

*Sample to Box II* *care.*

# The Reign of Terror

at Tabriz.

---

## England's Responsibility.

(With Photographs and a Brief Narrative  
of the events of December, 1911, and  
January, 1912.)

COMPILED FOR THE USE OF THE PERSIA COMMITTEE

BY

EDWARD G. BROWNE, M.A., F.B.A., F.R.C.P.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

OCTOBER, 1912.

Printed and Published by  
TAYLOR, GARNETT, EVANS & CO., Ltd., Blackfriars Street, Manchester.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# The Reign of Terror

at Tabriz.

---

## England's Responsibility.

(With Photographs and a Brief Narrative  
of the events of December, 1911, and  
January, 1912.)

COMPILED FOR THE USE OF THE PERSIA COMMITTEE

BY

EDWARD G. BROWNE, M.A., F.B.A., F.R.C.P.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

---

OCTOBER, 1912.

---

Printed and Published by  
TAYLOR, GARNETT, EVANS & CO., Ltd., Blackfrairs Street, Manchester.





DS  
315  
B85

# The Reign of Terror at Tabriz.

## A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS.

THE purpose of this publication is to call attention to certain terrible events which took place in December, 1911, and early in the present year, in Tabriz, the chief commercial city of Persia; firstly, because these show as nothing else can show the means which are being employed in order to crush the spirit of Persian nationality and to reduce one of the most ancient and gifted peoples of the world to a condition of servitude to the power of Russia; and, secondly, because the responsibility of this country, which has claimed, along with Russia, the exclusive right to political influence in Persia, is clearly involved.

Tabriz is a city of over a quarter of a million inhabitants in the extreme north-west of Persia, about 80 miles south of the Russian frontier, in the fertile province of Azarbayjan, and, owing to its comparative wealth and commercial activity, and the hardy and courageous character of its inhabitants, it became the centre and chief support of the Nationalist movement of revolt against the tyranny of the feeble and corrupt government of Muhammad Ali the ex-Shah. This liberating movement, of the utmost promise for the future of Persia, first took effect in the time of the ex-Shah's father, who shortly before his death in January, 1907, had accepted and sworn fidelity to the New Constitution. Within a year and a half of his accession Muhammad Ali attempted, by the aid of his Persian Cossacks and their Russian officers, that is, practically a Russian force, violently to suppress the Constitution, to destroy the Majlis, or Parliament, and to restore the previous absolute power of the Shah. In Teheran he was for a time successful, but Tabriz resisted and stood a siege of nine months, from July, 1908,

to April, 1909. By the latter date it was reduced to the verge of starvation and its fall appeared imminent. It would have surrendered, no doubt, to the Shah, when Russia, seizing the opportunity, and with the full concurrence of our own Foreign Office, intervened. This was done nominally for the protection of the Consulates and the lives of Europeans, and assurances were given that the occupation by Russian troops should be only temporary. The troops have, however, never been withdrawn. They remained permanently encamped just outside the city until in December of last year, their actual entry into Tabriz, with the object of finally suppressing the Nationalist Party within it, gave rise to the resistance of which the sequel was so terrible.

The long resistance of Tabriz in 1908-9 had enabled the popular movement to gather force in other parts of Persia, and after the relief of Tabriz it displayed itself with unexpected vigour. It had never entered into the calculations of Russia that the Nationalist forces would be able to overcome the resistance of the Shah's Cossack brigade and to make themselves masters of Teheran. This, however, is what happened, and in July, 1909, the Shah was deposed, and the Persians succeeded in restoring the Constitution under the young son of the deposed Shah, with Nasir-ul-Mulk, a statesman of English education (he was at Balliol with Sir Edward Grey) as Regent. The possibility of any real national recovery and development by Persia under the new order has often been derided, but at least she might have been permitted to try. She was not permitted. By arrangement with Russia and Great Britain the Shah was exiled and pensioned, with an express undertaking that he should not be permitted to return, and that if he attempted to do so his pension should cease. He was permitted to return with the direct and almost open connivance of Russia, in whose territory he had taken refuge, and after his attempted invasion in July, 1911, had failed, the Persian Government was actually compelled to pension him again, and again he is now plotting for a restoration.

