be opposition to the war in Vietnam on the campuses, and also in the Nation. As far as this kind of activity is concerned, we expect it. However, under no circumstances will I be affected whatever by it.” Historians Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin argue that “personal

---

and collective confrontation of illegitimate authority,” in the 1960s were “unlikely to have much effect on American policy.”

Iranian students did have an effect on American foreign policy in the early years of the 1960s. Kennedy did not view the shah’s regime favorably, and many in the administration were receptive to the opinions of Iranian students in the United States. However, Lyndon Johnson drastically reversed the policies and attitudes of the Kennedy era, and the Nixon administration escalated the level of cooperation between Washington and Tehran that began during the Johnson administration. The decisions made by Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger in May 1972 were the culmination of an American policy toward Iran that had been developing for nearly a decade. Instead of a conservative reaction to the Iranian student movement, this policy was Realpolitik put into action. The Nixon administration viewed the world as a “single strategic theater” upon which it desired to forge alliances with world leaders that it believed would provide the best opportunities for American-defined stability. Washington believed that the shah could provide this stability, and ignored the plight of the citizens and students of Iran in favor of a ruler who supported American interests. The disconnect between the Iranian people and the shah led the Pahlavi regime to collapse with remarkable speed, increasing instability in the region that was to last into the twenty-first century.

The Iranian student movement abroad was indicative of the growing unrest among the intelligentsia, but both Washington and Tehran downplayed its significance. Leaders in Washington and Tehran should have been aware of the historical role that the intelligentsia has played in the modern Middle East. There were thriving Ottoman exile communities in Paris and

---


Geneva in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These exiles, along with disgruntled civil servants, malcontent students, and disaffected military officers within the Ottoman Empire, became known as the Young Turks. Similar to the Iranian student movement abroad in the 1960s and 1970s, the Young Turks were intensely patriotic, but internally divided. While studying in Europe, Ottoman students became exposed to Western philosophies and forms of government. Recent interpretations of Ottoman history by scholars such as Benjamin Fortna recognize that Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid initiated extensive educational reforms in an attempt to counter the influx of foreign influences that were being imported from European universities. However, the new intelligentsia allied themselves with Ottoman military officers to overthrow Hamid in 1909.  

There were also many Egyptian and Iranian students studying in Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Egyptian leader Muhammad Ali sent many students to France to revitalize his military. The same was true for Iran. Although Iranian education abroad exploded following World War II, its origins go back to the early years of the Qajar dynasty (1794-1925). In 1811, Fath Ali Shah, who was the second Qajar ruler of Persia, sent two students to England with the expectation that “they shall study something of use to me, to themselves, and their country.” After suffering two military defeats at the hands of imperial Russia in 1813 and 1828, the Qajar shahs began to send students to Europe in order to make their military more efficient.

---


The Iranian intelligentsia that became largely influential during the Pahlavi era began to grow into a new bureaucratic elite during the Qajar era. Many Iranians who were foreign educated became high-ranking generals, financial officials, and provincial governors.\textsuperscript{11} In Iran, like Egypt and the Ottoman Empire, “the path to state employment passed through Paris.”\textsuperscript{12} However, Iranians “learned more from their French-speaking instructors than the calculation of cannonball trajectories and double-entry bookkeeping.”\textsuperscript{13} Many new ideas were cultivated at European universities, and the new intelligentsia believed that the ideas of nationalism and progress “could reach the masses only through education.”\textsuperscript{14}

Many students that were educated abroad began to challenge the status quos. In many instances, European education led to the infiltration of Western ideas into Middle Eastern society. For example, the Constitutional Revolution (1905-1911) in Iran was in many ways encouraged by an influx of European ideas. Also, Mohammad Mosaddeq, who later challenged Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi’s regime in Iran, studied in France and Switzerland in the early twentieth century. Mosaddeq was an avid nationalist, and he “considered Paris the center of the civilized world.”\textsuperscript{15}

Many changes came about in the Middle East in the aftermath of World War I. Between 1921 and 1925, Reza Khan, a commander of the Cossack Brigade, assumed power in Iran and became the first Pahlavi shah. The years 1925 through 1930 marked the beginning of Reza Shah’s educational reform, and numerous laws were passed that encouraged foreign education, including a 1928 law that “provided for sending Iranian students abroad each year.”\textsuperscript{16} The

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Mottahedeh, \textit{The Mantle and the Prophet}, 58-9.
\textsuperscript{12} Cleveland and Bunton, \textit{A History of the Modern Middle East}, 94.
\textsuperscript{13} Mottahedeh, \textit{The Mantle and the Prophet}, 51.
\textsuperscript{14} Mottahedeh, \textit{The Mantle of the Prophet}, 51.
\textsuperscript{15} Kinzer, \textit{All the Shah’s Men}, 54.
\textsuperscript{16} Nikki Keddie, \textit{Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution} (Yale University Press, 2003), 91.
\end{flushright}
Iranian government also allotted 100 government scholarships for students to study in Europe. Many of these students became involved in the Iranian bureaucracy and were reform-minded.\textsuperscript{17}

Both Pahlavi shahs expanded educational opportunities in Iran. The University of Tehran became the nation’s first university in 1935, and by 1977-78 there were 21 state-run universities. However, even as the Iranian university system expanded, it could not keep pace with the number of high school graduates. In the 1961-62 academic year, 36.3 percent of students who passed their final high school examinations, which was similar to the French baccalaureate, were able to attend Iranian universities. By 1975-76, that percentage had dwindled to 14 percent. Between 1965 and 1975 the number of high school graduates exploded, yet there were only two new universities founded.\textsuperscript{18} This led to a lack of opportunities for educated Iranians. M. Sukru Hanioglu’s study of the Young Turks emphasizes “the government’s failure to provide jobs for those returning from Europe after successfully receiving education and training there.”\textsuperscript{19} A similar experience was repeated in Iran in the 1960s and 1970s. A lack of opportunity led many Iranians to stay abroad, thus creating the brain drain phenomenon. Iranians who studied abroad and returned home were often faced with unemployment, which led to the alienation of a sizable portion of the intelligentsia.

Education was also cheapened during the rule of Mohammad Reza Shah. Under the reign of Reza Shah, almost any high school graduate could go to a university or get a job in the bureaucracy. However, employment was not guaranteed to college graduates under Mohammad Reza Shah. This was partly because the establishment of new universities could not keep up with the amount of high school graduates, but foreign education had a lot to do with it as well. Historian Roy Mottahedeh noted that “in Iran, the degree – domestic or foreign – made the

\textsuperscript{17} Cleveland and Bunton, \textit{A History of the Modern Middle East}, 118.
\textsuperscript{18} Mottahedeh, \textit{The Mantle and the Prophet}, 64-8, 316-8.
\textsuperscript{19} Hanioglu, \textit{The Young Turks in Opposition}, 14.
man.”

More and more Iranians had doctorates, and many of them were from “wonderfully obscure American Universities.” As Nikkie Keddie noted, the growing intelligentsia, whether they were educated in Iran or abroad, “had little outlet for their talents.”

The ever-expanding Iranian intelligentsia combined with the increase of Iranian students abroad, a lack of bureaucratic employment home, and the brutal rule of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, to create a vocal dissident movement abroad by the 1960s. The Iranian student movement became an integral component of Western student movements, and their activities became a policy issue for the United States.

The outbreak of the Cold War changed the dynamics of Iran’s foreign education, and by the early 1960s the United States became the primary destination for Iranian students seeking education abroad. Throughout the 1950s, the American government sought to win the hearts and minds of foreign students and workers through a series of propaganda programs, including student exchange. Iran was a focal point of these programs because of its geostrategic and economic value. Students came to the United States in four possible ways. Some exchange programs were sponsored by the U.S. government while others were funded by philanthropic American organizations. While scholarships were issued by the Iranian government as well, the majority of Iranian students came to the United States through their own means and were supported by their families in Iran. Iranian students who came to the United States from the mid-1950s until the outbreak of the Iranian Revolution are referred to as the “first wave” of Iranian student migration.

---

22 Keddie, *Roots and Results of Revolution*, 119.
The Truman administration initiated student exchange programs during the Cold War. The Fulbright Act was signed into law on 1 August 1946, which ushered in the post-war impetus for foreign student exchange programs. The effectiveness of the program was bolstered by the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 which authorized the use of dollar funds for the exchange program.24 However, the effectiveness of the Fulbright program had a slow start in Iran. The total expenditures in Iran before 1952 totaled $222,109.40, ranking 24 out of 27 countries.25 However, the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME) had a cohesive student exchange program operating out of Iran by 1952. The AFME had its origins on 15 May 1951 when 24 persons met at the home of Dorothy Thompson to formally organize the group.26 The organization consisted of private American citizens who believed that “peace can be waged” through “a better understanding of the religious, cultural and social aspirations of people in other parts of the world.”27 As one of their first projects, the AFME’s Department of Student Affairs assisted Middle Eastern students in organizing student associations based on nationality.28 These

rchValue_0=ED019026&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED019026 (accessed on 16 April 2008).
developments took place during the instability of the Mosaddeq era. It was against this backdrop, in December 1952, that the AFME’s Department of Student affairs sponsored a conference in Chicago at which Iranian students decided to hold a convention in Denver, Colorado from 1 September – 4 September 1953. Barely two weeks after the overthrow of Mosaddeq, 85 students formed the ISAUS at the convention in Denver. The group discussed non-political issues such as education, agriculture, industry, society, and Irano-American understanding.

The final years of the Eisenhower administration brought a change in both American foreign policy towards Iran and the official political position of the ISAUS. Following Operation Ajax, the Eisenhower administration reluctantly began to offer large amounts of assistance to Iran. The United States assisted the shah in creating the intelligence service known by the acronym SAVAK. Between 1953 and 1961, the United States gave Iran approximately $500 million in military assistance. This allowed the shah to expand his armed forces from 120,000 to 200,000 men, and by 1956, the largest U.S. military aid mission in the world was in Iran.

In the summer of 1958, American Marines landed in Lebanon to protect the regime of its pro-Western leader Camille Chamoun while British forces intervened to prop up the rule of young King Hussein of Jordan. In the same year General ‘Abd al-Karim Qasim led a military coup that overthrew the Hashemite rulers in Iraq, and Syria merged with Egypt to form the United Arab Republic. Amidst these problems in the Middle East, the years 1957 and 1958 also

---

witnessed the Soviet launch of Sputnik, a crisis in Berlin, and the Second Taiwan Straits Crisis. This atmosphere of crisis led the United States and Iran to sign a bilateral defense agreement in March 1959 that declared that the United States would come to the aid of Iran if it were attacked. The ISAUS referred to the time between 1953 and 1965 as “Twelve dreadful years that have erased all traces of democracy, national pride, energy and optimism built up in Mosaddeq’s two and a half years of government.”

Amidst these developments, Iranian students slowly began to voice their political beliefs. As early as the first annual convention of the ISAUS, the AFME reported that “the students successfully, although with some difficulty, restrained their own political biases.” At the second annual convention of the ISAUS in 1954, some of the attendees expressed their concern with the political developments in Iran. They stated that the cultural, economic, and political development of their country could only be achieved “in an atmosphere of stability and freedom.” Murmurs of dissent began to emerge from within the group. However, “a lull occurred in the political movement,” because of a tightening of political opposition by the shah and his agents.

Mottahedeh noted that by the 1960s, “Iran was sending abroad more students for a country of its size than practically any other in the world.” In 1955-56, there were 2,818 Iranian students studying abroad in a total of 18 host countries. By 1960-61, this number increased to

---

34 Iranian Students Association in the United States, Iran in Turmoil (Chicago: Iranian Students Association in the United States, 1965), 5. Hereafter referred to as ISAUS.
38 Mottahedeh, The Mantle and the Prophet, 65.
7,610 students. James Bill acknowledged that “…an extremely significant part of the modern education system is located outside of Iran.” The increased number of Iranian students abroad was not only a major development within the context of the Iranian educational system, but also in Iranian political life and its foreign policy. As the shah noticed, the large numbers of Iranians studying in the United States was “truly a remarkable phenomenon, although,…it had its negative as well as positive aspects.”

In the shah’s eyes, one negative aspect was the politicization of the ISAUS that occurred at the group’s eighth annual convention in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1960. This was two years before the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) formalized its beliefs in Port Huron, Michigan. While the ISAUS became organized politically before American student groups, there was a transfusion of ideas between Iranian students and American protest movements throughout the decade. Iranian students utilized the sit-in method contemporaneously with members of the African American Civil Rights Movement. Their protests grew throughout the middle of the decade, and Iranian students felt a level of solidarity with the Civil Rights Movement, the anti-war movement, and the Free Speech Movement (FSM). By the end of the decade they protested alongside members of SDS and the Black Panthers, along with various European organizations. Members of Iranian student groups, like those in the United States and Western Europe, developed more radical beliefs and alternative interpretations to Marxism-Leninism as the decade progressed.

---

In many ways, the Iranian student movement was the vanguard of the student movement that occurred across the globe in the 1960s. William Sullivan, ambassador to Iran during the Carter administration, was aware that a large number of Iranian students in the United States were anti-shah. While their protests grew loud by the late 1970s, Sullivan appeared unaware that it was not a recent development. Sullivan stated that “…they had adapted the techniques of Vietnam-protest movements to their own cause and had mounted numerous political demonstrations in several states.”

In reality, the politicization of Iranian students preceded the American student movement. As early as 1961, Iranian students took to the streets, carried signs, confronted police, and opposed American imperialism. Noam Chomsky, who was involved with dissident Iranian students, wrote that to criticize U.S. foreign policy during those years was “a very courageous break with conformity.” The risk loomed twice as large for Iranian students. Not only did they risk deportation by the U.S. government, but they could be tortured or killed if they returned to Iran. In 1960 the Cold War consensus still loomed large, and “it was not until the early 1960s that this near uniformity of subordination to domestic power combined with arrogance and self-righteousness began to erode significantly.”

Iranian students were first wave in this erosion process.

While Iranian students were one of the first groups to challenge the Cold War consensus in the United States, they were also influenced by what they experienced on campuses in the United States and Western Europe. Historian Odd Arne Westad argues that foreign students studying in the United States amidst the vocal American student protests of the 1960s realized that not only did they deserve to play a political role in their own countries, but also that they had

---

45 Chomsky, “The Cold War and the University,” 176.
the potential to provide an alternative focus of power to that of the government. Iranian students studying in the United States and Western Europe during the turbulent 1960s developed their critiques of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi’s regime, while at the same time formulating their own alternate discourses on Iranian politics that became radicalized as the decade progressed.

Amidst these developments, a wealth of scholarship was produced by a wide array of historians. The United States did not emerge as a world power until the end of World War II, and the historiography of American foreign relations has been a relatively recent development. Literature pertaining to American foreign policy in the Middle East, including Iran, is an even more recent development. Before the Allied occupation of Iran during World War II, the American presence in the country was limited to missionaries and economic advisors. Therefore, historians the 1950s reached a consensus on the benevolent interests of the United States in Persia. American benevolence was contrasted with British and Russian policy with Qajar-ruled Iran in the nineteenth century when both imperial nations competed in the “Great Game” for dominance in Central and Southwest Asia.

From the 1940s to the 1970s, Iran played a major role in American foreign policy, and historians began to analyze U.S. – Iranian relations within the context of the Cold War. Some historians still made the case for American benevolence in Iran. However, revisionist critiques emerged by the late 1960s emphasizing the role that economic self-interest played in American foreign policy. At the same time, because of its war in Vietnam, many historians began to view the United States as an imperial power whose presence was felt throughout the developing world, including Iran.

Following the end of the Second World War, the United States and the Soviet Union were the two strongest nations in the world, and Iran was a sought-after ally of both superpowers. Geo-politically, Iran shared a 1,200 mile border with the Soviet Union. Economically, Persian Gulf oil was necessary to rebuild Western Europe and to use if the Cold War turned hot. Developments in Iran during the 1940s and early 1950s led historians of U.S. foreign policy to look at the history, economy, politics, and culture of nations such as Iran that became so important to U.S. interests during the Cold War.

Some of the earliest works of scholarship on Iran that were produced in the Cold War era include *The United States and Turkey and Iran*, by Thomas Lewis and Richard Frye, and *United States – Persian Diplomatic Relations, 1883-1921* by Abraham Yeselson. Both authors contrasted American interests to the competition between Britain and Russia in southwest Asia, thus corroborating John DeNovo’s later assertion that American presence in the Middle East before the end of the Second World War was mainly cultural and religious.47 By the Mosaddeq era, historical works such as Nasrollah Fatemi’s *Oil Diplomacy; Powder Keg in Iran* and L.P. Elwell-Sutton’s *Persian Oil: A Study in Power Politics*, began to emphasize oil.48 However, both Fatemi and Ellwell-Sutton draw conclusions similar to Frye and Yeselson.

Historians in the 1950s and early 1960s reached a consensus, arguing that American interests in the Middle East were benevolent and less imperial than those of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. These scholars were writing in a period of transition, and did not realize the new
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role that the United States was assuming in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{49} American exceptionalism was present in most fields of history during the first two decades following World War II. Michael Kahl Sheehan and Mehdi Heravi perpetuated exceptionalist beliefs in their works that were published in the late 1960s.\textsuperscript{50}

However, scholars of Iranian history who discussed aspects of U.S. foreign policy began to unravel the Cold War consensus. This could be seen in Richard Cottam’s \textit{Nationalism in Iran}.\textsuperscript{51} Cottam explained how the Eisenhower administration did not understand Iranian nationalism, especially during the Mosaddeq years. Cottam argued that intuitive value judgments replaced realist analysis in formulating policy in Iran. While Cottam stated that the Kennedy administration did not ignore long term trends or favor the \textit{status quo}, he acknowledged that the policies enacted would have negative results. These points are particularly valid regarding the treatment of the Iranian student movement by the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. While Kennedy questioned the status quo in Iran by meeting with, and listening to Iranian students residing in the United States, the administration encouraged the shah to initiate the White Revolution; a reform that was received negatively by many Iranians both at home and abroad, and led to further stifling of political and religious dissent.

By the late 1960s, the orthodox argument of U.S. foreign policy during the first two decades of the Cold War was challenged by the revisionists. Bahman Nirumand, who was an active Iranian in the German student movement of the 1960s, articulated his imperialist view of

\textsuperscript{49} One historian argued that the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union for influence in the Middle East was “new wine in old bottles.” James Gelvin interpreted this statement by saying: “What he meant by this was that the cold war struggle for influence in the region might be seen as an extension of the Eastern Question of the nineteenth century. Once again, great powers outside the Middle East intervened in the region to gain strategic advantage over their rivals. Only the cast of players and their immediate goals changed.” James Gelvin, \textit{The Modern Middle East: A History, Second Edition}. (Oxford University Press, 2008), 257.


American involvement in Iran in his 1967 work, *Iran: The New Imperialism in Action*.\(^\text{52}\) Fred Halliday shared Nirumand’s view of America’s imperialist intentions in his 1979 work *Iran: Dictatorship and Development*.\(^\text{53}\) Because of the emergence of the revisionist arguments, articulated by scholars such as Halliday and Nirumand, the historiographic debate was alive and well in the 1970s.\(^\text{54}\)

However, there was much less dichotomy in the scholarship on U.S. – Iranian relations that typical traditional and revisionist arguments reveal. Stephen McFarland made a very useful contribution to the literature when he reinterpreted the 1946 crisis and placed agency into the hands of the Iranians.\(^\text{55}\) McFarland’s post-revisionist argument added new dynamics to the historiography of U.S. – Iranian relations. However, he was not as apologetic to American policymakers as John Lewis Gaddis, who initiated post-revisionism in 1972, or Bruce Kuniholm, who authored a post-revisionist argument on the origins of the Cold War in the Near East in 1980.\(^\text{56}\) McFarland convincingly demonstrated how the Iranians played the great powers off of each other through the century-old strategy of movazaneh, or equilibrium.

The history of Iran, and the modern Middle East, along with diplomatic relations between the United States and the Middle East, was changed forever in 1979 when the shah was deposed.


and Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini returned to his native land, assumed power, and gave the Iranian Revolution a more anti-Western stance. Consequently, the historiography of U.S.–Iranian relations was also severely altered. When Iranian students stormed the U.S. embassy and took American diplomats and citizens hostage on 4 November 1979, the revisionist critique seemed to be verified. The animosity of Khomeini’s regime towards the United States led historians to question how relations between the two countries had grown to be so hostile. After 1979, historians of U.S.–Iranian relations had a new set of questions to answer. These included whether revolution was inevitable, and if it was not, to what extent the relationship between the shah and the United States played a part. Conflict emerged in the scholarship of the 1980s.

There are many interpretations regarding the role that the United States played in projecting Iran towards revolution, and most fall between two polar extremes. Said Amir Arjomand’s 1988 publication, *The Turban for the Crown: The Islamic Revolution in Iran*, emphasized that the internal developments in Iran produced an atmosphere ripe for revolution.57 Many scholars of Iranian history have asserted Arjomand’s thesis that the role of the United States was minimal in pushing Iran towards revolution.58 Nikki Keddie emphasized by contrast that the internal developments in Iranian society and culture interacted with western influence to push the country towards revolution. Her 1981 *Roots of Revolution: An Interpretative History of Modern Iran* remains the seminal work on modern Iran.59

American scholars have produced very polarizing interpretations in the post-revolution historiography. Barry Rubin’s *Paved with Good Intentions* argues that Washington believed that
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19
the shah’s modernization attempts were in the best interest of the Iranian citizenry. Rubin’s study, while sympathetic to American policymakers, explained a failed policy. James Bill authored the most comprehensive account from both American and Iranian perspectives in his 1989 study, *The Eagle and the Lion: The Tragedy of American-Iranian Relations*. Bill’s thesis, that the ultimate failure of U.S. policy in Iran was the result of a series of ill-fated decisions that personified a flawed foreign policy, certainly spoke truth on the matter. Bill emphasized the ignorance of policymakers in Washington to the realities of Iranian culture and politics. What distinguished Bill’s study from Rubin’s was that Bill recognized that American policymakers often acted in their own self interest, not in the perceived interest of the Iranians.

Perception played a major role in the scholarship of the 1990s as a cultural turn emerged in the historiography of U.S. – Iranian relations. Mary Ann Heiss made a vital contribution to the historiography of the oil nationalization crisis. Heiss’ study depicts Iranian conceptions of culture and gender shows how American policymakers were ignorant about Persian culture and attributed feminine characteristics to Mosaddeq. He was portrayed as a sensitive man, which was considered a strength in Persian culture and a weakness in the eyes of hawkish policymakers in Washington. These cultural misperceptions led American policymakers to falsely believe that
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60 Rubin, *Paved with Good Intentions*. Other publications by Rubin include but are not limited to *Anti-American Terrorism and the Middle East: A Documentary Reader* (Oxford University Press, 2002); *Hating America: A History* (Oxford University Press, 2004).

61 Bill, *The Eagle and the Lion*. Other publications by James Bill include but are not limited to *The Politics of Iran: Groups, Classes, and Modernization: Roman Catholics and Shi'i Muslims: Prayer, Passion, and Politics* (University of North Carolina Press, 2002); *The Shah, the Ayatollah, and the United States* (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1988).


Mosaddeq was soft on communism, resulting in the CIA-led coup that ousted Mosaddeq from office.

