

**Homa T. Nasab, The Foundational History of Museums in Iran
Viva Voce, 16 December 2009**

Tim Stanley (V&A Museum) and Mohammad Ali (aka Homa) Katouzian (St. Anthony's College, University of Oxford) served as Homa Nasab's Viva Examiners on December 16, 2009. They had scheduled her doctoral exam without the prior knowledge of/ confirmation from her supervisor, Prof. James W. Allan. The Examiners' Joint Report was submitted (received by The University Office) on February 2, 2010. Based on objections from Nasab and her supervisor, the Report was sent back to Stanley and Katouzian and re-submitted & approved by the Faculty of the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford, in April 2010. The following is Nasab's response to the final version of her Examiners' official Joint Report which she submitted to the Faculty of the Oriental Institute as well as six Pro-Vice Chancellors at the University of Oxford, at the end of February 2011.



Stan & Ali @ the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford - Photo courtesy A Chump at Oxford (1940), Hal Roach Studios starring Stan & Ollie (Stan Laurel & Oliver Hardy)

Tim Stanley & Mohammad Ali (aka Homa) Katouzian - The topic of this thesis inevitably involves the political as well as cultural history of the period concerned. As already noted, however, regarding these aspects the study suffers badly from major errors of fact and judgment, historical anachronisms, etc. Such errors have been detailed in the appendix to this report which too has the endorsement of both examiners.

The candidate therefore needs to acquire an up-to-date and realistic account of the political cultural history of Iran between the late nineteenth century and the abdication of Reza Shah. And ALL that she needs to do in this regards is to use a few recent sources on the period:

Ervan Abrahamian's Modern Iran
Nikki Keddie's Modern Iran, Roots and Results of the Revolution
Homa Katouzian's The Persians

Homa Nasab - Stanley and Katouzian have already questioned my use of Abrahamian as a reliable source hence I don't understand how they can ask me to re-read his writings. [Please see the section on Taqizada, p. 17 of this report.]

I am astonished by the fact that my Examiners have failed to note my repeated references to Nikki Keddie's works, including *Modern Iran*, throughout my text [one random example: footnote 72, p. 35].

In other words, ALL I need to do is read Katouzian's *The Persians* in order "to acquire an up-to-date and realistic account of the political cultural history of Iran between the late nineteenth century and the abdication of Reza Shah"? NOTE that Katouzian's book was published six months AFTER I had submitted my thesis and two weeks before I sat for my Viva, on December 16, 2009.

APPENDIX to The Examiners' Report

Stanley & Katouzian - Ruznama here means diaries, nor newspaper.

Homa Nasab - *First, I take it that they mean 'not' rather than 'nor.'* Second, I have double checked my citation and the author of the source - Prof. Abbas Amanat, the Chair of Iranian Studies at Yale University - refers to *Ruznama* as 'newspaper' or 'gazette'. He also serves on the Advisory Council of *Iranian Studies*, a journal that is edited by Katouzian.

Stanley & Katouzian -

“

p. 28

Note ***however that Kazemzada never returned to Iran under Reza Khan/ Reza Shah,***

and soon after his accession became a guru in Switzerland.

”

Homa Nasab - Why allocate SEVEN lines to this *factoid*? I have already explained, "Kazemzada settled in Berlin at the end of the First World War and published a journal called *Iranshahr* (a Sasanian name for Iran) from 1922-27 [p. 47]." AND "In 1936, Kazemzada left Germany for Switzerland where he spent nearly three decades pursuing philosophical interests until his death in 1962 [footnote 55, p. 46]."

Stanley & Katouzian - 'Historic Golden Age' or idealised ancient Persia?

Homa Nasab - I don't understand why this is presented as an 'error'? This phrase is based on a QUOTATION from A.D. Smith and John Hutchinson's *classic* anthology on the study of *Nationalism* (Oxford: OXFORD University Press, 1994) which I have also included in my footnote. One example of my use of this term reads, "*Bringing Ctesiphon back to Tehran was a feast of reviving the splendour of Iran's 'Golden Age'*" (footnote: Hutchinson, *Nationalism*, p. 123. Hutchinson writes that the idea of a nation is based on "a set of repetitive 'mythic' patterns,

containing a migration story, a founding myth, a golden age of cultural splendour, a period of inner decay and a promise of [moral] regeneration [footnote: 454, p. 157]).” In addition, references to a nation’s Golden Age in studies of nationalism are so common that some even consider them clichés.

Stanley & Katouzian – ‘The National Museum of Iran’ was called ‘Museum of Ancient Iran’ until the revolution of 1979.

Homa Nasab - What is the meaning of this? I refer to this institution as *Muze-ye Iran-e Bastan* (which **means** the Museum of Ancient Iran) on FIFTY-NINE separate occasions, throughout my thesis. In addition, I am afraid that my Examiners’ statement is incorrect: the institution was referred to **both** as The National Museum of Iran as well as the Museum of Ancient Iran (*Muze-ye Iran-e Bastan*).

Stanley & Katouzian – Either Shahzada or Hazrat-e ‘Abdol’zim, not Emamzada.

Homa Nasab – Why do I keep getting the impression that my Examiners insist on continuing to mislead their readers? Here, they are alleging that I have mistakenly called Abd al-Azim (in Qom), an Emamzada [descendant of an Imam]. He WAS an Emamzada; and, as I have already explained in my thesis, one of more than 450 that are buried in Qom. My Examiners’ preference for *Hazrat* [a reverential title used to address religious figures] reflects that of the Islamic Republic of Iran’s. In addition, from the outset, I introduce Abd al-Azim as “*Shahzada (or Emamzada) Abd al-Azim in Rayy* [p. 32]” and continue to do so throughout my thesis. *I have, nevertheless, changed all titles to Shahzada [descendant of a king/shah].

Stanley & Katouzian – The slogans Liberte, etc. Were not introduced by Mehdiqoli Hedayat. He was a devoutly religious man and hated people like Voltaire.

Homa Nasab - Citation please. If Hedayat did not introduce this slogan in Iran, then, WHO did? [The answer is Sur Esrafil.] However, I have deemed this factoid unnecessary and deleted it from my text. ‘W’ should not be capitalized in ‘Were.’

Stanley & Katouzian – You may find his memoirs, Khaterat va Khatarat a useful historical source.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, “*Between 1903-1905, Mehdi Qoli widely travelled across Europe, the United States, Russia, Japan, China, and India the proceeds of which he published in two autobiographical accounts* (Footnote: Hedayat’s published accounts of his life and travels include: Mehdi Qoli Hedayat, Mokhber al-Saltana, *Safarnama-ye Makka*, Tehran: Entesharat-e Tiraj, 1304 (AH) (1886-87); and, *Khaterat va Khatarat*, Tehran: Zavar, 1965) [footnote, 34, p. 40].”?