The ex-Shah left Persia for the second time in October, 1911, and his departure coincided with an attack far more deadly on the independence of Persia. The Persian Government possessing no



qualified financial expert of its own, had wisely called in the assistance of a capable American administrator, and further, as revenue could only be collected efficiently from great, as well as small, by the aid of an efficient force, they had selected another capable European to take charge of this force. Mr. Shuster was appointed in the Spring of 1911, on the recommendation of the President of the United States, to take charge of the Persian treasury, and Captain Stokes, of the Indian Army, a most competent and energetic officer, was appointed in July, on the expiry of his term of office as military attaché to the British Legation at Teheran, to take command of the treasury gendarmerie. To this appointment the British Government at first took no objection. Both would almost certainly have succeeded in their tasks and restored the power and authority of the Persian Government at the vital points of finance and public order, but effective steps were taken by Russia speedily to get rid of them.

It was at this point that a further Russian advance was decided upon. Shuja-ud-Dowleh, or to give him his full name, of which this is only the title of honour, Samad Khan Shuja-ud-Dowleh, one of the ex-Shah's generals and active partisans, and chief of the Shahsevan tribe, had since August, 1911, been seeking to gain command of Tabriz, outside which the Russian force professed to maintain a sort of neutral attitude, but without success, being held in check by the same local fidais, or volunteers, who had so gallantly defended the city previously against the ex-Shah. The Russians determined to disarm the fidais, and for this purpose sent 700 men from Ardebil to assist in the occupation of Tabriz. They succeeded in their task, but only after provoking by gross mismanagement a certain measure of resistance which supplied the excuse for the terrible and indiscriminate severities which followed, and which were directed not only against the fidais, but against the leaders of the Constitutional Party and men of the highest position and character in the city.

Immediately after the defeat of the Nationalists, the Russians, being now in full control of the town, admitted Shuja-ud-Dowleh, who had so long been besieging it, and with their sanction

he assumed the Governorship. Of this appointment Mr. Shipley, the British Consul in Tabriz, reported with approval. Shuja entered Tabriz on January 2nd. On the previous day the Russians had begun the series of executions by which they removed most of the leaders of the Tabriz Nationalists; they had hung eight of them, including the Sikat-ul-Islam, the chief ecclesiastic of Azarbaijan (see photographs). These executions continued; and at the same time Shuja-ud-Dowleh and his followers were perpetrating horrible atrocities on the bodies of unfortunate Nationalists who fell into their power. These atrocities were, of course, known to the Russians. The body of one man (see photograph) was cut in half and the halves hung in the bazaar. At this time the Russians had from four to five thousand soldiers in the town. They could at once have checked, punished, or suppressed Shuja-ud-Dowleh. They did none of these things. Certainly they did not stop him, punish him, or remove him from his office. So far as is known, they offered no remonstrance whatever to his action. Nor, it must be added, does there appear in the dispatches of the British Consul at Tabriz, as published by the British Foreign Office, any description of, or reference to, the atrocities committed by Shuja-ud-Dowleh and his partisans, which would either have enabled the British Government, in view of its responsibility, to have remonstrated with Russia, or shown the British public the terrible character of the events which had happened at Tabriz. This question of the reports from Tabriz, so important in view of British obligations towards Persia, has still to be elucidated.

By the beginning of February information as to the reign of terror at Tabriz began to reach this country. Refugees from Tabriz had arrived at Constantinople, and one of them received many details which he sent to Prof. E. G. Browne, of Cambridge, who embodied them in a letter printed in the *Manchester Guardian* of February 9th. Writing on Feb. 7th, immediately after receiving a letter "from a well-known and trustworthy citizen of Tabriz, now at Constantinople," Prof. Browne said:—

"In an earlier letter written on January 6th this correspondent gave some particulars concerning the earlier victims of Russian martial law at



Tabriz, viz., the great ecclesiastic Sikat-ul-Islam; another notable ecclesiastic, Shaykh Salim, an eloquent and strenuous supporter of the Constitution during the last six years, and Sadik-ul-Mulk, a young officer trained at the Military School of Constantinople, who had held responsible positions on the Turco-Persian Boundary Commission and in the administration of Kirman. These three were amongst the victims hanged by the Russians on the *Ashûrâ*, or 10th of Muharram (December 31st), the most sacred anniversary of the Persians.

“Of later victims were several of the staff of the ‘Shafak’ (‘Dawn’), one of the chief newspapers of Azarbaijan. Another sufferer was Hajji Ali Dawa-furush, who had rendered conspicuous services to the Constitution and had taken a leading and valiant part in the defence of Tabriz, in which he was severely wounded. He was also one of the founders of the Madrasa-i-Sa’adat at Tabriz, a college numbering 500 students. His wife died some time ago, leaving him two little children, a boy and a girl, about eight years of age. After his execution the Russians blew up his house with dynamite.