After the post-World War II historiographic consensus of the 1950s and early 1960s concerning the benevolent nature of American foreign policy in Iran unraveled, revisionist accounts published amidst the disastrous failure in Vietnam led to a more imperialist and economically-driven view of the United States. While a post-revisionist synthesis of the origins of the Cold War emerged by the 1980s, the scholarship of the decade was consumed by varied explanations of the role that the United States played in pushing Iran towards revolution. Bill authored the most comprehensive account of the revolution from the vantage points of Washington and Tehran. By the 1990s, more narrowly focused studies on the interaction between the shah and Washington during the Cold War brought new light to events such as Operation Ajax, which was the CIA coup that removed Mosaddeq from power. By the early twenty-first century, a consensus that American policy in Iran was short-sighted emerged, although a plethora of reasons for this existed. The best scholarship of the new millennium places U.S.–Iranian relations into the broader context of the international Cold War and was indicative of the direction that the field was heading.

This study attempts to add greater depth to the understanding of U.S.–Iranian relations throughout the Cold War, and denies the argument made by Barry Rubin that American foreign
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65 Some of the more recent literature on Iran includes Ali M. Ansari, Modern Iran Since 1921; David Farber, Taken Hostage: The Iran Hostage Crisis and America’s First Encounter with Radical Islam (Princeton University Press, 2005); Kenneth Pollack, The Persian Puzzle.
policy in Iran was “Paved With Good Intentions.”66 Like James Bill, this author argues that there were “many instances of the politics of greed, misunderstanding, oppression, and suffering. Mistakes and misperceptions abounded on all sides, and policy conflict was present at all levels both in the United States and Iran.”67 An analysis of the Iranian student movement and American foreign policy often has the tone of Cold War revisionism, it does not emphasize economic determinants or domestic factors of American foreign policy. It instead sees the pursuit of a flawed policy with Iran as a reaction to the changing geo-political map of the 1960s. By doing employing this argument, one can best understand the change over time in U.S. – Iranian relations. While the desire for easy access to Iranian oil was constant throughout the Cold War, there were many other developments that drastically forced American policymakers to reassess their foreign policy with Iran throughout the 1960s. These developments include Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union, the Six Day War, the Vietnam War, and British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf. All of these developments took place amidst the student unrest of the 1960s.

While Washington tightened its relationship with the shah amidst these geopolitical developments, many social change movements developed that had profound social and political impacts throughout the world. No corner of the globe was left unaffected by the social unrest of the 1960s. There was upheaval in China, an uprising in Czechoslovakia, a cultural thaw in the Soviet Union, and protest in Mexico. In the United States, the Vietnam War and the push for Civil Rights led to the emergence of many social change movements. Student protests emerged in France and Germany and culminated in May 1968. The Iranian student movement is perhaps one of the most important, and unfortunately one of the most overlooked movements of the

66 Rubin, Paved With Good Intentions.
67 Bill, The Eagle and the Lion, 9.
decade. Inequality, imperialism, contrasting political ideologies, and the overbearing power of the state led members of all of these movements to push for a drastic change.

Because of the magnitude of unrest in the 1960s, historians have given much attention to the subject, particularly the American and European student movements of the decade. Michael Seidman has produced one of the most extensively researched books on Parisian students and workers and he emphasizes the political failures of the movement.  

Sabine Von Dirke examined the West German counterculture from the 1950s through the 1980s, and gives special attention to the student movement of the 1960s and its use of ideas from the Frankfurt School.  

Clayborne Carson gave a scholarly treatment to SNCC by tracing the evolution of the group’s ideologies and methods from the pacifist phase at the beginning of the decade to the more radical era of the late 1960s.  

W.J. Rorabaugh authored a study on Berkeley, which was the center of much student radicalism, including the Iranian student movement.  

One of the more recent works on SDS was authored by David Barber and he demonstrates how the limits of radicalization when dealing with gender and race splintered the group.  

Vladislav Zubok has authored a recent work that analyzes the “Thaw Generation” in the Soviet Union. Zubok argues that this generation was influenced by Nikita Khrushchev’s denunciation of Stalinism in 1956, leading them to resemble the Russian intelligentsia of the nineteenth century that was eliminated by Stalin’s purges.
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69 Sabine Von Dirke, “All Power to the Imagination!” Art and Politics in the West German Counterculture from the Student Movement to the Greens (University of Nebraska Press, 1997).
The student protest movements of Western Europe and the United States gained very few political achievements, despite the large role that they play in the historiography of the period. Seidman aptly termed the May 1968 protests in France the “Imaginary Revolution.” Arthur Marwick produced a remarkably comprehensive account of the 1960s in the United States and Western Europe and argued that the real legacies of the 1960s were cultural issues such as feminism, multiculturalism, and environmentalism.74 Both Seidman’s and Marwick’s works are empirical studies that rely on extensive archival research. Marwick was highly critical of the Marxist school of thought because of its emphasis on grand narrative over empiricism. This study is similar to Marwick because it relies extensively on empirical research and is absent of a metanarrative. However, it is different in that it emphasizes that the activities of the Iranian student movement resulted in political upheaval in Iran. The movement that began in 1960 greatly contributed to the downfall of the shah. Nikki Keddie noted that by 1977-78 students in Iran had become very important participants in the revolutionary movement.75

Still, there has been relatively little scholarly attention given to student movements that originated in the developing world. The Iranian student movement needs to be examined more closely by scholars from many disciplines. In 2002, Afshin Matin-asgari produced the first and only book to look at the Iranian student movement, and he examined it through the lens of the CISNU.76 Matin-asgari focuses primarily on the evolution of the group’s political beliefs and gives no real attention to the interaction between Iranian students and American foreign policy. Other works address the Iranian student movement in passing. While very brief, they often emphasize the same point: the movement’s importance. Mitra K. Shavarini posits that “One of the strongest opposition groups, with leftist influences, was known as the Confederation of

74 Marwick, *The Sixties*. It is important to note that Marwick does not address the Third World.
75 Keddie, *Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution*, 218.
Iranian Students.” Fereydoun Hoveyda asserts that “The Confederation organized demonstrations everywhere in Europe and America against the Shah and his ministers who traveled outside the country.” These points will be expounded upon in order to shed light upon one of the only student movements of the 1960s that ultimately played a major role in creating a revolution by the end of the 1970s.

The importance of the Iranian student movement was a consequential component of the unrest of the 1960s, and foreign education greatly influenced the political development of youth in the modern Middle East. These points are made within the context of American foreign policy, thus adding breadth and depth to the understanding of American Cold War policy in Iran, the 1960s, and Iranian history. By combining the approaches of scholars of U.S.–Iranian relations, and those of the student movements of the 1960s, this study is a unique contribution to the historiography of all three fields. American foreign policy played a major role in the developments in Iran, but one cannot deny the emphasis on internal social and cultural developments that occurred in Iran over the course of Pahlavi rule. The impact of both of these factors can be seen in the radicalization of the Iranian student movement.

This study also attempts to answer some of the calls that Jeremi Suri has made to look at “The Significance of the Wider World in American History.” First, this paper uses an international approach to the study of American foreign relations by using multiregional research. This study relies heavily upon U.S. government documents since it is a study on American foreign relations, not a cultural history of Iranian students. However, it does make use of Iranian student publications in order to give a balanced account of events. Foreign relations
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77 Shavarini, Educating Immigrants, 164.
within an international context has been a major development in the field since the end of the Cold War, and this importance can be seen in a plethora of works that have been published in the last fifteen years.\(^{80}\)

Suri also noted that Robin D. G. Kelley and Dirk Hoerder have argued about the importance of diasporic communities within the United States.\(^{81}\) Iranian students were spread throughout the entire world, with the majority of them in the United States and Western Europe. These students and their families constantly travelled back and forth from Iran to their host countries. By looking at these diasporas, exchanges, and double identities, one writes a history “on the move.”\(^{82}\) Most importantly, Suri recognized that one cannot write a history from below without history from above. A study that is multidimensional in scope is necessary.\(^{83}\) Until the 1960s, historians primarily focused on the ruling elites, however, a revolution in methodologies and perspectives produced a new emphasis on social history. While history from above neglects the lower classes which constitute the majority of people, history from below tends to isolate history in such a fashion that the bigger picture is often missed. This work is an example of history from above, history from below, and history on the move. Thus it is multidimensional in scope. By employing this methodology, a new dimension will be added to the historiography of American foreign policy, the 1960s, and education in the modern Middle East.

Signs of the shah’s unpopularity were present in the United States and were embodied in the Iranian student movement. However, policymakers in Washington did not take their protests into consideration while formulating policy. The shah was greeted with protest during every


\(^{82}\) Suri, “The Significance of the Wider World in American History,” 4-5.

visit he made from the early 1960s through the late 1970s. While these types of demonstrations became commonplace in the United States and Western Europe as the 1960s wore on, the shah was not accustomed to this type of behavior. As Ken Pollack noted, “Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi was not a man of strong character…He was clearly insecure on his throne; he saw plots everywhere and feared (or resented) anyone with independent standing as a rival.”

Therefore, the behavior of Iranian students in the United States became major issue by the mid-1960s between the shah and Washington. Because American policymakers were more concerned about improving relations with Iran, they did not take Iranian student protest seriously. This was a fatal flaw in American Cold War foreign policy with Iran.
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CHAPTER II – THE POLITICIZATION OF IRANIAN STUDENTS ABROAD, 1960-1963

There was a paradoxical relationship between Iranian students in the United States and the Kennedy administration. Iranian students had an ally in Attorney General Robert Kennedy. He was willing to listen to their concerns, and he had a strong influence on the president. Robert Kennedy’s interaction with Iranian students in the United States created tension between the State Department and the Justice Department, and between the shah and Washington. The Kennedy administration was the first, and the last presidential administration that took the views of Iranian students seriously. It was also the only post-war administration, with the exception of the Eisenhower administration during the Qarani Affair in 1958, which seriously questioned whether or not the shah was fit to rule Iran.85 The Kennedy administration considered that “One course would be to ride with anti-Shah forces and perhaps encourage them.”86 While the administration was “actively looking” for an alternative, they concluded in October 1962 that there was not one available, therefore, they had to encourage the shah to reform.87 The policies Washington encouraged in Iran, mainly under the banner of the White Revolution, were received unfavorably by a majority of the students. Therefore, while Iranian students had the support of both the president and the attorney general, they were not in favor of the administration’s essential policy regarding Iran.

However, the Kennedy administration had more cordial relations with Iranian students than with the shah of Iran. Mansur Rafizadeh, the former chief of SAVAK, remembered that “the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963, made the shah jubilant.”88 An
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Iranian general recalled that when the shah “received the news of Kennedy’s death, he asked for a drink to celebrate.” These feelings were the result of Kennedy’s emphasis on reform, the anti-shah sentiment that was prevalent among many high-ranking American politicians, and the consistently vocal protests of Iranian students in the United States throughout the early 1960s. The student problem exacerbated the already tense relations between Washington and Tehran, and this became a major issue in 1960, only a few months before Kennedy was elected president.

Throughout the 1950s, the ISAUS enjoyed strong support from the AFME. However, in 1959 the AFME noticed that the ISAUS was having organizational difficulties due to the large number of students in the United States, and because of the contrasting views of its members. By 1960 there was curiously no mention of the ISUAS in the annual report of the AFME. This anti-shah sentiment was gaining strength, and an abrupt change was about to take place in the relationship between Iranian students and their patrons in the AFME.

This change occurred at the eighth annual convention of the ISAUS, which was held from 29 August to 2 September 1960 in Ypsilanti, Michigan. 170 students from 25 states attended the convention, and it marked a turning point in the political behavior of the organization. Ardeshir Zahedi, who was ambassador to the United States and supervisor of Iranian students abroad, witnessed the transformation. Zahedi gave a speech at the convention that was received negatively after he referred to the events of 1953 as a national uprising. Following the speech, Zahedi used obscenities with the microphone still on to tell one of his
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90 Besides Robert Kennedy and William Douglas, Democratic senators such as Hubert Humphrey, Frank Church, and William Fulbright were adamantly anti-shah. See James Bill, *The Eagle and the Lion*, 136.
aides not to assist the ISAUS in any way. Zahedi’s attitude did not prevent the politicization of
the ISAUS; if anything it encouraged it.

When new leaders were elected at the convention, opposition activists gained the upper
hand. Sadeq Qotbzadeh was elected treasurer and Ali Mohammad Fatemi was elected
president. Fatemi and Qotbzadeh became leaders of the Iranian student movement abroad in
the early 1960s. Fatemi’s resentment towards the shah stemmed from his relation to Hosein
Fatemi, who served as foreign minister under Mosaddeq. Following the ouster of Mosaddeq in
1953, Hosein Fatemi was executed for treason. Qotbzadeh was an Islamist who was
radicalized by the shah’s marginalization of the clergy amidst his secular reforms. These men
are two examples of how the shah’s policies alienated both the secular left and the religious
community. The effects of these policies were felt on the streets of America throughout the
1960s.

In Ypsilanti, the new anti-shah leaders of the ISAUS proclaimed that “in recent years the
government’s general policy, both domestic and foreign, had brought irreparable damages to the
Iranian nation,” and demanded that “individual freedoms for patriots and freedom of national
associations be recognized in practice.” Concerning the domestic affairs of Iran, the ISAUS
Congress echoed those of the National Front. The National Front, which was formed in 1949
and was epitomized by Mosaddeq, was a coalition of influential liberal nationalists that
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95 Memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Talbot) to Secretary of State Rusk, “Agitational Activities of Anti-Shah Iranian Students in the United States,” 5 October 1963, *FRUS 1961-1963, Vol. XVIII*, 724. This document can be found in the National Archives in the General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3260, Folder EDX IRAN.
represented a wide variety of political groups. Like the National Front, the ISAUS in 1960 was a loose coalition of Iranians who professed liberal democratic beliefs and were against foreign intervention of any kind in Iran. American diplomats in Tehran believed that it was “surprising and also refreshing to find that idealism and especially a belief in civil liberties and democratic government are sincerely held by so many young people; but these beliefs are often coupled with such violent attitudes toward the government and sometimes with such radical nationalism that one may have doubts that these young people, if they were propelled into authority,…would act responsibly in foreign affairs.” Responsible behavior, according to Washington, meant not having cordial relations with the Soviet Union, or taking a neutral stance in the Cold War.

On 6 July 1960, the National Security Council concluded a study that stressed the negative implications for U.S. foreign policy if Iran adopted a neutral position in the Cold War or looked to the USSR for assistance. Positive non-alignment was exactly the stance that ISAUS adopted in 1960. The United States feared the influence of non-alignment on the people of the developing world, but in the case of the ISAUS, Washington had to contend with a non-aligned
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98 The most influential members of the National Front came from one of five political parties. These included the Iran Party. It was a progressive nationalist party that was headed by Karim Sanjabi and Allahyar Saleh who were anti-Soviet leftist intellectuals. Another main component of the National front was the Toilers’ Party, which was led by Mozaffar Baqai and Khalel Maleki. This was also a leftist intellectual group, but there were a good deal of the working class involved with this party. The rest of the working class who were loyal to the National Front were part of the Iranian Workers Party. Another group that was led by Ayatollah Abul Qassem Kashani, was the Mojahadin-I-Islam, which consisted of bazaar workers and the clergy. The last group that was involved with the National Front was the Pan-Iranist Party, which was an extremely nationalistic group consisting mainly of outcast members of the lower classes. All of this information can be found in “C.C. Finch Conversation with Dr. Sepahbodi,” DNSA, Iran Revolution, 10 December 1951, Memorandum Tehran, IR00269. Also refer to Mark Gasiorowski, “The 1953 Coup D’etat in Iran,” 262.
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organization within its own borders. The interests of the ISAUS were not aligned with the foreign policy interests of the United States. However, the ISAUS also denounced the Soviet-influenced Tudeh party. Throughout the 1940s, the Tudeh Party was the main influence of Iranian students, but with the rise of Mosaddeq to power, National Front ideology supplanted the influence of the Tudeh.\textsuperscript{103}

The non-aligned ISAUS created tensions between the group, the U.S. government, and the Iranian government. Zahedi made one final attempt to regain influence in the ISAUS when he invited Ali Fatemi and Sadeq Qotbzadeh to a meeting at the Iranian embassy. The meeting did not produce any positive results, and Zahedi referred to Qotbzadeh as a “son of a bitch thug.”\textsuperscript{104} While relations between the ISAUS and Iran struggled after the convention in Ypsilanti, they were forever severed following the meeting at the embassy. The AFME also broke relations with, and stopped funding the ISAUS after this sequence of events.\textsuperscript{105} From this point forward, the ISAUS deepened its ties with other student organizations, especially the Confederation of Iranian Students (CIS) in Europe.

The European CIS was founded in April 1960 and it aimed to “Coordinate all Iranian Students in Europe,” and to defend “their general interests in Iran and abroad.”\textsuperscript{106} Also, Iranian students at the University of Tehran organized themselves into the Organization of Tehran University Students (OTUS).\textsuperscript{107} The development and politicization of these organizations, along with the inauguration of John F. Kennedy in 1961, provided the students an opportunity possibly to influence American foreign policy, and alter the course of the Iranian politics.

\textsuperscript{103} Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 10, 181.
\textsuperscript{104} Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 39.
\textsuperscript{107} Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 11.
Iranian student protests in the early 1960s had two main causes. The first was the controversy that arose concerning the status of Fatemi and Qotbzadeh’s passports after they became openly anti-shah. The second was the White Revolution and the brutal repression of political dissidence inside Iran that followed. The vocal protests that began in 1961 combined with the attitude of the Kennedy administration towards Iran to create problems in U.S. – Iranian relations throughout the early 1960s.

In February 1961, Officer in Charge of Iranian Affairs John W. Bowling reported that “A very recent and burgeoning element in these organizations arises from college and secondary school students.” In April 1961, Iranian Foreign Minister Hosein Qods-Nakhai recognized that the Iranian government was having problems with its students, “particularly those overseas.” Fatemi and Qotbzadeh were two of the most vocal students, and in mid-1961 the Iranian government revoked their passports. This led the State Department to recommend that they be deported. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Phillips Talbot believed that their presence “had a serious impact on our relations with Iran” because the shah believed that the United States was working with these students and protected elements that promoted his overthrow. However, while the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) denied Fatemi and Qotbzadeh’s requests for a renewal of their passports, it did not enforce their departure.

Many Iranian students took to the streets to protest in defense of Fatemi and Qotbzadeh. These protests bore many similarities to the tactics employed by the Civil Rights Movement of
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the early 1960s. By the end of the decade, Iranian students had become deeply involved in the affairs of American and West European student groups. However, the origins of the relationship between Iranian students and their Western counterparts can be found in the early 1960s. These demonstrations occurred amidst the African-American Civil Rights Movement, and before any other American student organizations became politically active. Iranian students and African American students took part in many sit-ins. Iranian students also had concerns similar to members of the Civil Rights Movement; both strove for political, social, and economic equality. Later in the decade, the issue of American imperialism became relevant to both American and Iranian students. However, in the early 1960s Iranian students in the United States and Western Europe were in the vanguard of the student protest movement. The nationalist upsurge and turbulent politics of the Mosaddeq era, along with the brutal rule of the shah, had propelled Iranian students into political activism.

On 5 July 1961, fifteen Iranian students entered the thirtieth floor suite of Iran’s Consul General, Massoud Djahanbani, at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, staged a sit-in, and demanded the extension of Fatemi’s and Qotbzadeh’s passports. Afterwards they picketed outside the building. Fatemi was present and voiced his belief that he was targeted because of his political beliefs.112 During the protest, they spoke to interviewers about an Iranian “blacklist” that contained information concerning thirty to forty students in the United States, Great Britain, France, West Germany, and Switzerland.113 There was a blacklist, and by 1964, Colonel Naser Moqadam, Chief of Department Three of SAVAK, indicated that he possessed two volumes that contained biographic data and pictures of all students studying abroad that was collected for the shah’s

113 “Iranian Students Stage Protest Sit-In at Consulate,” NYT, 6 July 1961, p. 2.
Information from the blacklist was later passed on from Iranian officials to members of the U.S. government. This did not curb the enthusiasm of the Iranian student movement and protests continued throughout the summer. A week later, twenty-one students took part in a sit-in hunger strike in the chancery of the Iranian Embassy on 9 July.115

These protests drew attention, and Fatemi and Qotbzadeh gained support from the European CIS and other American and international student organizations. Twelve CIS members demonstrated at the Iranian embassy in London. The Association of Iranian Students Residing in Lausanne and the Union of Iranian Students in France also assisted their cause.116 The Federation of Iranian Students in West Germany and Berlin also got involved when two-hundred Iranian students staged a six hour sit-in in the Iranian Embassy in Cologne, Germany on 11 September 1961.117 The ISAUS also drew notice to its cause when it joined the International Student Conference (ISC) and the United States National Student Association (USNSA) earlier in the year.118

Also, the ISAUS, OTUS, and the European CIS merged in January 1962 when the CIS National Union (CISNU) was formed in Paris. The term confederation was aptly selected. There were many local Iranian student organizations in the United States and Europe. Some of these included the Iranian Students Associations of Northern California, Washington, D.C., and New York, to name a few. Local and regional groups were highly effective in giving Iranian students in specific areas both a sense of community and political purpose. Smaller branches had

much autonomy, but the CISNU served as an umbrella organization for all groups.\textsuperscript{119} This provided Iranian students across the globe a single organization that enabled them to be highly organized, vocal, and effective in protesting the shah’s regime. In 1962, the group was dominated by members of the National Front.\textsuperscript{120} However, while discussing the content of Iranian student publications, Donald Wilber, a major CIA operative who was involved in Operation Ajax, observed that the organizations were much more critical of the shah and his government than were leaders of the National Front.\textsuperscript{121}

While Iranian students were active abroad, protests also began to emerge at home. In January 1962 protests occurred in Iran that resulted in the arrest of three high school students. The CISNU stated that “This demonstration was very important, for it was the first time since 16\textsuperscript{th} of Azar, nine years earlier, that the students had taken such actions.”\textsuperscript{122} On 21 January 1962, two dozen Iranian students picketed the United Nations to defend those arrested in Iran.\textsuperscript{123}

A protest on 26 January 1962 brought Iranian students “to the heart of the American capital, in the center of its powerful government.”\textsuperscript{124} When the small but vocal group of Iranian students at Georgetown University heard that Robert Kennedy planned to stop in Iran during a month long good will tour that was to begin in February 1962, 60 of the students, including Fatemi and Qotbzadeh, gathered outside the office of the attorney general. Robert Kennedy told the students to come up to his office and plead their case. Fatemi and his colleagues elaborated upon the poor economic situation, government censorship, political repression, and SAVAK.

\textsuperscript{119} For example, the CISNU would serve as a federal government, the ISAUS as a state government, and local branches of the ISAUS would be state or city governments.
\textsuperscript{120} Matin-Asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 49-51.
\textsuperscript{124} Jerome, \textit{The Man in the Mirror}, 58; the meeting is also discussed in Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 57.
“Their message was clear: Don’t go to Iran. Don’t give your stamp of approval to the regime anymore.”¹²⁵ Robert Kennedy compromised with the students and said that he would only go to Iran if he could meet with opposition university students in Iran. This change was not approved by the State Department, and as a result, Iran was removed from the itinerary. In a later discussion Robert Kennedy said that it “caused a major fuss in the State Department.”¹²⁶

Robert Kennedy’s cancellation of his stop in Iran caused a major problem with the shah. Ardeshir Zahedi recounted the event a decade later in 1971 in a grievance to U.S. Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II. He complained that Robert Kennedy not only met with a group of anti-shah Iranian students but encouraged their behavior and gave them all ball-point pens with President Kennedy’s name inscribed on them.¹²⁷ After the meeting, Qotbzadeh had great respect for the attorney general. Even though Qotbzadeh had many deep-rooted objections to many of the policies of the Kennedy administration, he maintained his respect for Robert Kennedy.¹²⁸ Members of the Iran Task Force suggested in September 1961 that the United States might “attempt to influence Iranian students and teachers through influencing international student and teacher groups with U.S. components.”¹²⁹ Robert Kennedy tried to influence them by listening to their concerns.