Stanley & Katouzian – Reza Shah did not ‘select’ Hossein Pirnia as head of the legislature in 1906 (when he was a Cossack trooper) or any other time. Neither Hossein nor his brother Hasan Pirnia agreed with Reza Shah’s dictatorship and, shortly after his accession, they retired from politics.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, “*The younger Pirnia was elected to every session of the Parliament from 1906 until his forced retirement by Reza Shah in 1925. Like his elder*

brother; Pirnia dedicated his retiring years to producing at least one often-sited A Short Survey of the Economic Conditions of Iran, published three years prior to his death in 1945 [p. 42].”

Also, when I write a *select* group of Iranian notables, I think it is quite clear that the term (select) refers to my selection of cultural figures whom I have chosen to introduce in my Chapter I – Scholars & Intellectuals, Dealers & Collectors.

Stanley & Katouzian – Significantly for your analysis, Davar committed suicide in 1937, for fear of being murdered in jail like Teymourtash, Sardar As’ad, Friuz Mirza, etc., or be disgraced, like Forughi, Taddayyon, etc., or be executed like Mohammad Vali Khan Asadi, and almost all the early supporters of Reza Khan/ Reza Shah.

Homa Nasab - Citation please. I appreciate that conspiracy theories run riot in Middle Eastern Studies. Have there ever been concrete proof for any of these claims? Were they disgraced? Yes. Or, forced into retirement? Yes. However, this unsubstantiated analysis is rather dizzying. Nevertheless, I have added a footnote stating that Davar was driven to suicide. **I take it that they mean Firuz and not Friuz.*

Stanley & Katouzian – Ta’lim o Tarbiyat and Amuzesh o Parvaresh both mean Education.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, “By 1925, he had initiated the publication of the widely read and remarkably long-lived journal *Talim o Tarbiyat (Instruction and Education)* that was distributed by that Ministry.” AND “After Hekmat’s tenure, the journal’s name changed to *Amuzesh va Parvaresh (Education and Development)*, a title it carried until the 1979 Revolution [p. 43].”

Stanley & Katouzian – Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli = The National Heritage Society.

Homa Nasab - In his *Encyclopaedia Iranica* article on the subject, Isa Sadiq who was one of the organization’s FOUNDERS calls *Anjoman-e Asar-e Melli*, the National Monuments Council which is what I do throughout my thesis.

Stanley & Katouzian – Taqizada voted against Reza Khan becoming shah. Later he joined his government, and finally, in 1934, went into exile for fear of his life.

Homa Nasab - I have never claimed/written anything about anyone voting for Reza Khan to become Shah. This is a very specific and loaded topic that has no place in my thesis. I write, “*He [Taqizada] expressed his initial impression of Reza Shah, which at first reflected that of many of his contemporaries [p. 46].”*

Stanley & Katouzian – Taqizada was not the leader of the ‘liberal’ party. There was no such party.

Homa Nasab - Since my Examiners [Katouzian] do not agree with my source, I have deleted this reference from my text. HOWEVER, please see: “I now subjoin a translation of the essential parts of a petition addressed by the leaders of the **Liberal Party in Persia** a month ago to the foreign representatives at Tehran...” Source: “A Petition from Iranian Reformers to the Foreign Representatives in Tehran in 1892,” in *Manchester Guardian*, April 20, 1892,” in **Nikki Keddie**, *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Iranian Tobacco Protest of 1891-1982*, p. 152.

Stanley & Katouzian – His [Taqizada’s] notion of modernisation was very different from Reza Shah’s (see his memoirs).

Homa Nasab - Taqizada DID serve as Reza Shah’s Ministers of Roads & Transport, and later, of Finance. Again, we have already been through this!

Note: According to Abbas Milani (Professor of Iranian Studies at Stanford University), “When Reza Khan became the new shah of Iran, Taqizada became one of his closest and most trusted advisors and ministers in spite of the fact that in the Parliament he had opposed the law that ended the Qajar dynasty and installed Reza Shah as the new king (Abbas Milani, *Eminent Persians: the men and women who made modern Iran, 1941- 1979*, Syracuse University Press, 2008, pp. 324-25).”

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 47

E.G. Browne, not Brown.

“

Homa Nasab - What is the point of my Examiners dedicating SIX lines to identify a typo? They do this throughout their Joint Report – this should explain how they managed to fill EIGHTEEN pages of ‘criticisms.’

Stanley & Katouzian – In 1935 Foroughi was dismissed and disgraced because he had pleaded with the Shah to spare Asadi’s life.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, “*One of Asadi’s daughters was married to Mohamad Ali Foruqi who fell out of favour with Reza Shah when he tried to save his father in law’s life* [footnote, 744, p. 259].” My Source? **Mohammad Ali (aka Homa) KATOUIAN**, “State and Society under Reza Shah,” in Atabaki & Zürcher, *Men of Order: authoritarian modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, p. 33!

Stanley & Katouzian - The latter was the nayeib toliyat of the shrine in Mashhad, where a crowd had gathered in a Mosque to peacefully protest the shah’s order that all men wear the European hat, and were gunned down.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, “*Asadi was a representative in the Parliament who, in February 23rd 1926, was appointed the NAYEB TOLIYAT of the AQR [Astan-e Qods-e Razavi] and began his work on March 16th 1926* [p. 259].” WHY do my Examiners keep ‘introducing’ ideas that I have explicitly defined in my thesis? I see no need to include this factoid in my writing. However, IF I were to include it in my footnote, then, I would need their source to describe the public demonstrations in the Mashhad Shrine Mosque as ‘peaceful.’

Stanley & Katouzian – Note however that in 1935 Teimurtash was murdered in jail on the Shah’s order.

Homa Nasab – Why ‘note’ or ‘however’? What does it mean when I write, “*Many, including [Cyrus] Ghani, claim that Teimurtash was murdered while in prison. “He was accused and convicted of corruption, bribery and misuse of foreign currency regulations. Less than a year later, Teimurtash died in prison [footnote 73, p. 51].”*

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 78

Check dates: Galustian was born in 1869 and graduated in 1887?

”

Homa Nasab – WHO is Galustian? *Let me get this straight:* half a dozen ‘experts’ in Iranian Studies have read this report and NO ONE has asked WHO is Galustian? Could they mean Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian whose Foundation happens to have endowed a Chair of Armenian Studies at the Oriental Institute?

And, the answer is YES. According to Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian was born in 1869 and graduated from the King’s College, in London, in 1887.

Stanley & Katouzian – Damghan, not Damqan.

Homa Nasab - Based on my research, (unlike for example, the historic city of Rayy) there are no standardized (consistent) transliterations for this (city) name. It has been spelled: Damghan, Damgan or Damqan.

Stanley & Katouzian – Do you think that the claim that all 20th century Iranians were of the Aryan race and spoke a single language was a true description of the Iranian identity?

Homa Nasab - *What is the point of posing this high school-level trick question?* What does this proposition have to do with what I have written on this page, or anywhere in my thesis? I have devoted extensive parts of my thesis discussing Iran’s multi-culturalism especially as it relates to the founding of Museums of Anthropology in Tehran and in the regions.