While Robert Kennedy did not visit Iran in February 1962, the shah visited the United States in April. The shah attended many events, including a state dinner at the United Nations where thirty-five members of the CISNU picketed the building while chanting “Long live

¹²⁶ Edwin O. Guthman and Jeffrey Shulman, eds., Robert Kennedy in his Own Words: The Unpublished Recollections of the Kennedy Years (Bantam Books, 1988), 317.
Wilber noted that the April 1962 visit of the shah to the United States “was marked by picket lines and the distribution of leaflets that featured the most intemperate language.”

SAVAK chief Mansur Rafizadeh remembered that in 1962 there were two groups of Iranians in the United States. The first group was entirely opposed to the shah’s regime. They believed that the only way to bring justice to Iran was through revolution. The second group believed that the monarchy could be preserved, and justice could be achieved through peaceful means. However, in order for this to happen, the second group believed that the shah needed to enforce the Iranian Constitutional, allow elections be held without corruption, and initiate a program of social reform. Both of these groups of Iranians caught the attention of the Kennedy administration. Eventually, the attitudes of the first group encouraged Kennedy to press the shah to fulfill the expectations of the second group. However, the shah failed to deliver constitutionalism, legal elections, and social reform. As a result, it was the revolutionary group that became the majority by the mid-1960s.

The need for revolution was not yet the predominant opinion among Iranians during the shah’s trip to the United States, and the Kennedy administration emphasized its desire for the shah to initiate reforms. Many of the reforms of the early 1960s were initiated by Prime Minister Ali Amini and Minister of Agricultural Hassan Arsanjani. After Amini was ousted in the summer of 1962, along with many of his appointees, the shah repackaged Amini’s reforms as the White Revolution. The reform package was passed through a referendum in January 1963, and was officially called “The Revolution of the Shah and the People.” Initially, the program focused

---

131 Wilber, *Contemporary Iran*, 154.
133 Pollack, *The Persian Puzzle*, 82-5.
on six issues. Land reform was one of the most far-reaching and controversial points according to Iranian students. In addition, women received the right to vote, Iranian forests were nationalized, and a literacy corps to educate the rural population was created. Two of the points focused on Iranian factories. Government-owned factories were to be sold to finance the land reform, and workers were promised a share of industrial profits. Land reform and women’s suffrage resulted in the alienation of wealthy landowners and the clergy. Urbanization increased throughout the 1960s and 1970s; the unsuccessful land reform forced many peasants to the cities which had more opportunities for industrial work after the sale of government-owned factories. Other points of reform were subsequently added, and while industrialization occurred, there was little actual political liberalization.

The extent to which the reform initiatives were influenced by the United States was well known amongst circles of Iranian students. President Kennedy, along with national security advisor and prominent economist Walt Whitman Rostow, played a major role in influencing the shah’s reforms. Iranian student Payman Piedar later referred to the White Revolution as the “Kennedy-Rostow Pact.” The reforms, along with the brutal repression of political opposition led to an escalation in student protests throughout 1963. Referring to the White Revolution, the ISAUS said that it “was as much a ‘cure’ for the ills of the economy, as two asprins [sic] would be to a patient suffering from terminal cancer.” In the long run, the White Revolution was one of the primary factors in fomenting revolutionary sentiment. The shah ultimately fell victim to an uprising of the new urban class that was led by Muslim leaders. Iran was a rather unique situation in which religion played a major role in an urban setting. This is partly due to the

---

strong connection between the ulama and the bazaaris.\textsuperscript{138} Both the mass migration from the countryside to the cities, and the discontent among the clergy, were direct results of the White Revolution.\textsuperscript{139}

Ali Fatemi, one of the two most vocal leaders of the ISAUS, told a reporter that while Iranian nationalists like himself supported the push for women’s rights, they did not agree with the undemocratic government in Iran and the methods used by the shah’s government in suppressing the riots.\textsuperscript{140} A publication of the Southern California Chapter of the ISAUS also demonstrated its support for the enfranchisement of women. However, they thought that it “was a blatant publicity stunt - - a ridiculous gesture in a country where elections are consistently rigged and even the men’s votes don’t count.”\textsuperscript{141} The ISAUS also argued that the land reform was simply a way to increase the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{142}

A difference of opinion regarding Iranian students in the United States between the Justice Department and the State Department emerged. Iranian students often tried to play the two departments against one another as if they were a non-aligned nation playing the United States and the Soviet Union against each other. In February 1963 members of the Justice and State Departments held a meeting with Iranian student Fariborz S. Fatemi. He was the cousin of Ali Fatemi and was an Iranian-born graduate student studying international law at Syracuse University. He was also a Congressional Fellow under the sponsorship of Representative James

\textsuperscript{138} The many ties between the ulama and bazaaris are discussed in Keddie, \textit{Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution}, 30. There were familial ties, financial connections, and social interaction between the two groups.

\textsuperscript{139} The revolutionary effects that the White Revolution had on Iranian society are discussed at great length in many studies. For a very concise discussion refer to Fred Halliday, “The Gulf Between Two Revolutions: 1958-1979,” \textit{MERIP Reports}, No. 85, (Feb., 1980), 6-15. The discussion of the White Revolution is on p. 10.

\textsuperscript{140} “Tanks Disperse Teheran Crowds,” \textit{NYT}, 9 June 1963, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{141} ISAUS, “Don’t Let Familiarity Breed Indifference! Six More Students have been Jailed,” publication of the Southern California Chapter of the ISAUS printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in Turmoil}, 48.

\textsuperscript{142} ISAUS, “Don’t Let Familiarity Breed Indifference! Six More Students have been Jailed,” publication of the Southern California Chapter of the ISAUS printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in Turmoil}, 48.
Roosevelt of California. Fariborz Fatemi requested the meeting, and while he only wanted to meet with representatives from the Justice Department. However, the State Department deemed it necessary to have a representative present because the meeting would have an impact on American relations with Iran, and foreign policy was in the jurisdiction of the State Department. Fatemi was particularly upset with the way the police handled the removal of fourteen students who conducted a sit-in at the Iranian Embassy in Washington on 22 January 1963. He also protested the refusal to renew the passports of six students who were involved in the protest simply because they were politically active.

Historian Richard Cottam notes that by February 1963 the shah had silenced the nationalists inside of Iran, “but the Iranian student organization representing 25,000 students in the United States and Europe, always hostile to the Shah, moved into vigorous opposition.” Members of the CISNU in Europe also took up the cause of the fourteen students arrested in the Iranian Embassy in Washington. On 2 February 1963, two-hundred students who attended Graz Technological College in Austria gathered to protest the White Revolution, along with the arrest of the fourteen Iranian students in Washington. Throughout the 1960s, the very vocal contingent of students in Austria, especially in Graz, was one of the most active groups of Iranian students studying abroad.

---

143 Memorandum of Conversation between James W. Symington, M. Gordon Tiger, and Fariborz S. Fatemi, “Anti-Shah Demonstrations by Iranian Students in U.S.,” 4 February 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1963, Box 3260, Folder EDX IRAN, RG 59, NA.
144 Memo of Conversation, “Anti-Shah Demonstrations by Iranian Students in U.S.,” 4 February 1963, RG 59, NA.
146 Cottam, Nationalism in Iran, 307.
147 From American Embassy in Vienna (Riddleberger) to Department of State, “Iranian Students Protest,” 6 February 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3942, Folder POL 22, RG 59, NA.
As the White Revolution was implemented, violent protest grew in Iran. In early June 1963, riots broke out in Tehran, Shiraz, and Qom. They were eventually broken up when the Iranian military fired into the crowds. Throughout the first week of June, 86 people were killed and up to two hundred were injured.\textsuperscript{148} It was also during the protests of June 1963 that Ayatollah Khomeini was arrested and held under house arrest for more than half a year.

Members of the CISNU proclaimed that “June 5\textsuperscript{th}, 1963, was the beginning of the New Wave of struggle,” and it marked the beginning of a new militancy in the opposition to the shah’s regime.\textsuperscript{149} After these protests, the June 5\textsuperscript{th} Movement emerged. Prior to June 1963, the main emphasis of the Iranian opposition movement was the establishment of legitimate parliamentarianism. As a result of the experience on 5 June, a move towards revolution was made, and the underground organizations that began to surface by the late 1960s were created.\textsuperscript{150}

Prior the June 1963 the ISAUS desired reform in Iran, however, “The bitter defeat of 1963 taught our people that the path of Iran’s revolution must cross the ruins of the Shah’s regime…”\textsuperscript{151} The violent events of 1963 precipitated a radical drift away from National Front ideology.

Protests continued in the United States and Europe throughout early June 1963.\textsuperscript{152} With protest abroad aligning with violent uprisings in Iran, the U.S. State Department officially approached the INS and unofficially approached the Office of the Attorney General to seek solutions.\textsuperscript{153} Assistant Secretary Phillips Talbot was concerned that the student demonstrations would have a negative impact on American foreign policy. He was particularly concerned with an event that occurred in June 1963 when the shah’s twin sister, Princess Ashraf, was greeted by

a group of picketing Iranian students upon her arrival in New York to attend an international women’s conference.154

The fight between Iranian students and the shah’s regime that was violently suppressed in Tehran in June 1963 was now being fought on the streets of America. The phenomenon of Iranian student protest was not isolated in 1963 to the United States or Iran. It was a global phenomenon that only grew stronger as the decade progressed. Students in West Germany protested the White Revolution and were also faced with their own passport controversy. After Iranian students in West Germany began protesting the White Revolution, the West German government threatened to expel one of the leaders of the movement, Hasan Masali, a medical student in Kiel and chairman of the Committee of the Iranian National Front in Germany. In response to the threat, the CISNU and the Organization of Afro-Asian students in the Federal Republic of Germany rose up in his defense.155

On 19 August 1963, the tenth anniversary of the overthrow of Mosaddeq, thirty members of the Iranian Students Association of Greater New York picketed the U.N. headquarters demanding his release from prison.156 Similar protests continued to occur outside the U.N., including a demonstration led by Iranian students on 17 September.157 A sit-in also occurred at the Iranian U.N. delegations office on 23 September.158 The 23 September incident created concern, and Julius Holmes, the American ambassador to Tehran, argued that deportation

155 Telegram from American Consul General in Hamburg (E. Tomlin Bailey) to the Department of State, “Iranian Student Agitation in the Federal Republic – Case of Hessen Massali,” 5 August 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3942, Folder POL 22, RG 59, NA.
proceedings should take place against Fatemi and Qotbzadeh, even though it could not be proven whether or not they were involved in the incident.\textsuperscript{159} Following the volatile summer of 1963, the already sensitive issue of student protest abroad became a major policy issue for the U.S. government. Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Aram stated that Iranian student activity in the United States was a matter of utmost importance that was damaging U.S. – Iranian relations, and he pressed the issue during his trip to the United States in September and October 1963 to numerous American officials.\textsuperscript{160} Aram said that the student problem was “a very serious situation which is receiving the personal attention of the Shah,” and that it “was having an increasingly deleterious effect on United States-Iran relations.”\textsuperscript{161} Referring to Iranian students in the United States, Aram said that “they are hooligans, not students…and their aim is to damage U.S. – Iranian relations.”\textsuperscript{162} Most likely referring to Robert Kennedy, Aram also said that many of the student leaders were in touch with very high American officials.\textsuperscript{163}

The shah was already wary of the Kennedy administration’s emphasis on reform and the feelings expressed by Aram indicated that the behavior of Iranian students added to his suspicion. Student protests added to the fact that the shah was dubious of the intentions of

\textsuperscript{159} Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran (Julius Holmes) to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, 28 September 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3260, Folder EDX IRAN, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{161} Memo of Conversation, “U.S. - Iranian Relations – Iranian Students,” 30 September 1963, RG 59, NA; Memo of Conversation, “United States – Iranian Relations (Part 1 of 2),” 7 October 1963, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{162} Memo of Conversation, “U.S. - Iranian Relations – Iranian Students,” 30 September 1963, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{163} Memo of Conversation, “U.S. - Iranian Relations – Iranian Students,” 30 September 1963, RG 59, NA; Memo of Conversation, “United States – Iranian Relations (Part 1 of 2),” 7 October 1963, RG 59, NA.
progressive-mindedness that characterized who he called the “Harvard boys.”\textsuperscript{164} The Kennedy administration stressed economic, social, and political reforms and believed that “Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”\textsuperscript{165} In October 1961 U.S. Ambassador to Iran Julius Holmes told David Lilienthal, an American entrepreneur in Iran and former director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, that the shah believed that Kennedy’s statements meant that the United States was going to support revolution in Iran.\textsuperscript{166}

Members of the ISAUS were aware of this tension between the shah and the Kennedy administration. They also knew that if they played their cards right, they had an opportunity to influence American foreign policy with Iran. Iranian students in the United States desired to alter both the opinions of foreign governments and public opinion regarding the shah’s regime. However, they despised the Kennedy-influenced White Revolution. After the shah’s brutal reaction to the demonstrations throughout the summer of 1963, the CISNU came to believe that the shah’s “reform from above before getting caught up in revolution [\textit{sic}] from below” was “nonsense.”\textsuperscript{167} The ISAUS believed that their duty was “to communicate to the American working class and all peace loving people in the US to the actual nature of the people’s struggle in the Middle East”\textsuperscript{168} This language, particularly the emphasis on the working class and peace loving people, is indicative of the group’s drift towards communist ideology, and away from beliefs resembling the National Front.

By the fall of 1963 Secretary of State Dean Rusk believed that the activities of Iranian students in the United States had strained relations with Iran badly enough that the U.S.

\textsuperscript{165} Pollack, \textit{The Persian Puzzle}, 81.
\textsuperscript{168} ISAUS, \textit{In Solidarity with the Palestinian Revolution}, (Houston, Texas: Iranian Students Association in the United States, 1976), 20.
government needed to “take whatever measures we can to bring the situation under better control.”¹⁶⁹ Phillips Talbot noted that Iranian students were “embarrassing our relations with Iran at a time when it is in our interest to indicate in every way possible our support for the fundamental reform program which the Shah has undertaken.”¹⁷⁰

Talbot wrote in a memorandum to Secretary of State Dean Rusk that about 25 of the 5,000 Iranian students in the United States were “hard core,” and have “for several years severely embarrassed our relations with Iran by engaging in violent anti-regime activities.”¹⁷¹ To alleviate the shah’s suspicions, Talbot and Rusk once again urged Robert Kennedy to deport Fatemi and Qotbzadeh because “their continued presence has a serious adverse impact on our relations with Iran.”¹⁷² Foreign Minister Aram once again emphasized that the continuation of protests by Iranian students in the United States “could affect Iran-American relations.”¹⁷³

On 24 December, Ali Fatemi and Qotbzadeh met with representatives of the U.S. government to “discuss the problem in U.S. – Iranian relations caused by anti-regime activities of the Iranian Students Association.”¹⁷⁴ Iranian students in the United States continued to attract attention because “the ISA had continued to engage in activities which were troublesome and

¹⁶⁹ Letter from Dean Rusk to Robert F. Kennedy, 11 October 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File 1963, Box 3260, Folder EDX IRAN, RG 59, NA.
¹⁷³ Memorandum of Conversation between Foreign Minister of Iran Abbas Aram and John D. Jernegan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Near Eastern Affairs, 6 October 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File, 1963, Box 3260, Folder EDX IRAN, RG 59, NA.
¹⁷⁴ Memorandum of Conversation, “Warning to Anti-Regime Students in the United States,” 24 December 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1963, Box 3234, Folder V 31, RG 59, NA. (continuation of the document was found in Box 3942 POL 22 IRAN)
embarrassing to the United States Government in the conduct of its relations with a friendly power.”\textsuperscript{175}

Robert Kennedy was under extreme pressure from the State Department to bring the situation under control. However, instead of suggesting deportation, Kennedy issued the students a warning by saying that members of the ISAUS would not be shown preferential treatment if they continued to be vocal about their anti-shah beliefs and participate in “objectionable behavior.”\textsuperscript{176} Raymond Ferrell, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization for the Department of State argued that objectionable behavior was exemplified in the protests during Princess Ashraf’s visit and the 23 September protests at the headquarters of the Iranian U.N. delegation in New York. Farrell told the two students that they were admitted to the United States to study, not to engage in political activity.\textsuperscript{177}

Despite the pleas of the shah and the State Department, Fatemi and Qotbzadeh ultimately won their legal battle with some assistance from the Justice Department. Attorney General Kennedy did not always have an amiable relationship with the State Department. Kennedy favored the liberal admission of foreigners into the United States, and also permitted them to remain in the country when it may have been dangerous for them to return home. When Rusk approached Robert Kennedy about the deportation of Fatemi and Qotbzadeh, along with some of their fellow Iranian students in the Washington area, he knew that the attorney general would not be swayed by the fact that these students were anti-shah. Therefore, Rusk argued that the 30 students were communists. Kennedy then sought advice from his good friend, Supreme Court

\textsuperscript{175} Memo of Conversation, “Warning to Anti-Regime Students in the United States,” 24 December 1963, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{176} Memo of Conversation, “Warning to Anti-Regime Students in the United States,” 24 December 1963, RG 59, NA; Raymond Farrell defined ‘objectionable behavior’ as “harassment and insulting of visiting Iranian royalty and Government dignitaries; forced entry into Iranian diplomatic premises in this country; and distribution in the U.S. of communist publications and extracts therefrom.”
\textsuperscript{177} Memo of Conversation, “Warning to Anti-Regime Students in the United States,” 24 December 1963, RG 59, NA.
Justice William O. Douglas. Douglas was a First Amendment absolutist and a prolific foreign traveler who was knowledgeable of Iran and the shah’s brutal dictatorship.\(^\text{178}\) Douglas knew much about Iran because of his extensive travels around the world. He wrote in his memoir that “The game of the Shah was obvious – to try to still the mounting opposition against him at home and control Iranians abroad by executing dissenters.”\(^\text{179}\) Douglas urged Kennedy not to authorize the deportation unless the FBI could prove that the students were communists. A few weeks later after the FBI investigation concluded, Douglas received a “jubilant call” from Robert Kennedy to let him know none of the thirty students were communists and that “he told Rusk to go jump in the lake.”\(^\text{180}\)

According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, there were approximately 40,000 Iranians attending institutions of higher education in 1963. There were 14,000 students at Tehran University and another 6,000 attending other Iranian universities. There were approximately 15,000 to 20,000 Iranians studying abroad, with more than 5,000 Iranian students studying in the United States. By 1963, the United States surpassed West Germany as the host of the most Iranian students abroad, however, West Germany remained a close second with 4,000.\(^\text{181}\)


\(^\text{181}\) “The Iranian Intellectual Community,” *DNSA*, 21 December 1963; Talbot to Rusk, “Agitational Activities of Anti-Shah Iranian Students in the United States,” 5 October 1963, *FRUS 1961-1963, Vol. XVIII*, 723; Afshin Matin-asgari, *Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah*, 71; The foreign student census, which was conducted by the Annual Institute of International Education, showed that 77 percent of Iranian students in the United States were undergraduates. Less than 7 percent were funded by the government of Iran, and only 2 percent received aid from U.S. government programs. 68 percent were self-sufficient, and less than 12 percent had other sources of funding, including private sources and aid from American universities. Refer to Letter from Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs Lucius D. Battle to John J. Rooney, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 20 February 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 397, IRAN folder, RG 59, NA.
Throughout Kennedy’s presidency, anti-shah demonstrations by Iranian students were a common occurrence. While the ISAUS did have a voice in the Kennedy administration through Robert Kennedy, the results of the Washington-inspired White Revolution were severely frowned upon by Iranian students abroad.\textsuperscript{182} The demonstrations, along with numerous other factors combined with the shah’s already skeptical view of American intentions to make the shah suspect that the U.S. government supported the anti-regime activities of Iranian studying in the United States. The first factor was the Kennedy administration’s emphasis on reform. Second was the friendship between prominent Americans, such as Justice William O. Douglas and Robert Kennedy. Third was the Justice Department’s suspension of deportation proceedings against anti-shah activists in the United States.\textsuperscript{183} The residue of mistrust continued throughout Lyndon Johnson’s presidency, and Johnson’s policy was in many ways designed to improve upon the damage done to U.S. – Iranian relations during the Kennedy administration. Iranian student protest in the United States played a role in creating this situation.

\textsuperscript{182} ISAUS, \textit{U.S. Involvement in Iran, Part 1: Imperialist Disguises and Liberal Illusions, 1900-1963}.  

Dramatic changes occurred in both U.S. – Iranian relations and the Iranian student movement abroad from 1964 through 1968. Dissident Iranian students continued to become more vocal and radical as their numbers grew throughout the decade. While Qotbzadeh left the U.S. for France in 1964, Fatemi remained in the United States. Qotbzadeh, an ardent Islamist, eventually developed a relationship with Ayatollah Khomeini while in France. Fatemi and Qotbzadeh represented both the secular leftist and moderate Islamist tendencies in the Iranian student movement in the United States, and the movement was similar in Europe. While Ali Shariati, a very influential moderate Islamist, was involved in the European CIS, leftists such as Hasan Masali were equally, if not more influential in the mid-1960s. The ideologies of these men evolved and went in various directions throughout the next fifteen years as many more students joined the movement. After the brutal response to demonstrators in Iran during the summer of 1963, students abroad were among the only groups of Iranians able to express their political beliefs. Iranian student organizations such as the CISNU “were a large pool from which various communist, Maoist, Islamic, and nationalist groups recruited members.” This new generation of students developed a much more radical discourse on both Marxism-Leninism and Islamism.

Iranian student protest became more frequent by the late 1960s. Their demonstrations displayed disaffection with the shah’s regime throughout the United States and Western Europe. The ISAUS believed that its methods were “the enlightened, democratic way of trying to rid Iran

of an impossible leader - - by enlisting national and world opinion against him."  

As the decade wore on, Iranian students became increasingly involved with the American and European protests movements. In the Civil Rights Movement, SNCC become more radicalized and the Black Panthers emerged. From the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution on 10 August 1964, through the Tet Offensive of 1968, the American anti-war movement, FSM, and New Left became major student organizations that interacted with the ISAUS. Similar developments took place in Europe. All of these groups were protesting a lack of civil liberties, imperialism, and the overbearing power of their respective states. The shah became the center of many of these protests.

As the Iranian student movement became larger and more radical in ideology, it also became much more anti-American. The American Embassy in Tehran noted that the rise in anti-Americanism was primarily a result of its role in supporting a regime that denied the youth the role they desired to play. Both Kennedys were aware of this; this was why they listened to Iranian students in the United States. However, receptiveness in Washington to the concerns of Iranian dissidents ended with the assassination of President Kennedy on 22 November 1963. Only a month after Kennedy’s death, a report referred to students abroad as “professional agitators,” and recommended that U.S. policy “probably should not be overly influenced by attitudes of the intelligentsia” and that “it could hardly be recommended at this time that we change our overall policy to meet this problem.”

Instead, of altering its policy with Iran, the U.S. government desired to superficially improve its own position with the Iranian intellectual

---

185 ISAUS, “Don’t Let Familiarity Breed Indifference! Six More Students have been Jailed,” publication of the Southern California Chapter of the ISAUS printed in ISAUS, Iran in Turmoil, 48.
community by minimizing its “guilt by association.” When Kennedy was president, Iranian students had a friend in the attorney general. Robert Kennedy greatly impressed Iranian students in the early 1960s, and Sadeq Qotbzadeh’s fondness for him “bordered on hero-worship.” However, he retained his position for less than a year after his brother’s death before running for the Senate, and he no longer had significant influence in the White House.

An escalation in the activities of Iranian students abroad coincided with the Johnson administration’s desire to demonstrate unquestioning support for the shah. Johnson viewed the shah much differently than Kennedy. Johnson rolled back the emphasis on reform that had been coming from Washington from 1961 to 1963 for two reasons. First, Johnson was simply not that concerned about international justice, human rights, or reform. He was more interested in foreign leaders who would defend American interests abroad; not how they ruled their nations. Second, Johnson felt the need mend the wound that had developed between Washington and Tehran during the Kennedy years.

Johnson developed a friendship with the shah during two trips he made to Tehran as vice president, and he agreed with the shah’s brutal response to demonstrators throughout the summer of 1963. While Johnson desired strong relations between the United States and Iran, the shah was determined to let the United States know that he was indispensable to its Cold War policy by charting an independent course. By the mid-1960s, the shah sought a rapprochement with the Soviet Union because he was “tired of being treated like a schoolboy” by the United States.

---

191 Bill, *The Eagle and the Lion*, 156.
The shah saw Iranian students abroad as a growing threat to his throne; indeed the voices of the students grew louder. The Johnson administration saw the students’ behavior as a liability to the improvement of relations between the shah and Washington. By the end of the decade, the Six Day War, the Vietnam War, and British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf had begun to greatly influence Johnson’s foreign policy with Iran.

By 1964, the Iranian intelligentsia at home and abroad presented serious challenges for policymakers in Washington. Students were the most effective revolutionary element of the Iranian intelligentsia, and they were emphasized in U.S. government reports because they represented various social backgrounds and demonstrated “the most acute form of disaffection from the regime in Iran.” Also, there was an “exceedingly widespread” number of anti-regime Iranian students in the United States. Politically active members of the intelligentsia were not given a chance to play a role in the shah’s government. In late 1963 “one of the most exciting political problems of Iran today is how to bring younger elements of the intelligentsia into closer harmony with the regime.” The Iranian “angry young man” was the product of vast separation between his ideals and aspirations, and the actual reality of Iranian life. For the Johnson administration, the activities of anti-shah Iranian students in the United States escalated and became a “source of serious friction between the United States and Iran.” Therefore, the State Administration, the Shah of Iran, and the Changing Pattern of U.S. – Iranian Relations, 1965 – 1967, “Tired of Being Treated like a Schoolboy,” Journal of Cold War Studies, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Spring 2007), 83.

194 The United States government defined intelligentsia as “persons who have influence on the minds of other people because of the quality of their own minds, usually as the result of higher education.” Refer to “The Iranian Intellectual Community,” DNSA, 21 December 1963.
Department and SAVAK monitored the behaviors of Iranian students in the United States and Europe.

American diplomats in Austria regularly reported to Washington information regarding the vocal contingent of Iranian students in Austria. There were between 1,200 and 1,500 Iranian students studying there, and they were some of the most vocal in the world. Protests broke out in Austria during the shah’s January 1964 trip. On 25 January there was a demonstration in Innsbruck, and a day later, 40 Iranian students from Graz traveled to Vienna to demonstrate in front of the shah’s hotel. Following the arrests of 17 students over a period of two days, larger protests occurred on 27 January and culminated when approximately 200 Iranian students were joined by 50 Arabian and Greek students at a demonstration at the University of Vienna. American ambassador to Austria James Riddleberger confusingly reported that it was “difficult to determine if the anti-Shah sentiment is indicative of a strong political movement among the students.”

The State Department was deeply interested in the information regarding the demonstrations and wanted the flow of information pertaining to Iranian students abroad to continue because it was relevant to the attitudes of Iranian students in the United States.

One of the pamphlets that circulated at the demonstrations in Austria was entitled “Shah in Tirol.” It was signed by Iranian Students Abroad and read:

As you know [the] Shah comes again to Europe and spends millions for his pleasure. For this pleasure thousands of people in Iran die of hunger and cold. In order to maintain his inhuman regime he has caused thousands of people striving for freedom to be killed and to be thrown into prison. We appeal therefore to all people of the world to plead for the human rights in conformity with the Iranian
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200 Airgram from the American Embassy in Vienna to the Department of State, “Iranian Student Activities in Austria,” 14 February 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2334, (Folder title ripped off), RG 59, NA.
201 Airgram from Department of State to American Embassy in Vienna, “Iranian Student Activities in Austria,” 20 February 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files, 1964-66, Box 2334, (Folder title ripped off), RG 59, NA; Airgram from the Department of State to the American Embassy in Vienna, “Iranian Student Activities in Vienna,” 28 January 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2334, (Folder title ripped off), RG 59, NA.
people. Show the Shah that you condemn his attitude. Long live the struggle of the Iranian people for freedom and justice! Down with the dictatorship!  

Protests also occurred in the United States during the shah’s first official visit with President Johnson in early June 1964. Dean Rusk believed that this visit was very important “to the maintenance and strengthening of friendly ties.” Security was a major issue for this trip. American policymakers were especially concerned about the speech that the shah was to give at UCLA graduation ceremony. Many officials believed that the announcement of high profile appearances gave dissident students advance notice of his locations which provided them with ample time to prepare protests. President of the ISA of Southern California, Mostafi Kaidi Chaharmaheli, was enrolled at Woodbury College in Los Angeles and was active since mid-March in organizing anti-shah activities in the Los Angeles area.

Because of the security concern, the Director of SAVAK notified the U.S. government that three officers would be dispatched to Washington prior to the shah’s arrival and that their primary concern was to monitor the activities of Iranian students. These security measures were taken because of the “highly disturbing reports regarding the intentions” of a “small but highly vocal and active group of anti-regime Iranians” in the United States. In addition to security issues, these students were “seriously undermining the base of confidence necessary
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202 “Shah in Tirol,” in AE Vienna to DOS, “Iranian Student Activities in Austria,” 14 February 1964, RG 59, NA.
203 Letter from Frederick G. Dutton to Congressman George E. Brown, 9 June 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA.
204 “Various Aspects of Program for Shah’s Visit,” 20 May 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy files 1945-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA.
205 Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
206 American Embassy in Tehran to the Secretary of State, “Shah’s Visit,” 23 May 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA.
207 Letter from Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs Charles H. Mace to INS Commissioner Raymond Farrell, 15 May 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA; This letter is referred to on p. 39 footnote 3 in FRUS 1964-1968, Vol. XXII.
between Iran and the United States.”

Any incidents “would be highly damaging to our foreign policy, and to our national security interests in view of Iran’s military importance to us.”

Leading up to the trip, Talbot urged Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman to ask Robert Kennedy to take action in deporting Ali Shayegan. Shayegan spent many years in the United States and France, and was one of the more prominent members of the CIS. He was a moderate Islamist who organized many anti-shah demonstrations throughout the 1960s and 1970s. He was, along with Hosein Fatemi, one of the most anti-Western members of Mosaddeq’s cabinet. The deportation of Shayegan was deemed an important issue because the shah was still suspicious that anti-shah Iranian students were condoned, and possibly supported by the U.S. government. According to Talbot, a symbolic act such as deporting Shayegan could alleviate his suspicions, and possibly reduce the intensity of anti-regime demonstrations at UCLA. Also, Shayegan was considered a threat because he told an NEA officer less than a year before that “he intended to dedicate the remainder of his life to the destruction of the Shah.”

Talbot’s concerns about Shayegan were echoed by Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs Charles Mace, who sent a similar message to INS Commissioner Raymond Farrell two days later. Mace also wanted Robert Kennedy to issue another warning to the leaders of the ISAUS. Following President Kennedy’s assassination, Robert Kennedy
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208 Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
209 Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
214 Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
215 Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
warned the Iranian students that they should “adopt a very low profile.”\textsuperscript{216} Mace argued that stricter actions should be taken and the warnings this time should be harsher because it would convince the shah that the 24 December warning was not a “feint by us to disguise our continuing support or at least sufferance of anti-regime elements” in the United States.\textsuperscript{217} Mace also mentioned that a list was compiled by the Office of Security in the Department of State that identified Iranian students who were involved in anti-shah activities.\textsuperscript{218}

The actions taken by SAVAK and the State Department did not silence the students. Leading up to the shah’s visit, the ISAUS sent out a memorandum on 25 May 1964 that was addressed to numerous organizations in the United States, along with the “Freedom-Loving People of the United States.”\textsuperscript{219} It is important to note that Iranian students distinguished between American policymakers and the people of the United States in the 1960s. The letter was aimed at increasing the number of participants for the protests that were planned to take place in Washington, New York, and Los Angeles. They said that all the protests would be “in good faith and in accord with democratic principles of protest and peaceful assembly” and that the struggle of the Iranian people was “essentially identical with the battle fought by the courageous American people from the dawn of their independence.”\textsuperscript{220}

When the shah arrived at Kennedy International Airport on 4 June 1964 he was greeted by a group of Iranian students marching in front of the airport shouting “Down with the

\textsuperscript{216} Jerome, \textit{The Man in the Mirror}, 61.
\textsuperscript{217} Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{218} Mace to Farrell, 15 May 1964, RG 59, NA.
\textsuperscript{219} Letter from the Executive Committee of the ISAUS, 25 May 1964, printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in Turmoil}, 43. Some of the groups that the letter was sent to included the United States National Student Association, the African Students Association in the United States, the Organization of Arab Students in the United States, the National Association of University Professors, the International League for the Rights of Man, the AFL – CIO, the ACLU, the NAACP, and the Congress of Racial Equality.
\textsuperscript{220} Letter from the Executive Committee of the ISAUS, 25 May 1964, printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in Turmoil}, 43.
Groups of 25 to 30 students also greeted the shah at Dulles Airport, the White House, American University, the Sulgrave Club, and the Iranian embassy. While the shah was accompanied by Empress Farah, she remained on the East Coast, and she did not go with him to UCLA because of a “disagreeable experience with students in California two years ago.” The shah’s motorcade had to be constantly rerouted throughout the trip so that he would not come into contact with the groups of students protesting on the streets of Washington, D.C.

A one-hour meeting between the shah and President Johnson was arranged on 5 June, during which they discussed numerous issues. One was American military assistance and the modernization of the Iranian armed forces. The second was the Arab threat on Iran’s borders. The shah feared the influence of Nasser’s Pan-Arab Nationalism in surrounding nations and on the Arab population within Iran. Third, the United States assured the shah that it would not sacrifice Iran’s security interests as part of a settlement with the Soviet Union. There were also numerous issues to be discussed, which included thanking the shah for his support of the American war effort in South Vietnam. Along with these crucial talking points, Johnson was prepared to discuss the “Iranian student problem” in the United States. Rusk noted in an earlier memorandum that the shah might express dissatisfaction with the inability of the U.S. government to control anti-shah students studying in the United States. While Johnson remained adamant that the United States did not support the students’ activities, he assured the shah that
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221 “Shah in U.S. for Visit; To See Johnson Today,” NYT, 5 June 1964, p. 3.
222 Telegram from the Department of State to the Embassy in Iran, “Shah’s Visit,” 9 June 1964, FRUS 1964-1968, Vol. XXII, 82-3. This document can be found at the National Archives in the General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64).
223 Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran to Secretary of State, 22 April 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 397, Folder IRAN EDX, RG 59, NA; “Shah in U.S. for Visit; To See Johnson Today,” NYT, 5 June 1964, p. 3.
Iranian students under warning from the Justice Department would be deported if they participated in radical activities.\textsuperscript{226}

After meeting with Johnson, the shah continued with his other engagements. The trip brought the shah to some of the nation’s finest universities, and was an indication of growing “Pahlavism” in the United States.\textsuperscript{227} On 9 June the shah received an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from New York University. At the ceremony Dr. James M. Hester, president of the university, stated that the shah’s work in “building the future of Iran on social justice and democratic ideals gives the world an imperial example of wise and courageous leadership.”\textsuperscript{228}

About 50 Iranian students protested American acceptance of the shah’s policies outside the building where Dr. Hester made his statements. The shah was upset because he could hear the protestors shouting phrases such as “N.Y.U., shame on you” while NYU Vice President Thomas C. Pollock praised the shah.\textsuperscript{229}

Iranian Ambassador to the United States Mahmoud Foroughi said that the events at NYU were one of two troublesome occurrences during the shah’s trip.\textsuperscript{230} The second event that they found troublesome occurred at UCLA. Professor Robert G. Neumann, Director of the Institute of International Affairs at UCLA, wanted to award the shah an honorary degree and have him


\textsuperscript{227} Pahlavism is defined as close personal and professional relationships between the shah and American leaders in government, finance, industry, academia, and the media. For good discussion on Pahlavism see Chapter 9, Bill, \textit{The Eagle and the Lion}, 319-79.


\textsuperscript{230} Memorandum of Conversation between Mahmoud Foroughi, Colonel Mohamad-Ali Sobhani, Colonel Nasser Moghaddam, Officer in Charge of Iranian Affairs M. Gordon Tiger, and Keith O. Lynch, “Security Situation During the Shah’s Visit,” 19 June 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA.
deliver the Charter Day address at commencement in the spring.\footnote{Professor Robert G. Neumann to Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asia John D. Jernegan, “Proposal by University of California to Confer an Honorary Degree on the Shah of Iran,” 14 November 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1963, Box 3942, Folder POL IRAN 15-1, RG 59, NA.} American ambassador to Iran Julius Holmes believed that the plans “might have beneficial results for U.S. policy in Iran.”\footnote{Holmes to State Department, 16 November 1963, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1963, Box 3942, Folder POL IRAN 15-1, RG 59, NA.} However, security was a major issue. Iranian Cultural Minister Habib Naficy told Dean Scully of the Foreign Students Office at UCLA that “bus loads of Iranian students were being organized all over the United States to go to Los Angeles.”\footnote{Memorandum of Conversation between John D. Jernegan and Representatives from UCLA, “Iranian Student Preparations to Demonstrate Against the Shah,” 12 May 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2331, Folder POL 7 IRAN (1/1/64), RG 59, NA.} There were approximately 800 Iranian students in southern California alone. One Iranian student at UCLA reported that there would be over 1,000 Iranian students in Los Angeles for the ceremony. Also, a government agency informed UCLA that a student at San Fernando Junior College, ten miles away from UCLA, said that the shah’s visit to UCLA “would be a good time do away with him.”\footnote{Memo of Conversation, “Iranian Student Preparations to Demonstrate Against the Shah,” 12 May 1964, RG 59, NA.}

The UCLA student newspaper,\footnote{Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran to Secretary of State, 22 April 1964, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 397, Folder IRAN EDX, RG 59, NA.} The Daily Bruin, was also used by Iranian students to express their anti-shah sentiment. A letter published in late April by an anonymous Iranian student contained violent personal attacks on the shah.\footnote{Memo of Conversation, “Iranian Student Preparations to Demonstrate Against the Shah,” 12 May 1964, RG 59, NA.} Students also placed a full-page advertisement in the 12 May edition of the student newspaper that protested the shah’s visit. UCLA chancellor Franklin Murphy also said that the recent civil rights uprisings had “popularized the idea of demonstrations in this country and made it easy for any group to attract...
people whether they were themselves directly concerned or not.”

Phillips Talbot stated that “Our relations with the Shah, and hence our national security interests, have been seriously endangered by increasing activity on the part of anti-Shah Iranians in the United States, which may culminate in humiliating and perhaps dangerous demonstrations at the UCLA Commencement in June.”

A month before the commencement, officials at UCLA received large numbers of reports that hundreds of Iranian students and sympathizers were planning a “massive, well-organized and well-financed demonstrations.”

American officials urged the shah to cancel his appearance at UCLA and confine his appearances strictly to East Coast locations such as NYU and American University. The shah rejected the possibility of canceling his appearance at UCLA and stated that a cancellation would be considered a victory for his enemies.

Jernegan told Andrew Hamilton of UCLA that he approached the INS in order to “throw the fear of God into the students.” Despite the threats and warnings, there were more than two hundred anti-shah protesters in attendance at the UCLA commencement ceremony.

There were pro-shah demonstrations organized by two official
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243 Matin-asgari, Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah, 75.
Iranians, Supervisor of Iranian Students in the United States Habib Naficy and Mr. Kowsar, to counter the attacks made by the anti-regime demonstrators and fights broke out between the two groups. In the middle of the commencement ceremony, a plane that was rented for 250 dollars by a group of students flew overhead which carried a banner that said, “Need a fix? See the Shah.” A police helicopter chased the plane away from the ceremony. This reference to heroin greatly angered the shah.

When the shah returned to New York on 12 June from Los Angeles he was greeted by about 15 demonstrators. The shah appeared distraught and rundown when he met with three representatives from the Defense Department and one State Department official before he returned to Iran. While most of the meeting dealt with modernizing Iran’s armed forces through American weapons sales, the student problem was discussed. One American policymaker thought that the large-scale demonstrations in Los Angeles had depressed him. The shah told American officials at the meeting that the events at UCLA demonstrated that “he was the subject to what one might call an international conspiracy led by the communists with active assistance of Nasser and the Arabs.”

The grievances of Iranian students grew more vocal when the Iranian majlis passed a law that gave full diplomatic immunity to 1,800 American military advisors and their dependents. This agreement was known as the Iranian-American Status of Forces Agreement. It was

244 Telegram from the Department of State to the Embassy in Iran, 16 June 1964, FRUS 1964-1968, Vol. XXII, 91.
246 There was a letter sent from the International Federation for Narcotic Education that was sent to Clark Kerr in an attempt to prevent the shah from receiving the honorary degree. It emphasized the heroin problem in Iran and alleged that Princess Ashraf was arrested by Swiss police in 1962 for having numerous suitcases of heroin. See Letter from International Federation of Narcotic Education to Clark Kerr printed in ISAUS, Iran in Turmoil, 35.
unprecedented, with the exception of the American agreement with West Germany, and as
historian James Bill noted that “it nullified any and all Iranian legal control over the growing
American military colony” stationed in Iran.\textsuperscript{250} Following the passing of the law, Ayatollah
Khomeini, one of the leading Shia clerics in Iran, gave a speech protesting the bill, and argued
that it “reduced the Iranian people to a level lower than that of an American dog.”\textsuperscript{251} Khomeini’s
speech led to his exile on 4 November 1964. This greatly upset Iranian students and was one of
the issues Islamist students protested throughout the rest of 1964.\textsuperscript{252}

Protests continued when Iranian diplomats came to the United States. In late 1964, the
ISAUS organized a protest when a reception was given by the Iranian Ministry of Foreign
Affairs, headed by Foreign Minister Aram. In a press release that was put out before the
demonstration on 23 December 1964, the New York Chapter of the ISAUS said that “Since all
channels of expression are closed for the Iranian people under the present corrupt and dictatorial
regime in Iran, we feel a heavy responsibility for reflecting the voice of our oppressed
people.”\textsuperscript{253} The grievances of the ISAUS included the borrowing of two million dollars from
American banks to strengthen
the military, the immunities bill, and Khomeini’s exile.\textsuperscript{254} The
ISAUS was also upset about the shah’s security forces working outside of Iran. While the shah
ran a dictatorial state inside Iran, he was beginning to put pressure on Iranian students abroad.
Therefore, one of the principle reasons that they protested the reception held by the Ministry of

\textsuperscript{250} Bill, \textit{The Eagle and the Lion}, 158.
\textsuperscript{251} “The Granting of Capitulatory Rights to the U.S.,” 27 October 1964, as seen in \textit{Islam and Revolution: Writings
of the text can also be seen in Bill, \textit{The Eagle and the Lion}, 159-60.
\textsuperscript{252} ISAUS, 23 December 1964 Press Release of the New York Chapter of the ISAUS printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in
Turmoil}, 40; 5 November 1964 articles in \textit{The Times} and the NYT were published in CIS, \textit{Documents on the Pahlavi
Reign of Terror in Iran: Eyewitness Reports and Newspaper Articles} (Frankfurt, Germany: Confederation of Iranian
\textsuperscript{253} 23 December 1964 Press Release of the New York Chapter of the ISAUS printed in ISAUS, \textit{Iran in
Turmoil}, 40.
Foreign Affairs was because they were “permitting themselves to be used as an appendage of the security organization to extend the police state outside of Iran.”

In late 1964 Foreign Minister Aram was still very concerned about the “harmful activities of some Iranian students in the United States.” While Iranian and American officials were concerned about the shah’s safety in Los Angeles, there was an attempt to assassinate the shah in Iran in April 1965; less than six months after the assassination of Prime Minister Hasan-Ali Mansur. Mansur was a member of the Iran-e Novin Party, which was a group of technocrats loyal to the shah who were friendly with the United States government.

The assassination attempt on the shah occurred on 10 April 1965 inside Tehran’s Marble Palace. Both the American and Iranian governments initially announced that the assassin was Reza Shamsabadi, a 22 year old conscript in the Imperial Guard. Prime Minister Hoveyda was quoted in the French newspaper *Le Monde* saying that “there was not at all any question of a plot.” However, later in the month the Iranian government began to arrest a group of Iranian students in connection with the assassination attempt including six former members of the CISNU, five of whom were recent graduates from British universities. The CISNU believed that
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259 CIS, *Was it a Plot to Kill the Shah or is it a Conspiracy to Silence the Students?*, 3.
because they were active members and leaders of student organizations abroad they became targets of persecution by the shah’s police.\textsuperscript{260}

Eight more were arrested in the plot, bringing the total to 14, and the CISNU drew international attention to the trial in Iran. On 7 May 1965, 50 members of the British Parliament sent a letter to Ardestir Zahedi that protested the alleged torture of the accused and the secrecy of the trials. Extracts of the letter were published in \textit{The Times} of London and Zahedi expressed his displeasure.\textsuperscript{261} The CIS sent a letter to the Human Rights Commission of the U.N. on 25 October 1965 protesting the trial in Iran.\textsuperscript{262} They also conducted demonstrations, highlighted by a well-coordinated hunger strike that lasted nine days and was conducted throughout the United States and Western Europe.\textsuperscript{263}

The Iranian government claimed that they were motivated by their “communistic extremist” ideas.\textsuperscript{264} The shah stressed the communist ideologies of Iranian students abroad in a conversation he had with American diplomats in an attempt to get the U.S. government to crack down on its own group of Iranian students.\textsuperscript{265} The CISNU believed that because almost all political opposition to the government had been banned, Iranian students studying abroad were the only “pillar of freedom left,” and they would let their voices be heard.\textsuperscript{266} They believed that the shah’s attempt to blame the students for the assassination attempt was simply “A Conspiracy
to Silence the Students.” The Economist reported that while Iran’s internal opposition had been silenced, it was “a lot harder for the government to silence the buzzing of the well-organised [sic] and well-heeled student groups outside the country,” and that the trial was “plainly being used to try to shut up other students.”