What does it mean when I write, Reza Shah “*homogenized the country’s multi-cultural identities from the very start of his rise to power. He achieved this end, first, through the pacification and settlement of tribes by sheer force, and later, by forging a centrally-dominant culture. The year of his coronation as Iran’s newest King of Kings (1926), the government adopted “one nation, one country, one language” as its motto [p. 142].*” Once, again, my Examiners are presenting a random and vague ‘proposition’ that is designed to mis-lead their readers to believe that I have made grave judgements of error, and have failed to take into account extremely basic and necessary facts. **Why do they insist on doing this consistently throughout their report?**

Stanley & Katouzian – Who was Djalal?

Homa Nasab – What does it mean when I write, “*In the presence of one thousand guests, the President of Columbia University (Nicholas Murray Butler), the Persian Ambassador to the United States (Mirza Shaffar Khan Djalal), and the most renowned Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages (A.V. Williams Jackson) delivered addresses, and exchanged telegrams between the governments of Iran and the United States [p. 124].*”

Stanley & Katouzian - Note that the proceedings of the Ferdowsi millennium were not published because it included an article by Taqizada who by 1935 had been in exile.

Homa Nasab -

- I) I have cited at least one book that was published based on the proceedings of the Ferdowsi millennium; it can be found at the Sackler Library, in Oxford!
- II) As I have explained throughout my thesis, these types of elaborate exhibitions and events produced a great number of publications that were translated into different languages, including Persian. The Ferdowsi celebrations of 1934 were no exception.
- III) My Examiners may be referring to the lack of availability of a Persian translation of one of these publications, in Iran, at the time.
- IV) Even in that case, numerous contemporary Iranian publications, including the state-sponsored *Ettelaat* newspaper, published lengthy multi-part, illustrated articles on the Ferdowsi conference and exhibitions.

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 137

Breadth, not breath.

“

Homa Nasab - Thank you for claiming yet SIX more lines to point out a typo.

Stanley & Katouzian - “Reza Shah performed his part heroically,’ while no historian has applauded his tribal policy and some have described it literally as ‘genocide’ (read for example some of Cronin’s works on this).”

Homa Nasab - I appreciate that irony often does not translate well textually. However, considering that my analogy was presented in the following context (of nationalism’s theatricality), one would think that it is quite obvious what my I meant; “Since foreign interference and domestic tribal rebellion were dividing Iran into geographical and social fractions, unification of the masses was perhaps the most highly rated play on the international stage during the first half of the 20th century [p. 142.]” I have accordingly deleted ‘heroically’ from my text.

Also, my Examiners surely must have noted that I had unfortunately referenced Stephanie Cronin’s highly problematic ‘works’ in my writing. *I feel like a ping pong ball that is being bounced back and forth between Katouzian and Cronin, for nearly two (if not four?) years. What

is going on here? Is Iranian Studies so dysfunctional that there are only half a dozen writers publishing works in the field? Or, is this purely a symptom of academic nepotism?

Stanley & Katouzian - Mirza Saleh Shirazi, for example, is referred to by Nasab as 'Mirza Sala Shirzi' which is just plain wrong and shows a surprising ignorance of how the name Saleh is written Persian."

Homa Nasab - Do I really deserve to be addressed in this derogatory manner by a pair of old men just because I misspelled the ending of someone's middle name - from a language which does not have a standardized system of (Persian-English) transliteration?

*I won't even bother to ask why these two old men (Stanley and Katouzian) have not referred to me as Miss or Ms. Nasab in their *official* Joint Report. I am beginning to wonder whether exercising common courtesy is a thing of the past, at Oxford University?

Stanley & Katouzian - The coronation took place in 1926.

Homa Nasab - I appreciate my Examiners pointing out this typo where I mistakenly write 1925. I have referenced Reza Shah's coronation on SIX separate occasions throughout my thesis; this is the only time that I have made this mistake.

Stanley & Katouzian - Mirza Saleh, not Sala. The h is pronounced.

Homa Nasab - I have already been subject to a bizarre soliloquy regarding this misspelling.

Stanley & Katouzian - Sani' al-Dawla had been dead for decades when the National Library was opened.

HN -

- I) I have ALREADY stated in my thesis that he had DIED in 1911, more than three decades prior to the official opening of the National Library, in 1944. I write, "*The Hedayat Brothers, Morteza Qoli (Sani al Dola, 1856-1911) and Mehdi Qoli (Mokhber al Saltana, 1864-1955) were the grandsons of the country's poet laureate and Qajar courtier, Reza Qoli Khan.*" [p. 39]
- II) I have clearly introduced his role as someone who had helped to *set the foundations* of a National Library in Iran. Again, as I have explained in great depth throughout my thesis: after the initial introduction of their concepts, the actual creation of cultural institutions in Iran took years to manifest themselves.

Stanley & Katouzian - Mas'uddiya Palace had been presented by Mas'ud Mirza Zel al-Soltan to Reza Khan as a means of protecting himself.

Homa Nasab - Reza Khan came to power following a *coup d'etat* in 1921 and was crowned King in 1926. Mas'ud Mirza Zel al-Soltan, the son of Naser al-Din Shah Qajar, had DIED in 1918. Do my Examiners mean that he needed to protect himself from the GRAVE? Once again, I am afraid that I cannot allow Iranian-style paranoid conspiracy theories (bereft of ANY logical or historical proof) to infect my doctoral dissertation.

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 155

Bagh-e Melli = National Gardens

“

Homa Nasab - The literal translation of Bagh-e Melli is, indeed, National Gardens. However, the term PARK was introduced around this time and it continues to be referred to as such, to this day: *Park-e Melli*.

Stanley & Katouzian - Re ‘citizen formation’ and ‘the public museum was created to host the general public,’ please note that there were over 80 percent peasants, ninety percent illiterates and probably only 5 percent with a minimum of education, only half of whom lived in Tehran.

Homa Nasab - **Which words in my thesis have my Examiners actually understood?**

What does it mean when I write, “*It must be noted that the process of standardizing a coherent, identifiable and accessible system of visual communication was of utmost importance in a country with a very high percentage of illiteracy among its population [p. 141]*”

OR

When I continue to reiterate, “*During the period approximately between 1916 and 1944, some fifteen public museums were created across the country. Tehran led the way by hosting the largest number of museums, with Mashhad, Qom, Shiraz and Esfahan producing at least one such institution each. The intense proliferation of museums expanded into many regions, since by the 1930’s, the state had plans to institute new or additional museums in other cities, including Tabriz, Ahvaz and (again) Esfahan. ...Many of these projects were, however, suspended due to the events of the Second World War but were picked up again during the second Pahlavi era (1941-1979). Hence, by the very start of the 1970’s, no fewer than forty-five museums and over two hundred cultural organizations were established throughout Iran. These institutions covered the gamut from visual arts, dance, film, poetry, literature and festivals. Tehran, Esfahan, Qazvin, Bandar Abbas, Gorgan, Abadan, Ardebil, Tabriz, Mashhad, Susa, Hamedan, Yazd, Rezaiya, Miandoab, Khoy, Rasht, Kashan, Haft Tepe, Shiraz, Sanandaj and Saqaz, among other places became host to at least one museum & a complimentary or supporting cultural institution, each [p. 299].”*

This is the ENTIRE premise of my thesis.