In the wake of the assassination attempt the shah became “anxious that steps be taken to curb anti-regime activities by Iranian students, including those in the United States.” American officials assured the shah that the U.S. government kept “dissident Iranian students under close scrutiny” and were “mindful of a desirability of regulating their activities and dealing properly with their visa status to the extent this can be done without adverse publicity.”

However, the protests in the United States and Europe did gain publicity. Iranian students demanded an open trial in Iran and showed their solidarity with the alleged conspirators. A 72-hour hunger strike was active in Italy from 24 October through 26 October by members of the Federation of Iranian Students in Italy. Sixteen Iranian students participated in a hunger strike in Vienna that began on 26 October and ended on 28 October and took place in the offices of the Austria Union of Socialist Secondary School Students. They were endorsed by Austrian
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youth organizations such as the Free Austrian Youth and the Association of Democratic Students.\textsuperscript{272}

Protests also occurred in the United States. Thirty Iranian students took part in the protest in front of the Iranian Embassy.\textsuperscript{273} While these protests continued, Iranian students deepened their ties with protest movements in the United States and by the mid-1960s they began to see themselves as part of a larger struggle. In defense of those arrested in connection with the assassination attempt, the ISAUS said that the only crime of those arrested was that they were leaders in the CISNU. They also said that “They weren’t members of Berkley’s FSM, though they would like to have been. They weren’t demonstrating in Selma or attending teach-ins in Washington, although they would have had they been here.”\textsuperscript{274}

While cooperation between Iranian students and other student organizations in the United States and Western Europe increased, the political ideologies of Iranian students abroad became increasingly influenced by leftist ideology. The CISNU began to adopt slogans such as “White Revolution is a Lie; Red Revolution is a Must.”\textsuperscript{275} The radicalization of the CISNU was caused by both domestic and international factors. Domestically, the Shah had completely eliminated all forms of opposition following June 1963, including student movements inside Iran.\textsuperscript{276} The elimination of all political opposition made the cause of the students abroad even more severe. Abroad, there were numerous wars of national liberation, along with different alternatives to

\textsuperscript{272} Airgram from American Embassy in Vienna to the Department of State, “Iranian Student Demonstrations in Vienna,” 23 November 1965, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1964-66, Box 2334, (Folder title ripped off), RG 59, NA.
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Soviet-style communism. The ISAUS stated that the “struggles of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia [sic], Palestine, Dhofar, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, as well as many other peoples of the Third World… did not leave the Iranian people’s movement unaffected.”277 This set of beliefs became known as “Third Worldism.”278

The struggles of the Third World provided anti-regime Iranians with “a fresh source of energy” in their battle against the shah.279 The emerging wars of liberation and Chinese and Cuban versions of Marxism became very influential in student movements throughout the world. Revolutionary wars were taking place in Algeria, Vietnam, and the Congo, and had already taken place in Cuba and China. Many were influenced by the Cuban Revolution, and Che Guevara’s Guerilla Warfare was published in Iranian student publications.280 By the early 1960s the Sino-Soviet split had emerged, and Maoism became a powerful influence among both Iranian leftists and nationalists. As a result, the Iranian student movement began to be split internally between hard-liners and soft-liners.281 In the process, loyalties to the independent-minded National Front and Soviet-directed Tudeh Party waned as new philosophies emerged. The ideologies of Iranian students were also highly affected by the shah’s foreign policy. Any influence that the Tudeh Party still had in the Iranian student movement diminished as a result of the shah’s
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rapprochement with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. These rifts occurred between nationalists and communists, and between those who favored Soviet-style communism and those who looked towards China and Cuba for alternatives.

While secular nationalists with strong leftist leanings dominated the Iranian student movement abroad in the 1960s, moderate Islamists were also developing their own political philosophies that were strongly influenced by various strains of Marxism. Throughout the 1960s, Islamist Iranian students were developing a “new militant discourse of Islam.” “It was a strange synthesis of Soviet and Chinese Marxism, the existentialism of Sartre, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger, and a militant form of traditional Shi’ite Islam.” One of the most prominent was Ali Shariati. Shariati, a leader of the Iranian opposition movement in Europe, was involved with the CISNU. He wrote for the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN). He also translated Frantz Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth* into Persian. In the mid-1960s there were overlapping interests between many Iranian dissidents with drastically different politics.

Therefore, there was still cooperation between both the secular left and conservative religious figures such as Ayatollah Khomeini in order to form a broad coalition to oppose the Pahlavi regime. CISNU International Secretary, Hasan Masali, made a trip to Najaf to speak to Khomeini in the summer of 1966. While the meeting was cordial, and both groups realized that they could benefit from the other, the CISNU did not adhere to Islamic precepts, and Khomeini

was dubious of the secular nature of the group.\textsuperscript{286} However, pragmatism led Khomeini to instruct his followers to cooperate with secular leftists in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{287} While this relationship was tenuous, it represented the variety of groups that held the common interest in their hatred of the shah. While the shah’s plans for modernization alienated the traditional and religious groups of society, his lack of political freedoms infuriated newly emerging groups and classes, such as the growing number of students and university educated Iranians.\textsuperscript{288} The impact of the shah’s rule could clearly be seen on the Iranian student movement of the 1960s.

Both secular leftists and Islamists offered an alternate political discourse for the future of Iran. While they often cooperated in order to form a broad anti-shah coalition, these diverging ideologies played a major role in the splits that eventually occurred in the CISNU. This uneasy tension can be seen in the relationship between Qotbzadeh and Fatemi. Early on, even as there was solidarity between the two while they fought deportation during their days in leadership of the ISAUS, tension grew between them. “As much as he loved Sadegh for his intelligence and commitment, Fatemi grew wary of Sadegh and his politics of Islam,” and this forced them to drift apart.\textsuperscript{289} The treatment of the clergy in Iran further radicalized Iranian students, and Islamists such as Qotbzadeh began to form their own groups. However, while Islamists and secularists drifted apart, there was not full-blown animosity between the groups in the mid-1960s.

While the shah acted forcefully against any opposition in Iran, anti-shah demonstrations continued throughout the United States. By the autumn of 1965, the shah was still aggravated by the reluctance of the U.S. government to do anything about their behavior. His concern with
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Iranian students in the United States reemerged when he witnessed protests by Iranian students in a stop-over in New York on 18 May 1965.290 The talking points were typical of the mid-1960s, and they included modernization of the Iranian military, Nasser’s influence, and “The oft-mentioned specter of communist influence on certain Iranian students in the United States.”291 American officials were concerned about the intensity of student activity in New York during the stop, and security measures taken to conceal protests were not successful.292

The activities of Iranian students abroad were detrimental to relations between the two nations at a time when the shah improved relations with the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc. The State Department recognized that the shah’s “sensitivity re small things,” especially regarding student criticism abroad and anti-regime articles in the foreign press, was a roadblock to good Iranian relations with the United States and nations around the world.293 Because of numerous factors, including the student issue, “the U.S. – Iran relationship is not as healthy as it was,” and the shah asked Ambassador Meyer, “Does Washington really care for Iran?”294

The shah’s desire to show Washington that he was not dependent on them combined and his anger over the student issue led him to seek rapprochement of the Soviet Union. In 1965 the shah visited Moscow and told Anastas Mikoyan, who was then Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, that Iran would not allow itself to be a launching point of aggression against the
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Three months later the shah concluded a deal with the Soviet Union to build a steel mill in Isfahan. The Soviets also aided the Iranians in building a gas pipeline and a mechanical engineering plant. As part of the deal, Iran agreed to buy $110 million in Soviet arms. There was also an increase in trade between Iran and Eastern Bloc countries. However, the shah desired American arms, and he believed that he could use Soviet rapprochement as a bargaining chip to gain access to a greater quantity of American-made weapons at a better price. It also appeared that the shah believed that Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union could encourage Washington to do something about Iranian student protests in the United States. Because of Johnson’s desire to limit Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union, the administration did not view the vocal protest of Iranian students in the United States as a sign of a flawed policy. The Johnson administration instead viewed the protests of Iranian students as a liability that jeopardized the fragile relationship between Washington and Tehran.

While the ideologies of Iranian students abroad were evolving throughout the mid-1960s, their attitudes regarding the United States remained paradoxical. They revered the Constitutional rights that were guaranteed to them while on American soil, and they still looked to influence those whom they referred to as the freedom loving people of the United States. However, they greatly resented American foreign policy. This resentment was not just contained to U.S. policy regarding Iran, but its imperial actions throughout the entire world. While the

---


297 The ISAUS was extremely aware of their legal rights while in the United States. They published their own pamphlet describing these rights: Caroline and Cyrus Ghani, *The Alien and United States Laws: With Particular Reference to the Foreign Students (Iranian Students Association Special Publication No. 2)*, (ISAUS, 1958). At the time of the publication, Caroline Ghani was an attorney in New York City and Cyrus Ghani was the editor of *Daneshjoo* and graduated from NYU law school.
condemnation of American imperialism increased, the number of Iranian students studying abroad grew to nearly 30,000 by 1966.298

By the late 1960s, the Iranian student movement was joined by student movements in their host countries. While much emphasis has been given in recent scholarship to the transnational nature of protest movements, the Iranian student movement was truly global. One reason for this was the political intensity of groups such as the CISNU. Iranian students were extremely committed to their cause. Also, the Iranian student movement became a truly transnational phenomenon because there were too many high school graduates for too few opportunities to study at Iranian universities. Another reason for the transnationalism of the Iranian student movement was because there was not one college classroom in Iran that did not have at least one SAVAK agent monitoring activity.299 It was difficult to voice opposition in Tehran for fear of execution, imprisonment, expulsion from school, or being drafted into the army.300 The impetus for the remarkable transnational growth of the Iranian student movement can be best described by the students themselves.

In a country like Iran where no opposition to the regime is officially tolerated, at any cost, and freedom of speech does not exist, it is only too natural, and indeed inevitable, for student organisations[sic] to become actively involved in high politics. These organisations [sic] working in the relatively free atmosphere of Western Europe and America, rightly take advantage of their position in serving as forums for free expression of opinion and especially of discontent with the state of affairs in their country.301

This 1966 statement greatly resembles the results of a 1961 poll that showed that Iranian students attended school abroad for “freedom of political expression” over “opportunities for
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participation in productive work." While the Iranian student movement drastically changed during the first half of the 1960s, this desire for free speech remained a constant. Politicized Iranian students thrived in the West as universities became the center of the student protest movements of the late 1960s. The university atmosphere was the ideal locale for dissemination of agitation and radicalism.

Historian Odd Arne Westad notes that many students who studied abroad in the 1960s were impressed by the radical student movement in the West, which occurred throughout Europe and the United States. Although Westad does not investigate the case of Iranian students in the United States, one can certainly transpose his ideas to them. In the case of Iranian students, their experiences in the United States and Western Europe simply reinforced the beliefs that they already held regarding the political role that they deserved to play in the Iranian government. 

Westad also notes that in some cases, foreign students studying in the United States turned against the dominant American ideology and began to adopt various critiques of American modernity, especially in its foreign policy. Iranian students had been some of the earliest to protest U.S. foreign policy, but the growth of anti-imperialist protest in the United States certainly added fuel to their fire.

Iranian, American, and West European students were all protesting the overbearing power of their respective states, the suppression of free speech and civil liberties, and imperialism. American imperialism directly affected both American students who were drafted to fight in Vietnam and Iranian students who were oppressed by the American-backed regime of the shah. Both groups were also concerned with African-American civil rights. To Iranians, the civil rights movement spoke to their sense of equality. The title of one article in Daneshjoo, the
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quarterly publication of the ISAUS, was entitled “Solidarity with American Students in Their Struggle Against Racial Discrimination.” There was a cross-current of influences between American and Western European students and foreign students. While many Western students adopted Maoism in the late 1960s, many Iranian youths also favored the Chinese variant of Communism. Throughout the latter half of the 1960s, the majority of the members of the ISAUS were self-proclaimed Maoists.

However, there were particularities to the grievances of each movement. The revolutionary momentum of Iranian students from 1966 to 1969 was aided by three factors. The most important was the failure of the shah’s reforms, especially the White Revolution. According to the ISAUS, the land reform initiative resulted in increased exploitation of the peasants and further control and centralization of the agricultural economy. The students also believed that the Literacy Corps was more a mechanism for surveillance of the countryside than an educational tool. A second factor was the rise of anti-imperialist and anti-reactionary forces throughout the world during the late 1960s. The ISAUS, which had been protesting throughout the decade, became an integral part of this movement. Not only did ISAUS call for the end of American imperialism in Iran, but in 1966, the group’s congress passed a resolution that called for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. A third factor was the growth of revolutionary underground organizations. These three issues made Iranian students
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realize that the results they desired could only be achieved through revolution, and also “drove
the masses even closer to the open arms of the revolutionary struggle.”  

While the shah consistently voiced his belief that the U.S. government assisted anti-
regime students in the United States, the radical magazine *Ramparts* published an article entitled,
“How the CIA turns Foreign Students into Traitors.”  It broke the story that the AMFE was a
front organization for the CIA. While it was not initially established as a front organization, it
became one by 1960. The transformation happened when Edward W. Overton, a little-known
federal bureaucrat, became vice president of the organization. After Overton’s arrival, the
CIA provided the organization with more than 90 percent of its income. Most of this money
went to the AFME’s department of student affairs. One of the main goals of the organization
was to create pro-American and pro-shah sentiment among Iranian students.

The editors of *Ramparts* showed that the AFME continued to fund the Afghanistan
Students Association (ASA) because some of its members agreed to act as informants for the
CIA. However, in the case of the ISAUS, funding was discontinued after the transformation of
the group in Ypsilanti in 1960. AFME members still monitored the annual conferences of the
ISAUS. In 1963 the group’s former president, Hasan Lebaschi, approached chairman of the
AFME Earl Bunting. He asked Bunting if he would be willing to fund projects that were non-
political, such as publishing a directory of Iranian students who were studying in the United
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States. When Bunting asked if the group had changed its political position, Lebaschi told him they had not. Bunting responded, "In that case…I’m sorry, we cannot help you."\textsuperscript{315}

Ironically, less than one month after the publication, the shah and Prime Minister Amir Abbas Hoveyda expressed their suspicions that the CIA was funding anti-shah students in the United States. Ambassador Armin Meyer told both the shah and Hoveyda that the U.S. government “has no secrets for the whole story has appeared in \textit{Ramparts},”\textsuperscript{316} The article made it very clear that the CIA cut off funds when the group became openly anti-shah. However, Meyer could not convince the shah and Hoveyda, who referred to an article in a German magazine that charged that the CIA was offering secret support to Iranian students.\textsuperscript{317}

By the time the \textit{Ramparts} article was published, the number of adamantly anti-shah Iranian students in the United States had grown from the 25 “hardcore” students in 1963 to several hundred who were “ardently and volubly opposed to the Shah” and who worked “principally through the Iranian Students Association.”\textsuperscript{318} The ISAUS believed that it was their “task to wage coordinated political struggle against the Shah’s regime and imperialism,” and that “Iranian students abroad are a part of the Iranian people and therefore have to uphold the aspirations of the broad masses of Iranian people.”\textsuperscript{319} In order to do this, the ISAUS held many demonstrations and began publicizing human rights abuses in Iran throughout the Western
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world. Iranian student groups gained the assistance of American civil liberties groups and “ultra-liberals” in publicizing numerous accounts of the oppression of personal liberties in Iran.320

Although U.S. policymakers monitored the developments of the movement, they did not take the complaints of student protesters seriously while formulating foreign policy. While speaking about the impact student protest had on his foreign policy in December 1967, President Johnson said that “…I am not going to be deterred. I am not going to be influenced. I am not going to be inflamed by a bunch of political, selfish men who want to advance their own interests.”321 As student unrest spread around the globe, Johnson recognized that “It is a problem that is not just for us. It is a problem for the entire world.”322

The protest movement in West Germany that emerged fully by 1968 had its origins in June 1967. One of its first major confrontations was the result of student protest of the shah’s visit to West Germany that “had not been organized by SDS,…but by the Iranian Confederation of Students.”323 The nine-day visit of the shah and the empress began on 27 May and was marked by demonstrations in Bonn and Munich, and most importantly Berlin. The press paid close attention to their protests, and the visit became intertwined with the rise of New Left student activism.324 The protests became violent when the students confronted the shah’s party as they arrived at the Deutsche Opera House in Berlin on 2 June. The shah’s car was “plastered with eggs,” and “some members of the party were also splattered.”325 A struggle broke out and

the police used four water cannons to force demonstrators away from the opera house.\textsuperscript{326} Dr. Ruprecht Rauch, West German Chief of Protocol, was responsible for arranging the program in Berlin, and he noted that the visit went “very, very badly,” and that the shah had “firmly conveyed his annoyance.”\textsuperscript{327}

The Berlin demonstrations, in which 3,000 students participated in, were “unprecedented in any foreign country” and resulted in the death of Benno Ohnesorg.\textsuperscript{328} Ohnesborg was an apolitical student at Free University of Berlin who was just beginning to become involved with New Left politics. There has been no evidence provided that he did anything to provoke the police.\textsuperscript{329} One historian noted that by this time, “student organizations which had been growing in strength and militancy were now turning into movements that would have to confront state repression,” and that “the killing of Benno Ohnesorg during demonstrations against the Shah of Iran’s official visit to West Berlin marked the transformation.”\textsuperscript{330} While the demonstrations were organized by the CISNU, SDS members participated, along with members from Kommune I and other unaffiliated students. Formerly apolitical students were also involved in the demonstrations. For instance, Ohnesorg was just beginning to take an interest in the politics of student protest, and was not affiliated with any groups.\textsuperscript{331}

The killing of Ohnesorg resulted not only in the intensification of the student movement in West Germany, but also in more vocal opposition to the shah. Iranian students remained extremely active in West Germany throughout the late 1960s, and American diplomats kept a close eye on the developments of the student movement in Europe. Dr. Bahman Nirumand, an
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Iranian exile and resident of West Berlin since 1964, was one of the most virulent critics of the shah in West Germany. On 22 November 1967, he gave a lecture in Zurich entitled “The Permanent Counter-Revolution – Persia and the West,” which drew 500 paying attendees along with a large overflow crowd which consisted mainly of students. The “usual bearded hippie element was present,” and the lecture, which was the first of six seminars on the problems of developing nations, was sponsored by the Progressive Students’ Affiliation. Nirumand’s philosophy served as an indication of the shift that took place in Iranians abroad as they adopted a more revolutionary philosophy. He cited the people’s democracies of China, Cuba, and North Vietnam as being progressive forces in the world, and he was a proponent of Cuban ideology and their path towards development. The American embassy noted that Nirumand’s lectures and writings played a large role in inciting the earlier demonstrations in Berlin.

By the late 1960s the U.S. State Department fretted that the behavior of Iranian students abroad had “caused a continuous irritation in our diplomatic relations with the Shah and his Government.” The tension that Iranian student protests created between Washington and Tehran was a major concern during the shah’s visit to the United States in August 1967. The shah’s visit was originally scheduled for 12 June but it was postponed because of the outbreak of the Six Day War. The shah was delighted at Egypt’s humiliating defeat because he saw Nasser as the most serious long-term threat to Iranian security. After being postponed, the shah’s visit was rescheduled as a two-day trip from 22 August until 24 August. American Ambassador to Iran Armin Meyer was supposed to brief President Johnson on 7 June for the shah’s visit.
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With the trip postponed, the briefing was not necessary. However, Johnson, Meyer, Walt Rostow and NSC Middle East staffer Harold Saunders still met to discuss how the war would affect American foreign policy in the Middle East. A senior NSC advisor suggested that with Nasser now “finished,” the shah should become “our man” in the region.336

The Six Day War was a critical turning point. Assessing the impact that the war had on American arms sales to Iran, Barry Rubin contends that it was “a dramatic event” that “signaled a turning point in the shah’s victory over the vestiges of the Kennedy policy of arms restraint.”337

With growing instability between the Arabs and Israelis, Iran, which consists mainly of Persians and had ties to Israel, became more important to American policymakers. Meyer and National Security Advisor Walt Rostow were the most influential promoters of closer ties to the shah’s regime. Both men were aware of the grievances of Iranian students. However, drastic political changes in the Middle East led them to solidify the relationship between Washington and Tehran. In Tehran, Meyer described the shah’s rule in very favorable terms and discouraged foreign service officers from making contacts with the opposition. Meyer’s reporting was a sharp break from that of previous ambassador to Iran, Julius Holmes, who encouraged more objective reporting on affairs in Iran. In Washington, Walt Rostow was very pro-shah and had a great deal of influence on President Johnson.338

As a result, CIA Director Richard Helms told Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara that the shah’s August 1967 visit “may well be a critical point in the history of our relations with modern Iran.”339 The 1967 trip also represented a visible turning point in the political beliefs of the Iranian student movement. Mansur Rafizadeh, who was the SAVAK chief of operations in
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the United States, recalled that “SAVAK noticed for the first time that among the protesters who greeted his arrival in New York were religious people carrying posters of Khomeini and large placards calling for his return to Iran.”

One of the main objectives of SAVAK was to minimize the impact of the religious demonstrators, and “to use all the means at its disposal to prove to the American authorities that the new breed of demonstrators were traitors, on the payroll of the Iraqi government, which had extended Khomeini indefinite asylum.”

When the shah arrived at the White House on 22 August, the Johnson administration had prior notice that there would be Iranian students staging a protest nearby. Between 60 and 150 masked members of the ISAUS staged a protest in Lafayette Park. The Secret Service advised the president and the shah’s entourage against walking anywhere between the White House and Blair House to avoid a risk of confrontation. The demonstrators were kept at a distance from the shah except in a few instances when they broke through the police line and got close enough to throw anti-shah and anti-CIA leaflets at his motorcade. While the demonstrations drew attention, Dean Rusk believed that they did not detract from the success of the trip.

Once again, policymakers in Washington ignored the voices of Iranian students in favor of strong relations with the shah. The Johnson administration, which was preoccupied with Iran’s growing role in the Cold War, for both geopolitical and economic reasons, did not consider the plight of its people. The American Embassy in Tehran hailed the trip as a diplomatic triumph because Johnson and the shah solidified their relationship and removed the shadow of Iran’s independent foreign policy. Referring to Iranian student groups, American
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diplomats in Tehran noted that they were “small and ineffective.”

Blinded by his support for Iran’s leader, and completely ignoring the voices of Iranians only two blocks away, Johnson told the shah that “You are winning progress without violence and bloodshed – a lesson others have still to learn.”

President Johnson, apparently referring to the nearby students, contended “We Americans challenge every propagandist and demagogue – whether he speaks on the radio waves of the world or in the streets of our own cities – to demonstrate his commitment to progress with facts and figures. The people of the world cry out for progress – not propaganda. They hunger for results, not rhetoric.”

While the Six Day War forced American policymakers to reexamine their Middle Eastern policy, the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf also had an important impact in the region. As early as April 1965, the shah was aware that the British would eventually withdraw their forces from the Persian Gulf, and that the United States would look to him to fill the vacuum. The British announced in January 1968 that they would be out of the region by 31 December 1971, and this led to further development of the Twin Pillars policy. In the summer of 1968 Walt Rostow noted that the United States needed to urge the shah to cooperate with Saudi Arabia’s King Faisal. From this point forward, the United States began to sell the
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shah massive amounts of military equipment. Iran was approved for $100 million of military credit sales in June 1968, because Secretary of State Dean Rusk, along with others in the administration, emphasized that the United States needed to bolster Iran’s defense capabilities in response to the upcoming British departure from the region. By 1968 this policy was underway, and King Faisal of Saudi Arabia and the Shah of Iran were now the “Brotherly Hands” of the Persian Gulf.

While Johnson believed that the shah was a progressive leader who could bring stability to the region, and the administration began large-scale military sales to Iran, Iranian students at home and abroad continued to oppose his regime. During May and June 1967 and January and February 1968, protests broke out in eight of Iran’s institutions of higher education because of complaints about the educational system. Along with simply upgrading the quality of education, their demands included the abolition of newly instituted tuition fees, upgrading of degrees, larger university budgets, and better facilities. Even though these demands were apolitical, the security and police over-reacted and made many arrests. Just as reform in the university system was demanded by French and American students during the unrest of 1968, the shah launched a reform program in the wake of the demonstrations. The shah initiated this reform at the Ramsar Conference for Educational Revolution from 6 August – 8 August 1968. However, he encountered difficulties. The problem of modernization in the universities was indicative of the overall problems that Iran faced by the 1970s. While conservative and religious students found
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the modernization of education threatening, more liberal students and professors believed that the change did not come fast enough. Therefore, the implementation and progress of these reforms were slow, and in many instances they did not happen at all. The outbreak of serious protest in Iran for the first time in five years indicated that student unrest in 1968 was truly a global phenomenon.

Protests by Iranian students were prevalent in Austria. The American embassy in Vienna reported that protest had “become almost a ritual with Iranian students in Austria.” There were between 700 and 900 Iranian students in Austria in 1968, with the most active in Graz. Many were considered to be “career students” and were close to being “professional expatriates from Iran.” Between 150 and 200 students demonstrated the shah’s arrival in Vienna for a medical exam on 10 February 1968. The protesters were mostly Iranians, but they were joined by European leftist students. The Iranian and European students protested the extravagance of the shah’s recent coronation ceremony while Iranian citizens starved, and were also appalled by the torture and execution of political prisoners, lack of freedom, and economic problems. The protest aimed at spreading knowledge of the shah’s brutal regime and to get the Austrians and the rest of the world to understand their cause.

With the growth of Iranian student protest occurring in Western Europe as well as the United States, the shah began to realize that student dissent was a widespread phenomenon. In the middle of March 1968, the shah told Armin Meyer that he believed Iranian student protesters
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in the United States were Communist inspired. However, while recalling Iranian student demonstrations in the United States just before his death in 1980, the shah genuinely believed that the oil companies and the CIA were involved in “fomenting and financing” the activities of Iranian students in the U.S and that “This effort acquired a professional polish over the years that students could not have achieved on their own.” One must conclude that the shah temporarily scaled back his suspicions from the early and mid 1960s because he was beginning to receive the large amounts of sophisticated American military hardware that he had always desired.

However, student unrest was still a concern to both the American and Iranian governments. By 1968 the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf was definite, and Washington had a great interest in maintaining the shah’s cooperation with other Middle Eastern nations to prevent an increase in the Soviet or radical Arab presence in the region. However, the relationship between Tehran and Washington became temporarily uncertain when Johnson announced on 31 March 1968 that he would not seek re-election. The amount of support that the shah received from Washington very much depended on personal relationships at the highest level. With men such as Robert Kennedy running for president in 1968, the relationship between the United States and the shah could have shifted. Therefore, the shah had a “feeling of great sorrow and sadness of learning of the President’s decision to not seek re-election.”

---
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The shah made his last visit to the United States with Lyndon Johnson as president in June 1968. During the trip he went to Harvard University where he gave the commencement speech and received an honorary degree. Similar to the UCLA ceremony four years earlier, there was concern over his security. Iranian Ambassador to the United States, Hushang Ansary, was particularly concerned about the shah’s personal safety. The Minister to the Court of the Shah, Amir Asadullah Alam, was worried because a left-leaning Persian daily, Peigham-Emruz, ran a story that criticized the shah’s visit to the campus. A group of student protesters gathered at the ceremony, and their impact that the demonstrators had was disputed by the State Department and the shah’s government. The State Department concluded that the ceremony went well. However, SAVAK chief Rafizadeh was reprimanded by the shah for his lack of ability to control the students. The shah scolded Rafizadeh and said “You are not doing a good job here,” “They lowered our esteem. It was very bad today.” “There must be an end to these barbarians. You have to buy some of them and get rid of the rest. How many times have we said that?”

Harvard was not the only location that Iranian students confronted the shah during the August 1967 visit. The shah was greeted by 100 student protesters upon his arrival at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. He then went to Washington where two or three students with unknown intentions were found loitering outside Blair House just before the shah
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arrived there.\textsuperscript{370} Dean Rusk believed that Johnson’s meeting with the shah was “a useful opportunity to talk with this close and valued friend from the Middle East. With the forthcoming departure of the British from the Persian Gulf, the role of Iran in the area will become increasingly significant.”\textsuperscript{371} As a result of the British departure from the region, the shah became a more valued ally in the eyes of policymakers in Washington, and support for his regime grew stronger.

Iranian students had also been slowly losing any influence they might have on U.S. policy towards Iran since President Kennedy’s assassination. While the Johnson administration tightened its relationship with the shah during his summer 1968 visit, Iranian students also lost their hope for an ally in a future American president. Robert Kennedy, who was a friend to Iranian students and a Democratic presidential candidate in 1968, was assassinated and died on 6 June. The assassination of Robert Kennedy scarred the nation, eliminated one of the most prominent allies of the Iranian student movement, and disenfranchised many members of the Democratic Party. His assassination was a pivotal, yet often overlooked event that greatly impacted the course of U.S. – Iranian relations. The shah breathed a sigh of relief as the Democratic Party fell apart at the seams in the summer of 1968. With the election of the shah’s old friend Richard Nixon to the presidency, he regained an ally in the White House.

While Iranian students had lost influence in Washington, they gained influence among student organizations in Western Europe and the United States. Hamid Naficy, who studied in the United States from 1964 to 1973 and is now a university professor, said that he “…was

\textsuperscript{370} Telegram from the Department of State to the Embassy in Iran, “Shah’s Visit to US,” 13 June 1968, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1967-1969, Box 2215, Folder POL 7 IRAN (6/1/68), RG 59, NA; Document also found in \textit{FRUS 1964-1968, Vol. XXII}, 529.
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intimately involved in the U.S. counterculture movement...” Babak Zahraie, and Iranian student at the University of Washington who faced deportation in the early 1970s, was active in the anti-war movement. While Iranian individuals became involved in the American counterculture and anti-war movement, Iranian student groups became highly involved with American organizations. The ISAUS often participated in events with the Black Panthers. A rather unusual message from the ISAUS was published in The Black Panther by the end of the decade. Most publications by Iranian student groups were primarily critiques of the shah’s government. However, the one-page article written by the ISAUS in The Black Panther had no mention of the shah. The group was throwing its support unquestionably behind the cause of the Black Panthers. This article was most likely an attempt to demonstrate that the ISAUS was a vital component of 1960s radicalism. Also, in return for their support, the ISAUS hoped their support would be reciprocal. The two groups protested together in the following years.

Lyndon Johnson dismissed the concerns of American and Iranian student groups. These concerns included escalating the war in Vietnam, and adopting a policy of largely uncritical support for the shah. Despite this global call for a retreat from imperialism, the Johnson administration sought more intimate relations with the shah. Major shifts on the geopolitical map led Washington to ignore the voices of Iranian students. Washington wanted to limit the effects of Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union and demonstrate to the shah that the United States was a reliable ally. By the late 1960s, the Vietnam War severely curtailed the effectiveness of the American military throughout the world. The Six Day War escalated the level of instability in the Middle East that Washington hoped could be countered by a strong ally in Iran. Also, with the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf, the United States hoped that the
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Shah would be a surrogate for British influence. Further, although this author does not stress economics, Robert McNamara emphasized that “…a large number of jobs and substantial profits are attributable to U.S. military sales abroad.”\textsuperscript{375} As a result, the United States sold Iran $385 million worth of military equipment from 1967-1970, and this figure skyrocketed in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{376}

“Although the Johnson administration had drafted the blueprint, Richard Nixon gave the new U.S. strategic doctrine in the Middle East its name.”\textsuperscript{377} The Twin Pillars policy took on a new form under the Nixon Doctrine. With the continued growth of the shah’s control in Iran, and steady growth in the number of Iranian students abroad, the United States was faced with a growing student movement within its own borders that was adamantly opposed to its policies regarding the shah. Despite their protests, Washington escalated its level of cooperation with the shah in the late 1960s, and this continued throughout the 1970s. The imperatives of America’s Cold War foreign policy were evident in Iran. Washington desired a strong ruler who was anti-communist and who could keep markets open to American business. As a result, U.S. policy makers paid scant attention to the fact that the shah had fallen out of favor with the majority of the Iranian citizens. The rift between the shah and the people of Iran had grown so wide that the CISNU believed that any attempt at reform at this point would be like “trying to heal a bullet wound with a band-aid.”\textsuperscript{378}
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\textsuperscript{377} Douglas Little, American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945 (University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 143.

When Richard Nixon became the thirty-seventh president of the United States on 20 January 1969, the shah breathed a sigh of relief. While the shah had firmed up relations with President Johnson, the brief possibility that a Democratic candidate such as Robert Kennedy or Hubert Humphrey would take up residence in the White House evoked concern in Tehran. The shah knew what he was getting in Richard Nixon. The shah was an ardent supporter of Nixon’s two bids for the presidency in 1960 and 1968. As previously noted, the relationship between Washington and Tehran was ultimately decided at the highest level. While Kennedy was more attuned to the concerns of the Iranian population, including Iranian students in the United States, Richard Nixon was not. SAVAK chief Rafizadeh noted that “Never had I seen him [the shah] so weak as when he met Kennedy, and never so mighty and arrogant as when with Nixon.” U.S.–Iranian relations were shaky in the early 1960s, however, the election of Richard Nixon in 1968 solidified and expanded upon the policy decisions that were made by Lyndon Johnson throughout the middle of the decade.

The shah wrote that his “friendship with Richard Nixon dates back to 1953 when he was Eisenhower’s vice president.” This relationship began when Nixon visited Tehran in December 1953, only four months after Operation Ajax. Nixon’s 1953 trip infuriated Iranian students. Upset that Nixon was given an honorary degree at Tehran University, students at the university staged a massive demonstration on 7 December 1953. Because the shah wanted to “preserve the calm of the university at all costs,” the shah’s troops opened fire on the
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382 Nixon’s 1953 trip to Iran was similar to his 1958 “goodwill” tour of Latin America. Nixon’s car was attacked in Caracas, Venezuela, and the incident highlighted the anger in Latin America regarding American Cold War foreign policy. The protests in Tehran in 1953 highlighted Iranian resentment of American involvement in Operation Ajax.
demonstrators and killed three students. Many more were wounded and several hundred arrested. 7 December was later recognized as “the Day of Solidarity with the Iranian Student Movement,” and is also known as Student Day. The election of Richard Nixon as president combined with the behavior of the shah to exacerbate the already tense relations between Iranian students, the shah, and the U.S. foreign policy establishment.

Nixon’s Middle East policy placed great emphasis on the shah. The Nixon Doctrine was outlined in Guam on 25 July 1969 and called for surrogates to take up the cause of the United States so that American troops would not have to be employed. Nixon’s enunciation of his foreign policy in Guam was first indicated in the plan of “Vietnamization,” which was an attempt to turn the ground fighting in Southeast Asia over to the South Vietnamese. However, the Nixon Doctrine also produced a special relationship between Washington and Tehran that came full circle by May 1972. Even though the Nixon Doctrine was designed to lessen the burden on American troops in Vietnam, its emphasis on regional allies that could uphold American interests was most visible in the Persian Gulf. In the process of applying the Nixon Doctrine to the Middle East, Washington ignored clear warnings of discontent that were voiced by the growing number of dissident Iranian students both at home and abroad.

By 1969, both the shah and Richard Nixon wielded immense power on the international stage. However, the Iranian student movement also exercised great influence after interacting
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and networking with western student movements throughout the 1960s. Just as Berkeley was a hotbed for American student protest, it also played a major role in the Iranian student movement. An Iranian Marxist study group consisting of nationalists, Muslims, and secular leftists was founded in Berkeley in 1966. After interacting with American radicals in the late 1960s, they adopted an exclusively Maoist ideology and formed the Organization of Revolutionary Communists in 1970. The group became a largely influential in Iranian leftist politics throughout the 1970s. The ISA also was highly active in the Berkeley area, and it published articles in numerous student newspapers, including *The Berkeley Tribe* in 1971.

Despite the shah’s attempts, the Iranian student movement remained a force to be reckoned with in the United States and Europe. By the end of the 1960s, about 500 students in the United States were extremely well organized and vocal in their opposition to the shah. These students held meetings, disseminated publications, and held demonstrations, especially during the shah’s visits. Students in the United States, Germany, Austria, and England were “a major irritant to the Shah,” and “strained relations with host governments and have often led to supersecrecy and extremely tight security measures during his trips.” The strenuous opposition of these students towards the shah’s regime led the CIA to believe that the shah would never be able to win student support, and that student resentment of the shah’s authoritarianism would continue to pervade student organizations throughout the 1970s.

The Iranian student movement bore both similarities and differences to those of American and European students. There was a radical drift that took place amongst anti-war and
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black activists in the 1970s. Groups such as the Weathermen emerged out of disenfranchised members of SDS, and militant German left-wingers organized the Baader-Meinhoff Group, or the Red Army Faction. At the same time, SNCC became radicalized by the end of the decade, and Black Panthers severely altered the tone of the movement that Martin Luther King, Jr. once led. Many Iranian students also became radicalized. Maoist ideology peaked in the ISAUS by 1970, and the beliefs espoused by members of the organization were once again shaped by the shah’s foreign policy. When Iran established diplomatic relations with China in August 1971, many Iranian students began to question Maoism. Although Maoism was still present, it lost some influence by 1971.  

Trotskyist groups began to emerge in Great Britain and the United States that consisted mainly of disaffected members of the CISNU who referred to the group’s leadership as “Maoist-Stalinist and bourgeois nationalist.”

The splintering of Iranian student organizations was partially the result of radicalization and the development of organized guerrilla movements such as the Organization of the Iranian People’s Fada’i Guerrillas (OIPFG) and the Organization of the Iranian People’s Mojahedin (OIPM). The OIPFG and the OIPM became highly active by 1971 and had the support of Iranian student groups abroad. The development of an underground guerrilla movement marked the beginning of a new type of struggle that Iranian students became a major part of. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the Iranian left went through major changes. During the mid-1960s much of the old Tudeh and National Front ideologies were left behind in favor of Chinese and Cuban interpretations of Marxism. “By 1971, the transition and revival of the communist movement was complete, and the generational polarisation [sic] between the two strands of

---

Marxists had taken place." For the rest of the 1970s, the Iranian left began to view support for guerilla activity as the only way to determine one’s commitment to the revolutionary cause. The ISAUS gave varying degrees of support to both the OIPFG and the OIPM.

Iranian students continued to intensify their protests throughout the world during 1969, and the connection between anti-Vietnam protesters and anti-shah protesters was intimate. In Austria from 20 January to 22 January, there were vocal demonstrations against American military involvement in Vietnam and American support for the shah. On 20 January the two protests converged in Vienna. The first was a group of 150 to 200 demonstrators who protested American involvement in Vietnam and called for an end to the war and recognition of North Vietnam. The anti-war protesters later conducted a sit-in at the opera house in Vienna where violence broke out when police beat and arrested several demonstrators. They also carried signs that read “Out with CIA Puppets in the Third World.” This sign was relevant to another group of protesters in Vienna who were protesting the shah’s stay there. Between 250 and 300 anti-shah protesters began a march that eventually converged with the anti-war group. Together, they united in protest against American involvement in the Third World, and staged a sit-in close to the shah’s hotel. The convergence of anti-shah and anti-war protesters underscored the truly global nature of the student movement of the 1960s.
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A British newspaper noted that “among Iranians, as with other nations, it is the youth who are taking the initiative.” On 27 January 1969 a group of Iranian students occupied the Iranian embassy in Rome and held it for several hours. Protests also took place in Switzerland when Iranian expatriates protested the shah’s visit. On 5 February 1969, demonstrators marched in front of the Iranian Consulate General in San Francisco. The group consisted mainly of members of the ISAUS, but there were also members of SDS, the American Federation of Teachers, and six members of the Black Panthers.

Iranian student unrest also continued in West Germany. When Prime Minister Hoveyda visited West Germany from 28 April to 30 April 1969, his travels were restricted. He went to Bonn because it was the only city where German authorities could guarantee to control the behavior of dissident Iranian students. The trip was an attempt to undo the damage done during the 1967 visit, but it failed. Following Hoveyda’s trip to West Germany, the Iranian Student League in Frankfurt issued a call in its monthly publication to Iranian students both in Iran and abroad to work for the overthrow of the Pahlavi regime because of “increasing persecution by the Shah.”

401 Telegram from Department of Sate to American Embassy in Tehran, “March Against Iranian San Francisco Consulate General,” 6 February 1969, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1967-1969, Box 2220, Folder POL 17 IRAN – US, RG 59, NA.
402 Airgram from American Embassy in Tehran to Department of State, “Iran/Germany: Prime Minister Hoveyda’s Visit to Germany,” 19 May 1969, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1967-1969, Box 2216, Folder POL 7 IRAN (12/1/69), RG 59, NA.
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Demonstrations occurred in Iran that stressed improvements to Iran’s education system in 1967 and 1968, and more protests broke out in 1969 as a result of a large increase in bus fares. However, the largest demonstrations still occurred abroad because of the constant surveillance by SAVAK. The American embassy predicted that demonstrations and manifestations would continue to occur and become more embarrassing and threatening to the shah’s regime.  

Large demonstrations occurred when the shah made a five-day visit to the United States in late October 1969, and there was tightened security because both the American and Iranian governments were concerned about possible embarrassments. There were also special preparations made by the ISAUS leading up to this visit. On 20 September there was a meeting held at the Iran House in New York City. The meeting was led by Bijan Mosahebnia, Ghasem Ali Eskandary, Ali Zareyan, Bijan Mohajer, Dr. Khosro Parsa, Cyrus Yeganeh, Abdol Hamid Zarbakhsh, and Hassan Zevarei, who were all members of Iranian student organizations in the United States. Dr. Parsa was identified as the primary organizer in the New York area. Fazlollah Bazargan, Dr. Tahirpour, and Ahmed Massoud were also present, and they were leaders of the protest movement in California. Abdol Hamid Zarbakhsh and Mehrdad reportedly went to Italy to recruit radical Iranian students studying there to come to the U.S. to participate in the demonstrations.
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the demonstrations. It was also expected that Arab and Ethiopian students would participate in demonstrations in New York and Washington.\footnote{Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, “Shah Visit Planning – Security Measures,” 9 October 1969, Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1969, Box 2216, Folder POL 7 IRAN (12/1/69), RG 59, NA.}

The ISAUS formed committees to better prepare themselves for the shah’s visit, and contacted Iranian students in New York and other major cities to encourage their participation in the demonstrations. Members of the ISAUS also informed the American press of the purposes of the demonstrations and to contact police to secure permission and designate areas for the protests. For visual effect, the students discussed the possibility of producing pictures of the shah to burn and deface in other ways, and of marching in front of the U.N. with chains wrapped around themselves to show solidarity with political prisoners in Iranian jails.\footnote{Very elaborate demonstrations began to take place by the 1970s. One protest in San Francisco in 1973 consisted of a mock gallows scene. To see a picture of this, refer to Fred Lowe, “Iranian Students Acquitted,” \textit{The Guardian}, Vol. 25, No. 44 (29 August 1973), 9.} This information was obtained by a spy within the ISAUS who worked for SAVAK, and given to the Iranian Embassy in Washington. The Iranian Foreign Ministry Fourth Political Division Chief Kazemi then passed the information on to the American Embassy in Tehran.\footnote{AE Tehran to Rogers, “Shah Visit Planning – Security Measures,” 14 October 1969, RG 59, NA.}

SAVAK’s activities in the United States greatly increased by the late 1960s, including the recruitment of student spies.\footnote{For an interview with one of the founders of the CIS in which SAVAK infiltration is discussed, refer to Sullivan, “Interview with ‘Professor Ali’ (pseudonym), in \textit{Exiled Memories}, 187.} The ISAUS recognized that the main objective of SAVAK activities abroad was to infiltrate student organizations.\footnote{ISAUS, \textit{On the Violation of Human Rights in Iran} (Report to the Subcommittee on International Organizations, \textit{U.S. Congress}), (College Park, Maryland: Iranian Students Association in the United States, 1976), 8.} By the mid-1970s it became apparent that there were hundreds of Iranians who were recruited to spy on anti-regime students. One informant, who later published an account of his activities, said that they reported to SAVAK...
agents in the Iranian Embassy in Washington on the activities of Iranian students abroad.\textsuperscript{413} The information given to SAVAK by student informants led Iranian officials to worry about the shah’s security during the October 1969 visit, and special preparations were made.\textsuperscript{414} “Special round-the-clock police ‘fixed post’ protection” was given to the Iranian Embassy in Washington at their request.\textsuperscript{415} There was also special concern given to the security of the Iranian Consulates in New York, and San Francisco, and the Iranian delegation headquarters at the U.N.\textsuperscript{416}

The ISAUS continued its campaign against the shah’s political oppression and human rights abuses when 50 students staged a demonstration on the afternoon of 18 October in front of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, where the shah was staying.\textsuperscript{417} Approximately 75 members of the ISAUS took part in the protest, some of whom attempted to break through the barricades and charge the Waldorf. A fight ensued between members of the ISAUS and the police. The ISAUS stated that they were outside protesting “political repression and violations of human rights in Iran.”\textsuperscript{418} Once again, prominent Americans praised the shah despite the protests of Iranian students. Just one night earlier, New York Mayor John Lindsay presented the shah with a medal marking the centennial of the American Museum of Natural History, and a
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silver cigarette case with the New York City seal on it. U.S. policymakers continued to misjudge the hostility towards the shah. They believed that Iranian student protests were “rather than the strident efforts of dissidents to diminish a record which, by world standards, is outstanding indeed.”

While the American government said that the protests did “little to diminish his prestige in this country,” the shah did not underestimate the importance of the student activities abroad. By the end of the 1960s the shah had consolidated his power and control over political dissent inside Iran, and he tried to do the same abroad. However, because of the political and social conditions in Iran, the number of Iranian students who desired to study abroad continued to grow. Most were seeking a better education and a political voice. There were between 25,000 and 37,000 thousand Iranians were studying abroad in 1970, including up to 12,000 in the United States. According to the records of the Iranian Ministry of Science and Higher Education, in 1970, 41 percent of Iranian students abroad were in the United States, with 28 percent in West Germany, 12 percent in Great Britain, 8 percent in Austria, 7 percent in France, and 6 percent in Turkey. These statistics are more remarkable when compared to other Middle Eastern nations. In 1970, Iran had a population of six million fewer than nations such as Turkey and Egypt. However, Iran had approximately three times as many students studying in the United States. Many became members of groups such as the CISNU. Nikki Keddie noted that “The Iranian
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student movement abroad was by far the largest and most oppositional of any such student movement, and this was due not only to its superior numbers, but also to its political commitment."