Stanley & Katouzian - More explicitly Reza Shah abdicated in the wake of the Allied occupation of Iran, but it is by no means certain that his abdication was ‘forced’ by the Allies.

Homa Nasab - Citation please. Katouzian’s allegiance to this interpretation of the history of his own country, Iran, is very curious. However, as an (Iranian-born) American I don’t wish to engage with this type of idiotic rhetoric.

Stanley & Katouzian - In fact: 'The Language Academy of Iran'

Homa Nasab - I write, "*the Academy of Persian Language (Farhangestan-e Zaban-e Iran), also known as the Iranian Academy of Culture* [footnote: Cyrus Ghani, P.24]." Would my Examiners PLEASE just come out of the closet and explicitly state if they have personal issues with the authors of some of my (especially living) sources, in Iranian Studies? It would be much more graceful than to continue to debunk MY writing. I have explicitly footnoted my reference in an often-cited text by Cyrus Ghani, *Iran and the Rise of Reza Shah from Qajar Collapse to Pahlavi Rule* that is published by Katouzian's own publisher, I.B. Tauris.

An example of a civilized response would read something like, "*We don't find this author's writing particularly reliable. You may want to consider so & so's text of such and such date on this topic more useful.*" Unfortunately, there are no signs of such conduct to be found anywhere in my Examiners' Joint Report. Nor was it apparent during my one hour and forty-five minutes long Viva.

Stanley & Katouzian - 'Minister of Culture' Hakimi: in fact Minister of Education (and fine arts) which was then known as Vezarat-e Ma'aref va Sanay'-e Mostazrafa.

Homa Nasab - What is the meaning of this? I have introduced the Ministry of Education, Endowment and Fine Arts (*Vezarat-e Ma'aref va Sanay'-e Mostazrafa*) on the THIRD page of my FIRST chapter and continued to do so, in at least TEN different places, throughout my thesis.

Stanley & Katouzian - Traditionally, the first Iranian artist to go to Europe and learn their techniques was Mohammad Zaman in the 17th Century. Many had followed him before Kamal al-Molk.

Homa Nasab – Thank you for introducing yet another FACTOID. However, where in my thesis have I stated that Kamal al-Molk was the FIRST Iranian artist to visit Europe? I have written that he founded "*the first European style academy of fine arts in Iran... [p. 183]*"

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 185

Hakimi 'minister of culture' again.

”

Homa Nasab - AGAIN, we have ALREADY been through this!

* During my Viva, “Dr. No” Stanley embarked on a fervent rant about my translation of ‘ma’aref’ as ‘culture’ stating that it can only mean ‘education.’ At some point, even Katouzian blushed and interrupted him, “*Well, actually, ma’aref can also be translated as culture.*” Yet, what do we read in my Examiners’ Joint Report? “[*Nasab's*] text is littered with infelicities... For example, *ma’aref* is translated as ‘culture’ when it actually means ‘education’, as in *Ministry of Education, not Ministry of Culture.*” A perversion that they continue to repeat throughout their Joint Report.

Stanley & Katouzian –

“

p. 190

Note that Khayyam’s 1934 mausoleum, while perfectly sound, was demolished in 1963

and the present ‘monument’ was erected in its place. Attar’s was and still is the traditional mausoleum.

”

Homa Nasab - What is the point of allocating TEN lines in their Report to present these FACTOIDS?

- a) I have ALREADY written, “*Nearly two decades later, a newly erected memorial was created for Omar Khayyam on the original site designed by Iranian architect Houshang Seyhoun (1920-) and sculptor Master Abd al-Hasan Sadiqi (1894-1995), in 1963 [pp. 190].*”
- b) These may be relevant if only for inclusion in one of my footnotes. The only reference, in my thesis, on Attar reads, “*The [National Monuments] Council’s additional projects were the setting up of Mausoleums for Sa’di (Shiraz, 1945-52); Avicenna (Hamadan, 1949-1954); Nader Shah 1955-63); Farid l-Din Attar (Nishapur, 1960-1963); Qaffari Kamal al-Mollk (Nishapur, 1960-63); in addition to some dozen other monuments to celebrate the contributions of indigenous and international figures to Iranian heritage [p. 191].*”
- c) The National Monuments Council has already been the subject of a dissertation by Talin Grigor: see my Bibliography and Footnotes.
- d) My period covers c. 1910’s-41 and does not concern later dates – although I do take them into consideration when deemed critical to relevant discussions.

Stanley & Katouzian - The trans-Iranian railway project was a white elephant, built by spending the then colossal amount of \$150 million, with very little gain for decades to come. The money was raised by imposing a crippling excise tax on the large majority of the people. Roads could have been built instead of much more cheaply and usefully.

Homa Nasab - The context of my reference to trans-Iranian railways reads, “*Patrick Clawson, in his study “Knitting Iran Together,” figures that despite the tremendous challenges that Iran faced at the start of the 20th century, the low cost of transport contributed to the process of centralization of nearly every aspect of her social, cultural, economic and political life. This factor also played a considerable role in the state’s subsequent attempts at unifying various regions and homogenizing their indigenous populations. These cultural policy choices were reflected in every aspect of contemporary cultural developments, including the founding of national/regional museums [p. 192].*” Source: Patrick Clawson, “Knitting Iran Together: The Land Transport Revolution, 1920-1940,” *Iranian Studies*, Summer/Fall 1993. *Iranian Studies* is EDITED by Katouzian. IF I were to include my Examiners’ additional information about this subject in a footnote, I would need their citation to this particular ‘information.’

Stanley & Katouzian - Museum’s visitors; How many and who? The last time I visited it was 2006, and my friend and I were the only visitors. I wonder what it was like in 1935.

Homa Nasab – Only a pair of characters who have never conducted research in Iran would request an “audience development data/information” file on a museum (*The Museum of National Arts (Muze-ye Honar-haye Melli) Tehran*) in that country, from the 1930’s in that country. The only exception is the Shrine Museum in Mashhad whose details I have already discussed.

Stanley & Katouzian - The longest reigning Iranian shah was the 16th century Shah Tahmasp of the Safavids.

Homa Nasab - Yes, by three years. Thank you, I have corrected this.

Stanley & Katouzian -

“

p. 216

Again, ‘minister of culture’

”

Homa Nasab - AGAIN, yes, this is third (or is it the fourth?) time that my Examiners have introduced the same pseudo-error. We have already been through this: see translation of *ma’aref* as *culture* and *education*.

Stanley & Katouzian - Foruqi was a scholar rather than an intellectual.

Homa Nasab - What does this mean? I have introduced Foruqi as “*one of Iran’s most illustrious reformers and thinkers* [p. 48].” Also, I would appreciate the Examiners’ definition of an ‘intellectual’ in the context of early 20th century Iranian history. It seems that we have different notions of this concept. I have already presented mine.

Stanley & Katouzian - Si-o-Sa Pol was otherwise known as Pol-e Allahvardi Khan, and was apparently commissioned by him (check).

Homa Nasab – Thank you for presenting Yet ANOTHER FACTOID that had no place in my thesis. However, my only reference to this bridge (*Si-o-Se Pol*) is as a geographical anchor to introduce: “*The [Vank] Cathedral and its adjacent Museum are located just south of one of the city’s most celebrated monuments, Si-o-Se Pol* [p. 230].” In addition, this Bridge may have been commissioned by Allahvardian, but it was constructed under the patronage of Shah Abbas I who has (officially) been credited as its commissioner.

Stanley & Katouzian - Military Academy not ‘Officers’ College (also p. 235).

Homa Nasab - Point taken. However, in many instances – especially in popular media -, the Academy was also referred to as the Officers’ College.

Stanley & Katouzian - The Gendarmerie was (as in France) a paramilitary rural police force. They were merged with the Cossack Division to create the new army which they called Qoshun – not a new police department.

Homa Nasab - Deleted - I have deemed this factoid unnecessary.

Stanley & Katouzian - Reza Khan's religious pretensions were tactical and short-lived. He did not simultaneously try to limit the ulama's power.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write:

“For most Iranian reformists, secularization of governmental institutions was an integral aspect of modernization. This counter-religious attitude was effectively enforced in the passing of a number of legal measures, especially the 1934 Law of Endowment. Qanun-e Oqaf gave full control of the country's extremely powerful and rich religious institutions over to the central government [p. 32]”

AND

“At the time of his rise to power, in February 1921, one of Reza Khan's biggest challenges was to counter or neutralize - contingent on one's choice of interpretation - the religious (Shiite) tenets and rituals which had governed the lives of Iranians from the time of the Safavids' rule (1501-1722). Several scholars have discussed the vigilant steps that the founder of the Pahlavi Dynasty took to demonstrate his loyalty to Islam, at the start of his rule. After 1927, however, the state's relationship with religious authorities broke down as military, financial, legal, and educational reforms marginalized the ulama's presence, from their long reign at the centre of power. Reza Shah's swift move toward secularization brought about major alterations of “lifestyle, family loyalties, sexual habits, social manners, modes of leisure, artistic and literary taste, and historical perspective [which] were shaped by distinct indigenous patterns.” Hence, institutions like museums which had notably come to be identified as “secularized spaces of ritual” were the ideal medium to facilitate this transmutation of one type of religio-spiritual and communal pageantry (albeit one with well-ingrained historical roots) unto other socio-secular types [p. 145]”

My thesis is FILLED with similar analyses of Reza Shah's attitude toward religion. Hence, WHAT exactly is the point of my Stanley & Katouzian's objection/ statement?

Stanley & Katouzian - But in the 1930's he even banned the Moharram mourning, even rowzakhani.

Homa Nasab - Why 'but' and 'even'? 'But' and 'even' allege that I am ignorant of this fact. What does it mean when I write, *“After 1927, however, the state's relationship with religious authorities broke down as military, financial, legal and educational reforms marginalized the ulama's presence from their long reign at the centre of power [p. 144]”*? A fact that I continue to reiterate and explicate throughout my thesis!

Stanley & Katouzian - It was not the state but Sheikh Abdol-Karim Haeri Yazdi and his students who created the hawza in Qom.

Homa Nasab - *Let me get this straight:* In Stanley and Katouzian's own words, Reza Shah was so corrupt and anti-religion that he:

- a) ***Drove his own ministers to commit suicide;***
- b) ***His system of government, in the first decade of his rule, was dictatorial;***

- c) *And in the second*, absolute arbitrary rule;
- d) *His* religious pretensions *were tactical and short-lived*;
- e) *He did not* simultaneously *try to limit the ulama's power*;
- f) *And, in the 1930's he even* banned *the Moharram mourning, even rowzakhani*.

OK(?)!

But, then, why are my Examiners now claiming that the Grand Ayatollah Hajj Sheikh Abdolkarim Haeri Yazdi (1859-1937) was a completely **free** and **independent** agent to found an ecclesiastical centre (*hawza*) for training Shi'ite clerics in Iran's most religious city, purely based on his own accord?

*And, do the above (Stanley and Katouzian's OWN) statements not prove my earlier point which they have disputed, "*From the very first year of his rise to power as the Minister of War and later Prime Minister (1921-1925), Reza Khan simultaneously expressed enthusiastic interest in upholding the country's religious traditions, while introducing schemes to immediately gain control of the management of the same religious institutions' affairs.*" [p. 246]?

***Stanley & Katouzian - Taqizada, while believing in a certain kind of modernisation, never blamed Iran's backwardness 'on the 7th century Arab invasion.'* He was neither a zealot nor a racist. It was others.**

Homa Nasab -

- I) Citation please.
- II) WHO are others? What is the point of all this 'secrecy'? This is an academic dialogue. Would the Examiners please provide me with the names of these "others"?
- III) My understanding of Taqizada's notion of modernity comes from Ervand Abrahamian, *Iran Between Two Revolutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), "*Taqizada believed that 'the only way Iran could leave behind the dark middle ages was to follow the Western experience of separating religion from politics and introducing scientific rational knowledge into public education'* [p. 46]."
- IV) It is breathtakingly ignorant of my Examiners to label the notion of Aryan revival, at the start of the 20th century, as 'racism' since the study of the Indo-European (Aryan) origins of Persian culture was a rigorous and legitimate academic field throughout Europe and North America.

Stanley & Katouzian - The forced unveiling only affected around 15 percent of women (i.e. the urban women), the great majority of whom were opposed to it.

Homa Nasab - Where, in the following sentence – which is my only reference to 'unveiling' -, do I claim that women across the country (urban spaces or not) were in agreement with this process of 'unveiling'? I write, "*Reza Shah who had introduced compulsory education for girls and boys, also took measures to 'emancipate' women of their 'subordinate' position in society and introduced the concept of 'unveiling' whereby women were free to leave their private spaces without the heavy burden of the chador, or the often black veil under which Iranian women were seen. The first showing of this move was taken by the Queen Mother who appeared in a very thin veil at the Shrine of Hazrat-e Ma'suma in Qom, in 1928. It took another eight years before the law was introduced for the abandoning of the chador in public places, on February 1, 1936* [p. 258]."

The Examiners' statement is a factoid that *may* be included in a footnote.

Stanley & Katouzian - 'The compulsory education' at best might have affected primary schooling among the urban minority. But in practice even that was not observed.

Homa Nasab - Where, in my thesis, do I claim that compulsory education was immediately implemented throughout the country, and adopted by all educational institutions over night. I have clearly stated that it was *introduced* during Reza Shah's period. My only statement about this topic reads, "*Reza Shah introduced compulsory education for girls and boys* [p. 258]." IF I were to expand my footnote on this matter, I would need the source upon which these two are making their claim: citation please.

Stanley & Katouzian - Asadi was executed over the Mashhad protest as described above. He was not accused of financial corruption, and was not even tried before executed.

Homa Nasab - I am afraid that I have no interest in engaging with middle eastern-style conspiracy theories that are mass-produced and uncritically endorsed by everyone, *without* reliable documented evidence. Citation please.