The shah had always found organized student opposition abroad to be an irritant. However, on 21 March 1970, the CISNU was declared to be illegal. From this point forward, any member of the CISNU who returned to Iran faced between three and ten years in prison. Despite the ban, Iranian student protest abroad grew throughout the early 1970s. Demonstrations occurred in some unlikely places, such as Finland during the shah’s June 1970 trip. The shah was greeted by 500 demonstrators upon arrival on 22 June. Demonstrations continued through 25 June, when 600 to 700 protested the shah’s presence at a state dinner. American officials worried not only that shah would become irritated, but also about the severity of anti-Americanism that was present in the protests.

One day later, on 26 June, 41 Iranian students in Northern California gathered in front of the Iranian consulate in San Francisco to protest Iranian government’s reaction to the massive bus strikes that occurred in Iran. The demonstrators in San Francisco were also protesting the
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“Banned Students,” *The Economist*, 27 March 1970 in CIS, *Documents on the Pahlavi Reign of Terror in Iran*, 235. For an example of members of the CISNU returning to Iran and getting arrested look into the case of Hossein Rezai. Accounts of his arrest and student reactions to it can be found throughout *Documents on the Pahlavi Reign of Terror in Iran*, including p. 235.
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attendance of Princess Ashraf at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. She was ironically the head of the Human Rights Commission. A struggle ensued between Iranian students and the San Francisco police. The students were all arrested, and as a result, the consulate refused to renew their passports. Accordingly, the ISAUS embarked on a nationwide campaign in their support. Fereydoun Safizadeh, who is now a university professor, remembered the protest: “Outside Iran, it was on the Berkeley campus for the first time that I saw active student opposition to the Pahlavi rule in Iran in the summer of 1970. I saw students fundraising to get fellow students out of a San Francisco prison for attacking the Iranian consulate.”

Protests continued throughout the Western Europe in defense of the bus strike and the arrests in San Francisco. Iranian students in Great Britain had been politically active ever since five of their comrades were arrested after returning to Iran in 1965, and they held numerous demonstrations in early July, protesting in front of the American and Iranian embassies on 12 July. These demonstrations continued throughout the summer of 1970 and included a hunger strike in August.

In August 1970 a situation that involved Iranian students in Germany created some tension between the shah and the United States. The CIS held a meeting in Darmstadt from 31 July to 1 August. Four hundred students attended and the primary reason for the meeting was to organize themselves in opposition to the political conditions in Iran. The meeting took place at Darmstadt Technical College where the group held its meeting and spent the night. The students were in need of a place to sleep, so they asked a Germany military installation for assistance.
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The group ended up receiving cots from a U.S. Evacuation Hospital with the assistance of Bundeswehr officer Wiesbadener Kurier. Following the meeting, the Iranian Embassy in Bonn reported to Tehran that American and German military authorities aided Iranian students. Shortly after, Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Khalatbari called U.S. Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II to express his concern over the incident. While discussing the meeting of Iranian students in Germany, Khalatbari indicated “great GOI sensitivity to activities of Iranian leftist students abroad.” Shortly following the event, a string of protests broke out in Germany. On 4 August about 300 Iranian students staged a protest, and a day later group of about 50 occupied the Iranian Consulate General in Munich.

Later that year, on 19 October, the Iranian government withdrew its ambassador to West Germany, closed its consulate general in Berlin, and reduced its diplomatic and consular staffs throughout the rest of the country. The Iranian government also forbade Iranian students from attending German universities. These orders were the result of the “failure of the present government to crack down on left-wing students here who have been demonstrating against the shah,” along with their protests and occupation of Iranian consulate generals that had been occurring since 1967.
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Collaboration between Iranian and American students continued into the 1970s. Iranian students demonstrated “close cooperation and firm solidarity with the anti-imperialist movement in the U.S.”439 The ISAUS compared the shooting of twenty-eight students on the campuses of Iranian universities to the killing of four Kent State University students by the Ohio Army National Guard on 4 May 1970 in a publication entitled “Iran’s Kent State and Baton Rouge.”440 Much bloodshed occurred in Baton Rouge, Louisiana throughout 1972. In January a gun battle broke out between the police and a group of black Muslims. The shooting resulted in the death of three African Americans and two police officers. In November, another deadly confrontation took place in Baton Rouge on the campus of Southern University. Similar to the events at Kent State, the National Guard was sent in to quell student protests and two black students were killed.441

On 1 September 1970 a joint demonstration was held by SDS, the New York branch of ISAUS, and the Progressive Labor Party.442 The protest was in support of liberation struggles around the world and called for the United States to get out of Southeast Asia and the Middle East. It also called for the end of war-related research, including the closing of the Riverside Research Institute, which was the location of the demonstration. The demonstrators linked the plight of political dissidents in Iran and the African American community and compared the surveillance of the Black Panther Party by the FBI to SAVAK’s monitoring of Iranian students at home and abroad. The protestors argued that the uprisings in Asbury Park and New Bedford
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442 ISAUS, SDS, Progressive Labor Party, (Flyer) Demonstrate: Tuesday, Sept. 1st, 4:30 pm: Meet at 110th St. & Amsterdam: March to Riverside Research Institute (major weapons research facility) 125th St. & Broadway (Students for a Democratic Society, Iranian Students Association in the United States (New York), Progressive Labor Party, 1970).
were the result of high unemployment and intolerable living conditions. Many Iranians faced these same issues.\(^443\)

A CIA study on student dissent in the United States entitled “Restless Youth” reached President Johnson’s desk in September 1968. The CIA also conducted an investigation of student unrest abroad that was completed by September 1970.\(^444\) The CIA report misread the nature of the Iranian dissent to the shah’s regime. While the study recognized that student protest began to emerge in Iran in the late 1960s, especially around issues such as education and public transportation, it argued that the lack of student unrest inside Tehran in the mid-1960s was the result of university graduates obtaining jobs and becoming part of the shah’s bureaucracy. However, the primary reason was that during these years that the shah systematically eliminated all of his political rivals. The shah cracked down on protest in his own country. However, dissent simply emerged in other nations. Consequently, the Iranian student movement became truly global in scope. The transnational nature of the CISNU provided the group with a wide audience to which it could air its grievances. Some of their grievances were related to the shah’s developmental programs, which were decided by, and aimed, at the highest echelons of the Iranian society. Therefore, many students felt no sense of identification with the government. These students “felt that the regime had been taken from them.”\(^445\)

Anti-establishment sentiment was prevalent among students throughout the world by the late 1960s. However, it was especially inflamed in the case of Iranian students, and their sentiment was derived from the fact that there was effectively no political opposition to the shah’s regime. In Iranian universities, there were no political or social organizations, with the

\(^{443}\) ISAUS, SDS, Progressive Labor Party, (Flyer) *Demonstrate.*


exception of “Youth Houses,” which were infiltrated by the SAVAK and its informants. Any dissenters in Iranian universities were either expelled or drafted into the military.\textsuperscript{446} The ISAUS noted that in Iran, “Faculty members, as well as students, are harassed and arrested if they show any kind of sympathy with the resistance movement or object to the crystal clear presence of SAVAK agents in the universities.”\textsuperscript{447}

These problems in Iran created unrest among its student population, and while Iranian students abroad had been some of the earliest student protesters, students at Iranian universities joined in the global student movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. The Iranian government was no longer immune to the domestic protests that were prevalent in other nations. An Iranian newspaper said that “If our youth…in sheer imitation of such eccentric Western subcultures as beatniks and blackshirts and Black Panthers would wear their hair long and grow beards and hang donkey beads over strangely fashioned rags,…then they must be led to the right path and saved from such deviation…These manifestations of protest and defiance totally lose their significance and become a pathetic farce when imitated by Iranian youth who have nothing whatsoever to protest against.”\textsuperscript{448} However, Iranian students actually had much more to protest than American students. To curb the sense of connection between Iranian youths and their Western counterparts, Chief of National Police General Mohsen Mobasser initiated a law that gave the police the power to “apprehend long-haired youth and give them haircuts.”\textsuperscript{449} The law was repealed and Mobasser was replaced by Lieutenant General Jafar Qoli Sadri when police

\textsuperscript{447} ISAUS, \textit{On the Violation of Human Rights in Iran}, 7.
\textsuperscript{448} Airgram from America Embassy in Tehran to Department of State, “A Tonsorial Tragedy – The Fall of Iran’s Chief of National Police,” 10 October 1970, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1970-1973, Box 2378, Folder POL 15-1 IRAN (1/1/70), RG 59, NA.
began to give the wrong people haircuts. When a prominent Iranian painter who lived in Paris
visited Tehran to attend an exhibition of his work sponsored by the Iran-America Society, he was
apprehended by police who cut his hair. Also, Sharam, the son of Princess Ashraf was detained
and given a haircut.\footnote{AE Tehran to DOS, “A Tonsorial Tragedy,” 10 October 1970, RG 59, NA.}

While there were increased security measures at home, the Iranian government also
increased their activities abroad. In late 1970 the CIS urged the British government to take
action against SAVAK agents operating in Britain. The students and numerous media outlets
accused SAVAK of setting the London residence of Ahmad Ghotbi, an Iranian student leader, on
fire because he was writing a book that exposed the activities of SAVAK. Ghotbi also received
four death threats in a one-week period, one insinuating that his house would be burnt if he
attempted to publish his book.\footnote{The Morning Star, 10 October 1970 and 10 November 1970,
The Tribune, 23 October 1970 in CIS, Documents on the Pahlavi Reign of Terror in Iran, 203-5, 209, 220.}

Despite SAVAK activities, protests continued in December 1970 in Britain, West Germany, Switzerland, and Italy.\footnote{“Embassy invaded by students,” The Guardian, 10 December 1970; “Iran students hunger strike,” Morning Star,
11 December 1970; “Students’ hunger strike goes on,” The Observer, 13 December 1970. All found in CIS,
Documents on the Pahlavi Reign of Terror in Iran, 223-4.}

SAVAK increased its operations in Europe and the United States. Cooperation between
the United States and SAVAK became intimate by the 1970s. In January 1971, SAVAK
released the names of 236 Iranian students who were involved in anti-shah activities abroad.
Iranian students referred to this as the blacklist, and it contained the names of members of the
CISNU, along with students in Italy, Germany, the United States, Turkey, and France. The
names of those who led the occupation of Iranian consulates in Munich and San Francisco and
the Iranian embassy in Vienna were also included.\footnote{Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, “Dissident Iranian Students,” 5 January 1971, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1970-1973,
Box 2378, Folder POL 12 IRAN (1/1/70), RG 59, NA.} Iranian students abroad were keenly aware
of the activities of SAVAK. The ISAUS stated that because of the formation of dissident groups in foreign nations, “SAVAK has taken on a significant role abroad, monitoring the activities of thousands of Iranian students in foreign colleges and universities, whose actions are a major source of embarrassment to the Shah.”

Historian Roy Mottahedeh has noted “Demonstrating against the government was a rite of passage without which Iranian university and even high school students felt their education incomplete.” The emergence in the late 1960s and early 1970s of university demonstrations in Iran created a “hyper-sensitivity to criticism in Iran” by the shah’s government. This hyper-sensitivity coincided with the increased radicalization of Iranian students both at home and abroad. During the first week of May 1971, very large and violent demonstrations broke out at Tehran and Arya Mehr Universities. The students protested against the shah’s political oppression and his lavish lifestyle, along with the White Revolution. These demonstrations were put down forcefully, and the American embassy in Tehran believed that they were indicative of anarchistic attitudes among Iranian students, as well as the ever widening gap between the students and the government.

By 1971 the U.S. government noted that the intensification of campus protests in Iran were externally directed and supported. The influence of Iranian students abroad began to have an impact on Iranians at home. The radicalization of the opposition elements presented

454 ISAUS, On the Violation of Human Rights in Iran, 7-8.
455 Mottahedeh, The Mantle and the Prophet, 66.
opportunities for the CIS and well-educated intellectuals studying abroad to exploit political
grievances inside Iran. The American embassy in Tehran was concerned that these anti-
regime activities sought to weaken Iran before the British withdrew from the Persian Gulf in late 1971. The shah demonstrated that he desired to moderate leftist movements in the Persian Gulf when he assisted the Arab regime in Oman. During this war, the interests of the shah and the United States directly collided with the concerns of Iranian students. The ISAUS put out numerous tracts condemning the shah’s military backing of the Sultan of Oman, Qaboos ibn Sa’id, against Marxist rebels in Oman’s Dhofar province in the early 1970s.

While there was an increase in Iranian student protest in the United States and Western Europe in the late 1960s, countries previously unaffected by their protests bore witness to the worldwide struggle against the shah’s regime by the 1970s. In the summer of 1970, Iranian student groups formed in Montreal and Vancouver and by 1971 the Canadian government became concerned about their activities. Canadian authorities became concerned when Empress Farah traveled to Canada in June 1971. Officials in Ottawa told all consulate posts not to issue any visas for a two week period, unless they were members of the foreign ministry, in order to keep Iranian activists out of the country during her visit. American officials also recommended that security agencies in the United States inform Canadian authorities if they

461 ISAUS, Dhofar (San Francisco, CA: Iranian Students Association in the United States and Arab Student Organization in Northern California, 1974); ISAUS, The Solidarity of the Iranian People’s Movement with the Omani Revolution (College Park, Maryland: Iranian Students Association in the United States, 1976).
462 Matin-asgari, Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah, 119.
became aware of any suspicious activities or movements by Iranian student groups in the United
States.  

Over the last decade, the Iranian government had been concerned about Iranian students
not returning to Iran. There were many reasons for the “brain drain” phenomenon. Iranians
often had better opportunities abroad, and Iranian student activists faced danger if they returned
home. Bahram Molla’i Daryani was a leftist-leaning Iranian student who studied in the United
States from 1963 to 1967 and was a member of the executive committee of the ISAUS. After
returning to Iran Daryani faced the “excess zeal by SAVAK.” Daryani’s leftist politics upset
the shah, and this led him to tell a French correspondent that “concerning anti-Iranian activities,
American and British intelligence networks are working together with the communists.” While
discussing Daryani, Foreign Minister Zahedi told Ambassador MacArthur that the shah’s
opinions were still influenced by the early 1960s, especially Robert Kennedy’s 1962 meeting
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463 Telegram from American Embassy in Tehran to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, “Limitation of Canadian Visa Issuance to Iranians During Empress’s Visit to Canada,” 9 June 1971, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1970-1973, Box 2378, Folder POL 7 (6/3/71), RG 59, NA. The United States and Canada cooperated on the Iranian student issue. After Babak Zahraie was cleared of violating of immigration laws, the only issue that remained was whether or not he could be charged for not having the proper papers when he travelled to Canada in the fall of 1971. Refer to Mike Kelly, “Iranian Student in U.S. Wins Partial Victory,” The Militant, Vol. 36, No. 9 (10 March 1972), 21.


with a group of Iranian students from Georgetown.\textsuperscript{467} The recollection of incidents that occurred a decade earlier by a man who was no longer living led MacArthur to say that the shah had a split personality and an “elephant-like memory about what he considered past slights.”\textsuperscript{468} When Alam was asked if he believed that the United States was working with anti-shah groups, he replied that “there was some feeling in certain quarters (he did not specify) that we might do more to curb demonstrations and activities of radical Iranian students in the U.S.”\textsuperscript{469} MacArthur also noted that the shah’s sensitivities were “unquestionably wounded by demonstrations of radical Iranian students in US and elsewhere abroad.”\textsuperscript{470}

The ISAUS continued to protest the shah’s brutal regime, and the living conditions of the Iranian people. Still, Pahlavism in the United States was still prevalent in the United States.\textsuperscript{471} The ISAUS sought to reverse the tide of Pahlavism, and William Sullivan later noted that “the stridency of the protests and the multiplier effect created by those young Americans who supported the Iranian students had introduced a new picture of the shah to much of the American electorate.”\textsuperscript{472} While Iranian students had little impact on American foreign policy, they did believe that “the C.I.S. has been greatly successful in bringing to the Western public attention the true nature of the Shah’s regime, its dictatorial oppression and fascist control and suppression of

\textsuperscript{472} Sullivan, \textit{Mission to Iran}, 25.
the slightest opposition, both inside and outside Iran.” The CISNU also gained much support from American and European intellectuals such as Jean-Paul Sartre.473

The radicalization of Iranian students was partly driven by the shah’s lavish lifestyle and oppression of political opposition amidst poor living conditions in Iran. The shah held an extravagant ceremony on 15 October 1971 at the ruins of Persepolis to celebrate the 2,500th anniversary of the Persian empire. In order to glorify his own rule, neglect the Islamic history of Iran, and further secularize the nation, the celebration declared the Pahlavi regime the inheritor of the 2,500 year old Persian empire that dated back the reign of Cyrus the Great. The shah planned to build a 160 acre city over the ancient ruins of Persepolis to celebrate the emergence of Iran onto the world stage as a major political, economic, and military force.474 The CIS had over 1,000 members at the University of California at Berkeley, and about 250 of them demonstrated outside the Iranian Consulate in San Francisco on the same day as the ceremony.475 During the demonstration the consulate was bombed with a plastic explosive equivalent to 120 sticks of dynamite. Although nobody was injured, the blast caused $500,000-$900,000 worth of damage to the consulate, and it was strong enough to “bend trees.”476 There was a controversy over who was responsible for the bombing. While Kent Stephen Wells, a non-Iranian suspect was apprehended, his guilt was questioned, and he was ultimately released. Many speculated that a group of Iranian students planned the bombing in order to draw negative publicity to Iran the

473 Iranian Students Association of Northern California, The Regime of the Shah Steps Up Political Repression in Iran as it Prepares for the Celebration of the 2500 Year of the Iranian Monarchy (Berkeley, California: Iranian Students Association of Northern California, 1 October 1971), 1. Hereafter referred to as ISANC.
474 Ledeen and Lewis, Debacle, 21-2. Many world leaders attended the event including Vice President Spiro Agnew.
475 “Iranian Consulate on Coast Blasted,” NYT, 16 October 1971, p. 4. One of the most active branches of the ISAUS was its Northern California chapter.
same day the lavish ceremonies were taken place. However, a letter from U.S. attorney James L. Browning, Jr. to Ardeshir Zahedi on 12 June 1973, almost two years after the incident occurred, indicated that the bombing was not solved.477

Amidst this atmosphere of discontent, the Iranian government continued to crack down on subversives, and this affected American citizens. Sharon La Bere, an American nursing student from Oakland, California, was arrested tribunal on 9 November 1971.478 The Iranian government believed that she was sent to Iran with funds from Iranian students in the United States to contact guerrilla fighters. If convicted she could have faced ten years in solitary confinement. She was engaged to an Iranian student named Akbar Vahedian who lived in San Francisco. La Bere claimed she was in Iran to visit relatives of her fiancé. She was exonerated of the charges. However, she admitted to participating in anti-shah demonstrations in the United States and was sentenced to three years in jail because she acted against the national security of Iran.479

Despite the growing protests by anti-shah students abroad, and the complications that arose throughout the early 1970s, the Nixon administration continued to emphasize the importance of its relationship to the shah. Nixon and Kissinger believed that the shah’s leadership in the Persian Gulf fulfilled the objectives of the Nixon Doctrine. With the British out of the Gulf by late 1971, the United States feared having to deploy additional forces to the Middle East and Indian Ocean regions. Nixon believed that the shah would be a good surrogate for British power in the region. This special relationship further antagonized opponents of the

477 Letter from U.S. Attorney James L. Browning, Jr. to Iranian Ambassador to the U.S. Ardeshir Zahedi, forwarded to Department of State, 12 June 1973, General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files 1970-1973, Box 2381, Folder POL 17 IRAN-US (1/1/70), RG 59, NA. A day earlier, on 14 October 1971, the Iranian Student Association headquarters caught fire. The Metropolitan Police believed that this was done by SAVAK or by the local Organization of Arab Students.
478 “Iran Opens Military Trial of U.S. Woman as a Spy,” NYT, 10 November 1971, p. 8; “U.S. Woman is Sentenced by Iran to a 3-Year Term,” NYT, 17 November 1971, p. 15.
479 “U.S. Woman is Sentenced by Iran to a 3-Year Term,” NYT, 17 November 1971, p. 15.
shah’s regime, which by the early 1970s had become a very large segment of Iranian society. According to the ISAUS, “their anti-imperialist, anti-reactionary battle is currently directed against the puppet regime of the Shah of Iran and its principal supporter, U.S. imperialism.”\textsuperscript{480}

The view that the shah was a puppet of the United States “increased in scope today to fulfill the ‘Nixon Doctrine’ as the Gendarme of the Persian Gulf.”\textsuperscript{481}

On 30 May 1972, on their way back to Washington from a summit in Moscow, Nixon and Kissinger stopped in Tehran to reaffirm their relationship with the shah. Iranian students studying abroad were discussed at the meeting, and Nixon asked the shah, “Are your students infected?”\textsuperscript{482} However, the main talking point of the meeting was military hardware and the role of the shah in the Persian Gulf. At the meeting, Nixon asked the shah to “Protect me,” by becoming a surrogate for American power in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{483} Consequently, the shah was given a blank check to purchase all the nonnuclear weapons that the United States had to offer. Against the wishes of the Defense Department, the decision made by Kissinger and Nixon “effectively exempted Iran from arms sales review processes in the State and Defense Departments” and “created a bonanza for American weapons manufacturers, the procurement branches of three U.S. services, and the Defense Security Assistance Agency.”\textsuperscript{484}

For the rest of the shah’s rule, decisions regarding the acquisition of military equipment were essentially left up to the Iranian government.⁴⁸⁵

The ISAUS realized the importance of the trip when they noted that “A decision by President Nixon in 1972 allowed the Shah to buy virtually any weapons he wanted.”⁴⁸⁶ The ISAUS also recognized that as a result of this agreement, “The Iranian economy was soon flooded with American capital, the military with American guns, planes, and bombs, and American capitalists’ pockets were soon bulging at the seams with Iranian oil profits.”⁴⁸⁷ The agreement reached between Nixon and the shah on 30 May 1972 solidified the role that Iran played in the Twin Pillars policy that had been conceived in the final year of the Johnson administration, further developed with the Nixon Doctrine, and finalized in Tehran in May 1972. In the eyes of the Nixon administration, if peace and stability along with Western interests in the Persian Gulf were to be maintained, the “principal burden must fall on Iran.”⁴⁸⁸

Protests occurred in the United States and Iran as a result of the stop in Tehran. ISA spokesman Fahad Bibak reported that the CISNU “initiated the call for May 30 protest actions to coincide with Nixon’s arrival in Iran.”⁴⁸⁹ Protests were arranged in Washington, Chicago, and San Francisco. The Washington-Baltimore area ISA organized a demonstration that consisted of more than one hundred participants in the nation’s capital. The demonstrators shouted chants that included “U.S. get out of Iran, U.S. get out of Vietnam.”⁴⁹⁰ An ISA statement argued that “The present trip is to consolidate the ‘Nixon Doctrine’ in Iran. Despite its failure in Vietnam,
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[it] remains the basis of U.S. foreign policy…" In this instance, the reading of the situation by the ISA was remarkably keen.