Stanley & Katouzian - The 14th century Ilkhan ruler Oljaitu, who at one stage called himself Mohammad Khaodabanda, must be distinguished from the Safavid Mohammad Khodabanda, father of Abbas I.

Homa Nasab – What does it mean when I write, "*Shah Tahmasb's eldest son, Mohamad Khodabanda (literally meaning: Mohamad, the Servant of God) (r. 1578-1587)* [p. 243]" The date clearly indicates that the period to which I am referring is 16th-17th centuries Safavid era and not the 14th century!

Stanley & Katouzian – Fazelia: you make no comment of the great destruction of historic buildings and structures that took place in that and the following period. Surely this is also relevant to your story.

Homa Nasab - What does it mean when I write, "*In 1932, one of the [Mashhad] Shrine's oldest religious schools known as Fazelia was among the structures that was torn down to make room for a modern style Theological College (Danesh-kada-e Olum-e Ma'qul va Manqul) as well as the new Library and Museum buildings* [p. 265]."

AND

"The construction and management of shrine museums were supported by the introduction of systematic measures, especially the passing of the much-anticipated Law of Endowment (Qanun-e Oqaf), in 1934. The Law solidified the central state's power to seize control of all central and regional religious organizations and their endowments throughout the country, from which point on, their management was assigned to the Ministry of Culture, Endowment and Fines Arts [p. 241]."

AND

"These measures enabled Iran's secular-minded intelligentsia to support the central government's move toward the seizure of the ulama's control over the historically and financially rich religious endowments [which included numerous historic sites] from whose resources they had benefited for centuries. As with other Western organizations and traditions, the mainly European-educated Iranian officials turned to the secular, Western and non-indigenous formal space of the museum to help celebrate their indigenous, religious cultural heritage. This aim was partially achieved

through the creation of secularized public cultural spaces within a number of prominent Shiite shrines across the country [p. 252].”

*Endowments refer to all religious institutions’ /Shiite shrines’ possessions, including buildings and structures. I have explained the financial structure of the shrines in great detail in my *Chapter V – Shrine Museums*.

Stanley & Katouzian - Sheikh Baha al-Din Mohammad Ameli was not a scholar and a mathematician, he was a jurist, theologian and poet.

Homa Nasab - Citation please. The only references that I have found on Sheikh Ameli describe him as a ‘polymath’ or a ‘mathematician.’ *Do they mean theologian?

Stanley & Katouzian - Reza Shah’s government was constitutional and parliamentary?

Homa Nasab – *Another high school level trick question?* Again, Iran DID have a Constitution after The CONSTITUTIONAL Revolution of 1905-11 as well as a functioning Parliament, a number of whose members I have introduced in my thesis.

CONCLUSION TO APPENDIX

The topic of this thesis inevitably involves the political as well as cultural history of the period concerned. As already noted, however, regarding these aspects the study suffers badly from major errors of fact and judgment, historical anachronisms, etc. Such errors have been detailed in the APPENDIX to this report which too has the endorsement of both examiners.

The candidate therefore needs to acquire an up-to-date and realistic account of the political cultural history of Iran between the late nineteenth century and the abdication of Reza Shah. And ALL that she needs to do in this regards is to use a few recent sources on the period:

Ervan Abrahamian’s Modern Iran

Nikki Keddie’s Modern Iran, Roots and Results of the Revolution

Homa Katouzian’s The Persians

Homa Nasab - It is a pity that Katouzian and Stanley have questioned my use of Abrahamian as a reliable source in my thesis.

I am astonished by the fact that my Examiners have failed to note my repeated references to Nikki Keddie’s works, including *Modern Iran*, throughout my text [one random example: footnote 72, p. 35].

In other words, apparently ALL I had needed to do was to read Katouzian’s *The Persians* in order ***“to acquire an up-to-date and realistic account of the political cultural history of Iran between the late nineteenth century and the abdication of Reza Shah”***? Please note that Katouzian’s book was released six months AFTER I had submitted my thesis and exactly two weeks before I sat for my Viva, on December 16, 2009.

- Examiners' Joint Report -

Stanley & Katouzian - The topic of this thesis inevitably involves the political as well as cultural history of the period concerned. As already noted, however, regarding these aspects the study suffers badly from major errors of fact and judgment, historical anachronisms, etc. ***Such errors have been detailed in the APPENDIX to this report which too has the endorsement of both examiners.***

Homa Nasab - We have already examined Stanley and Katouzian's Appendix, in the previous nineteen pages!

Stanley & Katouzian - We need to understand the mechanisms by which this European concept was introduced to Iran.

Homa Nasab - I am sorry, but I don't even know where to begin by providing you with examples from my thesis. **This is the ENTIRE premise of my thesis.**

Stanley & Katouzian - As the text currently stands, the arguments in this [concept of museums] regard often remain undeveloped; like is not compared with like; and there are some striking lacunae, while some information provided is not sufficiently relevant to the topic at hand.

Homa Nasab - I simply cannot believe that my Examiners have composed an entire litany of nonsensical FILLER sentences (such as this one) to fill their *official* Joint Report?

Stanley & Katouzian - For example the candidate quotes the definition of a museum composed by the Qajar court official Mohammad Hasan Khan E'temad al-Saltaneh, although this is not put in context: no dates are given for E'temad al-Saltaneh, who died in 1896, ...and we cannot find his memoirs listed in the bibliography.

Homa Nasab - The only thing that is true about this statement is that I spelled Saltaneh as Saltana (which is done in some cases.) I have nearly stopped asking WHAT is wrong with this pair ...? If these two had looked at my bibliography, they would have noted: Iraj Afshar (ed.), *Ruznama-ye 'Etemad al-Saltana; journal de mémoires de M.H. 'Etemad al-Saltana, 1292-1313 (1878-1895)*, Tehran, 1971 [p. 306].

Stanley & Katouzian - Nasab then proceeds to compare E'temad al-Saltaneh's definition with that provided by contemporary "American" museum official, G. Brown Goode, in the year of the Iranian's death.

Homa Nasab - Firstly, I have never *compared* al-Saltaneh's and Goode's definitions of a museum. Secondly, what am I missing in my Examiners' ANTI-Americanism? Thirdly, I VERY clearly make a point of stating that GB Goode's definition of a *National Museum* was that of a *universally* understood concept – the very idea that my Examiners had critiqued me for failing to do a few paragraphs earlier(?!). In addition, the answer to their question is in my text, including the footnote for this reference, which clearly states that [GB Goode's] speech was delivered “in Britain at a meeting of the Museums Association in 1895 and at Washington D.C.'s Philosophical Society in 1896.”

My reference to G.B. Goode reads, “*In an 1896 article entitled “On the Classification of Museums,” G. Brown Goode, the Director of the United States National Museum (1881-1911),*

provided a detailed working definition of what National Museums are and do. 'National Museums contain the treasures belonging to national governments and are the legitimate successors of those treasure houses of monarchs, princes and ecclesiastical establishments which, until within the last two centuries, were the sole representatives of the museum idea. Every great nation now has a museum, or a group of museums more or less liberally supported, and intimately connected with the educational undertakings of the government... Goode then went on to define a National Museum's working mechanism, '... [pp. 25-26].''

Stanley & Katouzian - The use of an "American" source is not explained although elsewhere the candidate points to France as providing the dominant model for Iranians in the period under discussion.

Homa Nasab - I) What is the issue with this ANTI-Americanism? Yes, the "American" source is explicitly explained in my thesis: my Examiners simply needed to have read it. II) The French had NO plans to help Iranians found a(ny) museum(s) in the country, during the Qajar Era. What my Examiners are referring to is France's *monopoly* and interests in excavating Iran's portable antiquities. I understand that Stanley began his career as an advisor to private collectors, including Nasser Khalili. However, I now wonder whether he actually knows the difference between buying and selling other people's cultural heritage and helping them form their national aesthetic patrimony in the form of a museum?

Stanley & Katouzian - Nasab refers to the emergence of national associations of museum officials from the 1880's and of international associations in the 1920's and 1930's. She does not say whether the International Museums Office played a role in Iran but seems to discount it on the basis that no Iranians attended the first international congress of museum officials in Madrid in 1934.

Homa Nasab - I have dedicated an ENTIRE chapter introducing international advisors who influenced the formation of museums in Iran. These are French, German, British and AMERICAN (see above) museum professionals who were not only active participants in International Museums Office but were influential in its formation. My discussion of the IMO is very clearly in the context of presenting recently and contemporary international trends in museology.

My reference to the IMO reads, "*These legal and museological expansions in Iran reflected a wide range of similar developments that were taking place in countries around the world. Internationally, the interwar years were a very exciting period for the field of museology. In 1925-26, the International Museums Office was founded under the auspices of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (League of Nations). With the help of its publication, Mouseion (1927-1946), the IMO established internationally recognized professional codes of conduct by engaging nearly forty countries in its activities [p. 150].*"

Concerning the participation of Iranians at the 1934 Madrid Congress, I write, "*Even though we have no indication that representatives from Iran were at the Madrid congress, it is very likely that some leading Iranian cultural figures were fully aware of such developments. We know for a fact that indigenous newspapers and magazines continuously published photographs and articles on recent artistic, archaeological and museological developments from around the world [p. 150].*"

Stanley & Katouzian - Was it a result of the agreement made in 1927 with the French, who may have allowed only bilateral relations?

Homa Nasab - This is an obscenely childish and offensive question to pose, on so many levels. To suggest that the French were in a position to *allow* officials in Iran to conduct their business is unbelievable. What are my Examiners suggesting, now? That Iran was a French Protectorate? Most importantly, I have discussed the issue of the France's monopoly over archaeology excavations in Iran, and the abrogation of that monopoly in 1927, on at least ELEVEN different instances throughout my thesis.

Stanley & Katouzian - Even in the long digression on foreign scholars, collectors and dealers connected in some way with Iranian art found in chapter I, Andre Godard is given less space than the likes of the dealer Hagop Kevorkian, as is the American Arthur Upham Pope, also a key figure in Iran in our period.

Homa Nasab - I am flabbergasted by these words! As a former advisor to private buyers, Stanley ought to know the extremely important influence of dealer-advisors, especially during 'our period.' I continually emphasize the creation of the Iranian art market as it directly relates to the formation of the canon of Iranian art history. I do wonder about my Examiners undermining the power and influence of *other* dealers/scholar/advisors? In my judgement, these "digressions" are of utmost importance. NOTE: I discuss André Godard's involvement in the founding of museums in Iran on TWENTY-FIVE different occasions, and the AMERICAN Arthur Upham's Pope's on THIRTY-NINE occasions. In addition, I treat (another important AMERICAN figure) Hagop Kevorkian and the Kevorkian Galleries as two different (though, of course, inter-related) entities.

Stanley & Katouzian - France's role under Reza Shah should be seen in the context of the Great Power rivalry for influence in Iran, which involved primarily the British and the Russians. The French recommended themselves, presumably, because they were not British or Russian.

Homa Nasab -

- I) Presumably is not good enough.
- II) I have explicitly stated in my thesis that the reason I have not given equal weight to France's influence is because numerous theses have already been published on this topic.
- III) However, there is NOT one single thesis or book that explores the influence of the British, Germans and Americans on the formation of the canon of Iranian art history whose institutional manifestation took the shape of museums.
- IV) In addition, Reza Shah came to power in 1921 and was crowned in 1925. France's monopoly over archaeological excavations in Iran was abrogated in 1927. Reza Shah resigned in 1941. Do the math.
- V) Lastly, see my INDEX II – Outline of Archaeological Activities. It is there for a reason.

Stanley & Katouzian - But other countries need to be considered, too, including those in South Asia and the Middle East.

Homa Nasab - Yes, AND, Ghana, Mexico, Wales and ones addressing the Bolsheviks... (as per Cronin's 'recommendation').

** In May 2010, Edmund Herzig and the Faculty of the Oriental Institute had taken it upon themselves to appoint Stephanie Cronin as Nasab's co-supervisor without prior knowledge of or approval from the candidate. The purpose of this bizarre gesture was to help Nasab "sort out the historical part of [her] thesis." In turn, Cronin emailed Nasab a farcical list of readings on museums that included museological developments in: Ghana, Mexico, Wales and one addressing the Bolsheviks! Again, the topic of Nasab's thesis is The Foundational History of Museums in Iran – with comparisons to France, Britain, Germany*

and the United States. Three years earlier, Cronin had rejected Nasab's thesis on the basis that it was "too museological."

Stanley & Katouzian - We learn that Reza Shah's son, Mohammad Reza, visited the National Museum of Egypt in Cairo in 1938. No institution existed under this name, and presumably the Egyptian Museum was intended.

Homa Nasab – Why do I keep getting the impression that my Examiners are trying to discredit my work as a scholar rather engage in a mature and sober academic dialogue? Every museum historiographer knows that museums were often called by their descriptive titles, during at least the first half of the 20th century. For example, in Iran, The Museum in Fars was often referred to as the Shirazi Museum. Or the National Museum in Tehran was simply referred to as the Tehran Museum.

Stanley & Katouzian - No coverage is given to the influence of Egyptian and Turkish models on the development of Iran's museums, even though Reza Shah's awareness of developments in Turkey in particular is well-documented in other spheres.

Homa Nasab - As I have stated before, when I began to work on my thesis, every so-called Iranian studies 'expert' (the likes of [Houchang] Chehabi, Cronin, Katouzian, etc...) told me that I would only find 3-4 museums that were founded in Iran, during Reza Shah's reign (c. 1921-1941). I have uncovered FIFTEEN such institutions in addition to several dozens other related cultural institutions. WHERE do these men expect me to fit in further comparisons with Egypt and Turkey. In addition, Egypt and Turkey had founded their museums based on assistance from the same group of foreign (European & American) advisors whose influence I have painstakingly explored in what Stanley and Katouzian have labeled as 'digressions' in Chapter I of my thesis.