Violent protests also occurred in Iran during Nixon and Kissinger’s stop in Iran. Bombings occurred in Tehran, demonstrating that as the United States entrenched itself as an ally of the shah, opposition to his regime was growing stronger. By 1972 there was not only active and vocal opposition by Iranian students abroad, but there was also a large degree of internal dissent developing in Iran. Since 1970, there had been a serious rise in violence caused by the “youth underground.” The Iranian government believed that the youth underground was linked to organizations outside of Iran. Government officials also noted that the development of an Iranian “alienated youth” movement, “are part of a pattern that has become familiar elsewhere in the world.”

While Iranian student organizations consistently attacked the shah’s regime, anti-Americanism continued to grow stronger in their publications following 1972. Iranian students abroad saw themselves as a literal front in which U.S. foreign policy could be attacked. The ISAUS believed that “Iranian students are playing an effective role in exposing the U.S. backing of the Shah’s dictatorial regime. This in itself is a significant obstacle to the smooth implementation of the Nixon Doctrine in the Middle East.” Iranian student protests were aimed as a counterattack to American foreign policy and domestic Pahlavism in the United States. The ISAUS hoped that “Public knowledge of widespread opposition might call into
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question the nature of American involvement in the Middle East and set the stage for widespread public protest similar to the movement against the war in Vietnam.\footnote{ISAUS, Iran’s Kent State and Baton Rouge, 6.}

The public denunciation by American citizens that Iranian students envisioned never came to fruition, and the bond that the shah and President Nixon formed was very strong and continued throughout the rest of the shah’s life. However, even though U.S. – Iranian relations were stronger than ever, they strengthened amidst the rising tide of Iranian student protest abroad. Throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, Iranian student protest was a clear indication of the severity of the shah’s authoritarian rule and the fragile foundation on which U.S. – Iranian relations rested. The flawed Twin Pillars policy had become a foundation of American foreign policy and this further infuriated Iranian students. The ISAUS believed that the shah’s “mission in life within the context of the Kissinger doctrine, is to maintain the status quo for the imperialistic interests in the area.”\footnote{ISAUS, Dhofar, 3.} The ISAUS believed that the “Vietnam Nixon-Kissinger Doctrine of ‘let Asians fight Asians’ has been translated in the Gulf region into ‘let Iranians fight Arabs.’”\footnote{ISAUS, Dhofar, 3.} With increased animosity between Iranian students and the intimate relations forged between Washington and Tehran, protests throughout the United States and Europe continued to grow throughout the 1970s as revolutionary sentiment in Iran reached a fever pitch. With the Yom Kippur War and the subsequent oil boom, the number of Iranian students grew by leaps and bounds. Thus the problem of Iranian students in the United States became an even more explosive issue. The increased number of Iranian students in the United States led American policymakers to question the principle tenets of its student exchange programs. However, it did not lead them to question their foreign policy regarding Iran.
CHAPTER V – CONCLUSION

While the increased radicalization of the Iranian student movement bore similarities with its American and Western European counterparts, it demonstrated an important difference. Many scholars of the American student movement of the 1960s argued that it achieved no real political change. Richard Nixon, vice president during the conservative 1950s, was president by the end of the 1960s. The social and cultural issues that the student movement believed in, such as women’s rights, gay rights, African-American civil rights, and environmental protection, were the real legacies of the 1960s. In contrast, the Iranian student movement did contribute to a revolution that ousted one of the world’s most powerful monarchs. While the outcome of the Iranian Revolution was unpalatable to secular nationalists and moderate Islamists, many Iranian students played a large role in creating and maintaining the revolutionary momentum that boiled over in late 1978.

American foreign policy played a consequential role in giving the Iranian Revolution a severely anti-American tone. The May 1972 trip had an important impact on both American foreign policy and Iranian students. For years, Washington had many chances to rethink and revise its policy regarding Iran. The Kennedy administration did rethink its policy. However, the policies that Kennedy encouraged the shah to enact created negative results and radicalized both the secular left and the Islamists. Although the Johnson administration faced many challenges early on as a result of Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union and vocal student protest, the relationship between the shah and Washington was consolidated around the time of the Six Day War. By 1967, “Clearly, the more peaceful and optimistic days when ISAUS leaders appealed to the better judgment of Kennedy and other ‘leaders of the Free World’ were
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As a result of a possible Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union, the impact of the Six Day War on Middle Eastern politics, the effects of the Vietnam War on the mobility of American forces, and the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf, the strategic relationship between Tehran and Washington grew deeper. During this time, Iranian student protest indicated that the shah’s regime was unpopular, and that the chosen course of American foreign policy under Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon would bring negative consequences. Despite these indications, by the Nixon administration entrenched its foreign policy in the Middle East to the fate of the shah in May 1972.

Throughout the Cold War, the U.S. government’s policy concerning Iranian students was based on the acceptance of three basic ideas. First, that Iranian students studying in the United States served the national interests of both nations. Second, that a laissez faire attitude would produce maximum benefits for both the United States and Iran. Third, “when it comes to students more is better.” However, by 1977, officers at the U.S. consulate in Shiraz noted that many of the students came to the United States to avoid military service, along with other obligations and restrictions in Iran. In many instances, studying in the United States offered the students “the promise of escape more than a promise of fulfillment.”

A special conference of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA) on 21 October 1977 in Asheville, North Carolina recognized that foreign students in the American university system became a “big business” and that Iranians had become the largest group present in the United States. The influx of Iranian students to American colleges

---

became especially apparent after the oil boom that occurred in Iran following the Yom Kippur War in October 1973. The number of Iranian students in the United States went from approximately 15,000 in 1970 to nearly 35,000 in 1977.503

The deepening ties between Washington and Tehran also produced controversial relations between U.S. agencies and SAVAK. In an interview with Mike Wallace on “60 Minutes,” the shah publically acknowledged that there were SAVAK agents on duty in the United States. The shah said that SAVAK was “checking up on anybody who becomes affiliated with circles, organizations hostile to my country.”504 In March 1977 a story broke that indicated that the Chicago Police Department had been conducting and elaborate spying operation on Iranian students for seven years.505 Not only did the Chicago Police Department monitor the activities of the two hundred member ISAUS branch in Chicago, but SAVAK spied on Iranian students through the department.506 According to one former intelligence officer, “The first thing a developing country does is send off students to be educated…the second thing it does is send intelligence agents after them to make sure they don’t become radicalized and return to challenge the government.”507 No nation exemplified this more than Iran.
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Even though Jimmy Carter used human rights as a platform in the 1976 election and it was central to thinking, Iran seemed to be treated differently than other nations because of their vital strategic and economic importance. The ISAUS believed that Carter’s human rights policy was “nothing but a mirage, camouflaged to fool our people...”\textsuperscript{508} The Carter administration reaffirmed “support for a strong Iran, noting that Iran’s security is a matter of the highest priority for this country.”\textsuperscript{509} The reality of Carter’s Iran policy led the ISAUS to believe that “The main thrust of Carter’s international policy as it regards Iran is to preserve U.S. imperialist domination over Iran and the Persian Gulf.”\textsuperscript{510} While approximately two hundred Iranian students protested outside the White House in Washington on 31 December 1977, Jimmy Carter was spending his New Year’s Eve in Tehran where he toasted the shah by reiterating Kissinger’s belief that Iran was an “island of stability in one of the more troubled areas of the world.”\textsuperscript{511}

By 1977, the inertia of the policy that began around 1967 was too much to stop. William Stueck noted that “In most government settings, short of a disastrous turn of events or overwhelming evidence of such a turn on the horizon, policymakers tend to hold rather than alter established policy.”\textsuperscript{512} Jimmy Carter and his predecessors missed the overwhelming evidence that Iranian students abroad provided them. William Sullivan, referring to some of the younger members of Congress, said that “They were more closely attuned to the younger generation, which reflected the dissidence of Iranian students and their American sympathizers.”\textsuperscript{513} These younger congressmen warned Sullivan and other American politicians and diplomats of the
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political problems in Iran, and while some senior members of the House and Senate were also aware of these problems, they “tended to discount them because they had heard them on several previous occasions in the long regime of the shah.”

While in 1963 only 25 students were highly dedicated to the protest movement, there were between 3,000 and 4,000 that dedicated to the movement 1977. While the shah’s visits to the United States consistently brought Iranian students to the streets in protest, his November 1977 visit was explosive, and raised serious concerns in Washington. This protest demonstrates that the legacy of the 1960s was carried on by Iranian students abroad. When discussing the protests with a New York Times correspondent, one White House guard said, “Welcome to the 60s.” The anti-shah group was tenacious in its demonstrations and police responded by spraying the tear gas into the group of students. Remembering the events of 15 November 1977, Jimmy Carter said:

“On the south lawn of the White House, I stood and wept. Tears were streaming down the faces of more than two hundred members of the press. It was a memorable moment. In the distance we could hear the faint but unmistakable sounds of a mob, shouting at the mounted police who had just released canisters of tear gas to disperse them.” “That day – November 15, 1977 – was an augury. The tear gas had created the semblance of grief. Almost two years later, and for fourteen months afterward, there would be real grief in our country because of Iran.”

Carter’s recollection of the events is telling, and the incident was remembered by all who were involved. While the November 1977 events were indicative of growing unrest in Iran the real
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augury stretched far beyond that one day, back to 1960 when the Iranian student movement abroad became politicized. The Iranian student movement was an augury of revolution.

Despite the proximity of Iranian student protest to the nation’s capital, many American officials failed to realize how deep anti-shah sentiment ran in Iranian society, even though Iranian students protested real concerns at the highest levels of government. The ISAUS issued a statement in September 1976 on human rights abuses in Iran to the U.S. Congressional Subcommittee on International Organizations. There were even approximately fifty masked Iranian students at Ambassador William Sullivan’s confirmation hearing in 1977. While there were staff members of the Senate and House committees during the Carter Administration who were “alert to the political dissidence reflected in the actions of the Iranian students and to the possibility that this could embroil the United States disadvantageously,” their concerns were ignored. Instead, they continued to be considered a “major irritation to the regime,” instead of a sign of a flawed policy.

So what were the beliefs of Iranian students studying in the United States by the late 1970s? The CISNU as a unified group had split at the group’s Sixteenth Congress in 1975. Even though the group attempted to reunify in 1977, it never fully did. This split of the CISNU occurred for numerous reasons. Those that supported the Tudeh Party left the group a year earlier. The Maoist bloc disagreed with the National Front factions because they believed that they were not real revolutionaries. The National Front group had split based on varying support of guerrilla movements but agreed on their dislike of the Maoists. The ISAUS occupied the
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middle ground between the National Front and the Maoists. Even though they were primarily
Maoists, they agreed on many issues with the National Front.\footnote{Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 143-4.} The issue of guerrilla warfare
further split the groups. Mohammed Eghtederi, a spokesman of the ISAUS, noted that the group
was also split ideologically. The beliefs of the ISAUS ranged from the belief that Iran should be
ruled by a Muslim majority, to those who simply opposed American involvement in Iran. All the
groups were bound together in their desire to obtain the “freedom and liberty of Iranian society,”
which included “no foreign domination,” and a republican government.\footnote{Linda Charlton, “Shah’s Visit Underscored Large Number of Iranian Students in U.S.,” \textit{NYT}, 21 November 1977, p. 10.} Another spokesman,
Vahid Ahmad, stated that they were “fighting for a democratic government,” and that “whatever
form it takes is not this organization’s position to say.”\footnote{Charlton, “Shah’s Visit Underscored Large Number of Iranian Students in U.S.,” p. 10.} The fragmentation of the student left
was indicative of a lack of cohesion in the Iranian left as a whole. Without unification, the left
was unable to mount a successful push for power in Iran.\footnote{Refer to Maziar Behrooz, \textit{Rebels Without a Cause: The Failure of the Left in Iran}.}

The rift that became apparent as early as the mid 1960s between secularists like Fatemi
and Islamists like Qotbzadeh became wide open by early 1978. The Organization of Iranian
Moslem Students (OIMS) became very active in anti-shah activities in the United States by
1976.\footnote{For a compilation of OIMS publications refer to \textit{The Rise} (English Defense Publication) and \textit{Leaflets in English} (Wilmette, Illinois: Organization of Iranian Moslem Students, April 1979).} By late 1977, the Islamists gained the upper hand with the students in the revolutionary
movement. Prior to this transformation, secular leftists were the leaders of the opposition
movement, however they “lost their hegemonic role to a rival Islamist tendency.”\footnote{Matin-asgari, \textit{Iranian Student Opposition to the Shah}, 160; this is also discussed in Hoveyda, \textit{The Shah and the Ayatollah}, 28.} Anthony
Parsons, the British Ambassador to Iran in the late 1970s, was told by a well-informed professor
at Aryamehr University that about 65 percent of his students were inspired by Islam and 20
percent were inspired by communism. The remaining 15 percent who were neutral “would always side with the Islamic group if it came to trouble.”

Some Iranian students abroad returned home to Iran in the late 1970s to participate in anti-regime activities. The opportunity to participate in the revolution had the potential to be the culmination of a student movement that came of age during the 1960s. Beginning in the fall of 1978, especially by October, university students instigated and led many of the anti-shah activities. *Time* magazine argued that “the American experience in the ‘60s is one of the main influences on Iranian campuses.” One professor in the late 1970s stated that “Several of my radicalized colleagues are veterans of 1968 in the West and have been waiting ever since to repeat the experience at home.” After the Jaleh Square massacre on 19 September 1978, the Iranian military was ordered to refrain from opening fire on demonstrators. As anti-shah demonstrators realized that they could protest without being fired upon, they became bolder. “They developed tactics of fraternization with the troops, and young female students began placing flowers in the muzzles of their weapons.”

However, not all students desired to take part in revolutionary activity. The escalation of chaos during the fall of 1978 created a dramatic rise in the number of student visa requests. During the first half of the visa year, which lasted from April to September, a record number of
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students for a six month period requested student visas.\textsuperscript{538} There was a dramatic increase in the number of Iranian students who transferred from Iranian universities to schools in the United States amidst widespread closings of Iranian universities.\textsuperscript{539}

With the outbreak of revolutionary activity in Iran by the fall of 1978, the United States was in a predicament, and the shah’s regime crumbled with remarkable speed. The shah tried to save his regime by forming a civilian government headed by Shapour Bakhtiar on 29 December 1978, but the shah fled Iran on 16 January 1979. Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Iran on 1 February 1979, and the Bakhtiar regime fell on 11 February. By the end of March the new Islamic Republic of Iran had been officially established, and the left was systematically eliminated.

The political dissent that was embodied by Iranian students, and the Islamist tendencies of students in Iran, culminated on 4 November 1979. A group that called themselves Students Following the Line of the Imam stormed the American embassy in Tehran, took U.S. government documents, and held the personnel hostage for 444 days. 66 Americans were initially held hostage, with 52 remaining in captivity for the duration of the crisis. This sequence of events created a level of animosity between the United States and Iran that has not been resolved by the twenty-first century. After the onset of the hostage crisis, Iranian students in the United States encountered difficulties. There was a ban on student protest in front of the White House in fear that any harm done to Iranian protesters in the United States could provoke a
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retaliatory response to the hostages in Iran. President Carter ordered all Iranian students in the United States to report to the INS to have their visas checked.\textsuperscript{540}

Therefore, Washington’s inability to recognize the protests of Iranian students in the 1960s had drastic consequences for American foreign policy, the shah’s regime, and the situation of Iranian students in the U.S by the 1970s. While the American policymakers dismissed the calls for reform by Iranian students in the 1960s and early 1970s, the students clearly reflected the growing unrest within Iran. Because they represented such a large segment of Iranian society and were the only group that could actively speak their minds, their opinions were more valuable and representative of the population than U.S. policymakers tended to believe. Also, the impact that they could have on U.S. – Iranian relations, which was made apparent with the outbreak of the Iranian Revolution, was greatly underestimated. Many Iranian students abroad were determined to bring about political change in Iran, and were vocal in their opposition to the shah from the United States and Western Europe. While Iranian students lived in democratic societies, their expectations grew along with their radicalism. Three of Khomeini’s more liberal associates during the revolutionary period were foreign educated. These included Abol Hassan Bani-Sadr who was educated in Paris, Ibrahim Yazdi from Texas, and Sadeq Qotbzadeh who attended Georgetown University and was a large part of the student movement in the United States in the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{541}

In 1982 the ISAUS assessed the situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and concluded that they were proud of the “Iranian people’s victory over US imperialism…” and they believed
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that the revolution “ended the rule of one of the most brutal regimes in the world, and further exposed to the world the reactionary polices of the US.” 542 One of the major goals of the ISAUS by the late 1970s was “overthrowing the Shah’s regime and kicking out all imperialists from Iran.”543 Authors Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin argue that there were no partial victories available to the anti-war movement in the United States; “the movement would either force the United States government to end the war, or it would fail.” 544 However, the Iranian student movement did achieve a partial victory. While the movement’s goal of overthrowing the shah was accomplished, they failed to assist in the implementation of a form of government that was any more liberal than the shah’s regime. The ISA argued in 1982 that “after three years, everyone realizes the emptiness of the regime’s promises,” and that “The Islamic Regime…has brought society to the brink of collapse.”545 The leftist tendencies of the Iranian student movement of the 1960s in Iran were not realized because of a fractured coalition.

Payman Piedar, who studied in the United States in the mid to late 1970s, articulated how the secular left was alienated when Khomeini came to power. While studying in the United States, he was a staunch supporter of the Organization of the Iranian People’s Fada’i Guerrillas. While initially a Marxist-Leninist, he became influenced by Maoism and Guevarism. Piedar believed that the return of Khomeini to Iran was a counter-revolution against the forces that initiated the revolution, and that the establishment of the Islamic Republic was a death sentence for the organized left. He emphasized that the shah’s regime was hated, however, the Islamic regime was a severe impediment for progressive change in Iran.546 Secular leftists like Piedar
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did not desire the establishment of a theocracy in Iran. Many Islamists, including Khomeini’s more moderate associates who had studied abroad, also had contention with the route that the revolution took. Bani-Sadr was eventually impeached in 1981, and Qotbzadeh was executed in 1982 for supposedly plotting against the government.\footnote{Refer to Abol Hassan Bani-Sadr, \textit{My Turn to Speak: Iran, the Revolution & Secret Deals with the U.S.}, trans. William Ford. McLean (Virginia: Brassey’s, Inc., 1991); Jerome, \textit{The Man in the Mirror}.} Therefore, despite one of the most explosive revolutions of the twentieth century, the ideals of the majority of Iranian student protesters from the 1960s were unrealized. There is once again a burgeoning Iranian student movement in the twenty-first century.

The impact of collapse of the shah’s regime on U.S. foreign policy was drastic. Following the Iranian Revolution, hostage crisis, the Iran-Contra affair, the Iran-Iraq War, and two invasions of Iraq, the United States has failed to find a reliable Muslim ally in the Middle East. In the 1960s, the intersection of Iranian student protest and American foreign policy served as an ever-present reminder that U.S. policy in the region was flawed. However, consecutive administrations in Washington made many decisions, highlighted by Nixon and Kissinger’s May 1972 trip to Tehran, which further entangled the future of U.S. foreign policy in the region with the fate of the shah. While historian Jeremi Suri argues that détente was a conservative reaction to the international unrest of the 1960s, it is difficult to apply this paradigm to U.S. – Iranian relations. Instead, the tightening of U.S. – Iranian relations was a pragmatic policy decision that was the result of \textit{Realpolitik} philosophy. With the threat of Iranian rapprochement with the Soviet Union, the weakening of American military capabilities after the Vietnam War, the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf, and the alteration of Middle Eastern politics following the Six Day War, policymakers in Washington viewed the shah as the guardian of the Persian Gulf.
The Iranian student movement evolved at the same time as American policymakers were forging a closer relationship with the shah. During this time, they became intimately involved in the global protest movements of the 1960s. Iranian students and members of SNCC took part in sit-ins contemporaneously. In the first half of the decade, Iranian students were in the vanguard of student protest. Anti-shah demonstrations helped instigate the German student movement, and by the end of the decade they were joined by, and protested alongside groups such as SDS and the Black Panthers. During the 1960s the ideologies of Iranian students abroad became radicalized. While at first National Front and minimal Tudeh influence was present, Maoism and Guevarism became prevalent by the end of the decade. By the 1970s support for guerrilla warfare became the way to measure one’s commitment to the revolutionary cause. The radicalization of the Iranian student movement took place among both secular leftists and Islamists. While the two groups cooperated in the 1960s, divisions emerged by the 1970s. Just as the student protestors of the West attempted to forge a new political discourse in nations such as the United States, France, and Germany, secular leftists as well as Islamists developed their own alternatives to the status quo in Iran. Because of American foreign policy, the new political discourse in Iran contained a high degree of anti-Americanism. The ISAUS argued in the late 1970s that “one of the major responsibilities of Iranian revolutionaries is to sharpen and deepen the attacks against the regime and the U.S.”\textsuperscript{548}

Throughout the 1960s, Washington had many opportunities to rethink and revise its policy with Iran. However, there was such a fundamental misunderstanding of Iranian culture, and a complete disregard of the desires of the Iranian citizenry, that it continued to tighten the relationship with the shah. Even the progressive-minded Kennedys, who questioned the shah’s leadership and who attempted to revise its policy, ended up encouraging a reform effort that
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further radicalized the opposition. Towards the end of Johnson’s administration, the blueprint for American foreign policy regarding Iran was written. Every decision regarding U.S. – Iranian relations from that point forward reinforced the widespread notion among Iranian students abroad and large segments of the Iranian population at home that the shah was a puppet of Western imperialism. Even as Iranian students were joined by the global student movement of the late 1960s, and their activities reached a fever pitch by the 1970s, Washington further entrenched itself with the shah. As students became a major factor in revolutionary activity, American policymakers could only speculate whether they would have had better fortunes if they heeded the calls of secular nationalists during the previous decade. As the U.S. government recognized, Iranian students abroad were a conglomeration of discontented Iranian citizens who were united in their hatred for the shah. During the 1960s their numbers grew, and by the 1970s, as less wealthy Iranians began to study abroad in larger numbers, they represented a microcosm of Iranian society that eventually toppled the shah’s regime. Students abroad were also one of the only outlets for political dissent by Iranians, because of the severe political oppression inside of Iran. However, the United States made the same mistake that the shah did in believing that student discontent was only present in “a small handful of foreign-inspired troublemakers.”

This belief contributed to twenty-five years of U.S. support for the shah’s regime which had extreme repercussions for American foreign policy, the politics of Iran, and for Iranian students abroad. Contrary to the beliefs of the shah and policymakers in Washington, the Iranian student movement was very large and influential. Piedar noted, “most of the revolutionary cadres from the 1950s through the 1970s had risen from this very movement.”

---
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Figure 17. Anti-shah students confront police during the shah’s November 1977 visit. Tear gas was used to subdue the demonstrators. Source: Linda Charlton, “Clashes and Tear Gas Mar Shah’s Welcome in Capital,” New York Times, 16 November 1977, p. 19.

Figure 18. The tear gas that was used on the group of Iranian students depicted above drifted over to the White House lawn, and caused Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter to cry. The tear gas later affected the shah and members of his entourage as well. Source: Linda Charlton, “Clashes and Tear Gas Mar Shah’s Welcome in Capital,” New York Times, 16 November 1977, p. 19.
Figure 19. The battle lines are drawn; Anti-shah demonstrators line up on the near side Pennsylvania Ave. while pro-shah demonstrators stand on the lawn in front of the White House. Source: George Tames, “Carter Lauds Shah on his Leadership,” *New York Times*, 16 November 1977, p. A12.