Stanley & Katouzian - This story is not told with sufficient clarity, however. In part, this is a sin of omission: in some cases, the relevant facts are not provided; in others, there is a failure to draw out conclusions from facts that are provided.

Homa Nasab - What does this mean? How is it possible for me to implement this 'criticism' in my thesis? My Examiners go on to paraphrase my 102,000 word thesis in two measly paragraphs, and conclude by making the above assertion. If there ever was a Cliff Notes/ Wikipedia version of 'How to write a Joint Report on a doctoral thesis,' Stanley and Katouzian's folly is it. This is only one example of what my supervisor (James Allan) has rightly identified as a series of "nasty" and "open-ended criticisms."

Stanley & Katouzian - We need to know how the proposals that museums should be founded, and the rest of the reform agenda, survived the end of the [Constitutional] Revolution [1905-1911], and the circumstances in which the decision to found museums came to be taken.

Homa Nasab - *Let's see if I can make heads or tails of this statement:*

- I) Stanley & Katouzian have NOT read my thesis.
- II) They are struggling to mislead the readers of their Joint Report (especially the Faculty of the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford, who, also, would not have read my thesis) that my writing is fundamentally flawed.
- III) As I have stated before, even the existing National Museum of Iran (*Muze-ye Iran-e Bastan*) does NOT have an archive of its own history. These demands for me to

present archives for an ephemeral entity (the first so-called National Museum, 1916) from the period of the Constitutional Revolution is ludicrous.

- IV) The primary focus of my research is on the period during Reza Shah's reign, 1921-41. Hence, my inclusion of an ephemeral/temporary project is only intended to serve as a foundational reference to later developments; one that I have already extensively explored.

Stanley & Katouzian - The inclusion of English translations of long official texts, such as whole chapters of the antiquities law passed in 1930, hinders the flow of the argument.

Homa Nasab – I fully appreciate what Stanley meant when he said that my thesis contains “*Too many facts. Imagine telling a good story*” which was why he “*was bored*” reading it! However, boring or not, I deem the inclusion of these laws fundamental to my discussion. Allocating them to an index will signal them as optional reads, which would be very wrong.

Stanley & Katouzian / Homa Nasab - In the International Angle section of their Report, my Examiners provide a long paragraph that paraphrases my Chapter (I) on international dealers, scholars, etc. *They consistently do this throughout their Joint Report:*

When they paraphrase extensive parts of my thesis they systematically FAIL to mention that the information is derived from my writing, hence, lead their unassuming readers to think that it is they who are providing the information.

In normal and healthy academic environments this practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own has a name: it is called *plagiarism*. The ghetto scholarship and gutter politics of Middle Eastern studies as practiced by the likes of Katouzian, Stanley and Herzig, however, is an entirely different story.

Yet they don't fail to refer to me - as “the candidate” or “Nasab” - when they make their oddly-toned boorish comments. Example: “*Mirza Saleh Shirazi, for example, is referred to by Nasab as 'Mirza Sala Shirzi' which is just plain wrong and shows a surprising ignorance of how the name Saleh is written Persian.*”

Stanley & Katouzian - A long litany of scholars, dealers and collectors creates an unnecessary and barely relevant diversion...

Homa Nasab - I have already stated that I am flabbergasted by my Examiners' utter lack of understanding of the critical roles that international advisors, scholars and dealers played in the formation of the canon of Iranian art history, and the founding of that country's arts and cultural institutions. It's quite peculiar that Stanley, of all people, would frown upon this topic as a 'diversion;' he has arrived at his position by aiding private collectors such as Nasser Khalili with his buying practices.

*I do wonder what Herzig, Stanley, Cronin and Katouzian think of their publisher and benefactor, **Farhad Hakimzadeh**, who had been 'acquiring' works from various British public institutions, for well over twenty years.

Concerning Iranian collectors whose role my Examiners point out that I have not explored in my thesis: I cannot think of anyone else who is more passionate about the subject of collecting than I am. How do they think that I ended up with THREE post-graduate degrees before joining the OI? I was pursuing research on the American collector Dr. Albert C. Barnes of the Barnes Foundation (est. 1922). Unfortunately, that institution's archives remained closed for access by scholars due

to numerous legal challenges, until very recently (c. 2007). However, absolutely anyone with the most basic knowledge of Iranian arts & cultural politics knows that there exist NO available archives or reliable documentations on private Iranian collectors of Persian art, during this period. Even, to this day, Iran lacks the legal system to protect the rights of private collectors, hence, it would be utter madness for any collector to publicize the content of their possessions.

Stanley & Katouzian - The same could be said for the whole of chapter II (International Exhibitions), which should be more focused on the influence of external events within Iran and should be placed later in the dissertation, after the core facts about the development of museums in Iran have been presented.

Homa Nasab - Does this mean that my Examiners have completely missed the fact that my entire Chapter II IS focused on the influence of external museological events on Iran? Also, how does it make sense to present exhibitionary paradigms upon which Iranians museums were founded *after* the core facts have been presented? My discussions on a critical series of international exhibitions that took place between (approximately) 1910 and 1940 are designed to present the range and variety of exhibitionary models in which Persian art were contextualized. These are the very prototypes upon which Iranian museums were, later, founded. After all, these international exhibitions pre-date the formation of museums in most countries, hence, need to be examined as their *predecessors*. The suggestion that these early as well as contemporaneously evolving museological models should be presented ‘after the core facts’ conveys a depressingly shallow understanding of the study of museology – which, of course, is very different from museum management or even curatorial work.

Stanley & Katouzian - The English text often falls below the standard expected. The word ‘museologue’ does not exist in English. We find ‘Eur-Asian’ for ‘Eurasian,’ and ‘four-partite’ for ‘quadripartite’ or ‘fourfold.’ Such failings are not acceptable.

Homa Nasab - *I am very sympathetic toward Tenured Grammarians’ sensitivities to technical issues only when they are right.*

[One random contemporary example – not from my thesis:] Philip Leopold Martin, was a taxidermist and *museologue* who was the author of a number of scientific and museology books. (Source: *Popular Science Magazine*, November, 1885.) For another recent example, see: Professor Norman Davies (Oxon ‘62), *Europe: A History – A Panorama of Europe, East and West...*, Harper Collins, 1989, p. 5.

AND

My uses of the term ‘Eur-Asia’ are in a series of QUOTATIONS by British art historian Sir David Talbot-Rice (CBE) in “The Third International Congress and Exhibition of Iranian Art at Leningrad,” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, December 1935.

AND

I have been using ‘four-partite’ since I began the outline of my thesis well over 5 years ago. Throughout its various stages, the text has been read by more than a dozen different scholars on two continents (US & Europe) and no one has ever criticized me for it. Had my Examiners, even, bothered to Google the term they would have come across several thousand references in (purely) scientific journals.

*** This pile of mockery has served as the basis of my Examiners' perversely audacious claim that my "*text is littered with infelicities*" AND that my "*study suffers badly from major errors of fact and judgment, historical anachronisms, etc.*" I am afraid that I find their criticisms of my writing to fall below the standards that, we at Oxford, expect. *Such failings OUGHT not to be acceptable!*