“In the suburb of Hukmabad, which is chiefly inhabited by agricultural labourers, the Russians killed 75 persons, whose bodies they afterwards gibbeted

“The later news is contained in a long letter written on February 1st from Constantinople, of which I here translate that portion which refers to the events at Tabriz:—

“As for the cruelties which the Russians and Samad Khan (acting at their instigation and under their protection) have perpetrated in Tabriz, my pen is unable to describe them. Mirza Mahmud of Salmas, one of the *Ulama* and one of those elected in the elections of the first degree to membership of the Mejliss, was put to death in the house of Samad Khan with all sorts of torments. While he was still alive they plucked out his eyes and cut out his tongue (for he was an orator), after which they slew him. Samad Khan offered to let him go on payment of 400 tomans, but this sum he neither possessed nor could obtain. In like manner, Samad Khan is arresting many others and demanding for their release sums ranging from 100 to 2,000 or 3,000 tomans, in default of payment of which he kills them. He beheaded Na’ib Yusuf of Hukmabad, and afterwards cut his body in two halves like a sheep, and suspended them on either side of the bazaar. . . . To how many houses in which were women and children did they set fire and burn them down, and how many quarters have they made level with the ground.’”

The names of eighteen or nineteen of the victims were already known in Constantinople. Then came further details:—

“A telegram received in Constantinople on January 27th announced the execution of eighteen more men. Nearly all those whose names are given were either members of the ‘*ulamâ*’, or so-called ‘clergy,’ like the Sikat-ul-Islam, Shaykh Salim, who had been beaten almost to death before he was hanged, and Ziya-ul-‘Ulama . . . or active National Volunteers, or members of the local *anjuman* or Provincial Council. Amongst the victims were two young lads named Hasan and Kadir, aged 18 and 12 respectively, whose only fault was that their two elder brothers, who were National Volunteers, had succeeded in escaping

across the Turkish frontier, where they are still wandering, hungry and starved with cold. The youngest of these boys cried with his last breath, 'Long live Persia! Long live the Constitution!' and then adjusted the rope round his neck and bade the executioner do his work. The victims were brought in batches to the gallows, and hanged one by one in the presence of their comrades in misfortune."—(Prof. Browne, in the *Manchester Guardian* of February 13th.)

The news of the atrocities, which thus came to England by way of a refugee's letter from Constantinople, was confirmed, suddenly and completely, in August. First there came into Prof. Browne's hands at the beginning of the month eleven of the photographs here reproduced, each bearing particulars identifying the Persians executed or mutilated. Towards the end of August Mr. G. D. Turner, who had visited Tabriz earlier in the month, returned to England bringing with him copies of the photographs already in the hands of Prof. Browne, and some others besides. Mr. Turner was until June of this year honorary secretary of the National Council for European and Eurasian Education, and has now returned to India to take up again his post as honorary secretary for the Punjab of the Indian Y.M.C.A. How he came to go to Tabriz, what he learnt there of the terrible events of January and December last, how he came to obtain the photographs which furnish such striking proof of the charges made against the Russians and their instruments may best be judged from the article which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of September 3rd. It is as follows:—

I went to Tabriz in this way. In the hope of one day visiting Persia I had studied Persian in Lahore with a native from Ardebil whom misfortune had driven from his country. It was therefore with pleasure that I received the suggestion from the National Secretary of the Indian Y.M.C.A., who had been instructed to attend a missionary conference in Hamadan in July of this year, that I should meet him there and accompany him by way of Bagdad to India. He wrote later to say that he would be unable to go, and asked me to take his place as the representative of the International Y.M.C.A. Committee. I left London on July 1st, and travelled viâ Moscow to Baku and Teheran. From there I went to Hamadan, and found it impossible on account of the disturbed state of the roads west of that town to go further. It was doubtful whether I could reach the Persian gulf viâ Ispahan, and so I returned to Baku, intending to proceed to Constantinople. At Tiflis some friends suggested that I should visit Tabriz. I decided to do so, and reached Tabriz on August 5th. Little did I think of what I was to hear and see in that city. In what I write now my information is based on the testimony of credible eye-witnesses, who not unnaturally desire to



remain anonymous, but whose good faith is unimpeachable, and whose statements are borne out by photographs in my possession, some of which have been referred to in recent articles by others on the subject. I was assisted in my enquiries by being able to speak Persian and French.

My impression as a traveller in Persia was one of sincere gratitude to the Russians for tolerable roads and comparative safety in travelling along them. My heart never warmed to anyone as it did to a troop of a hundred disreputable-looking Cossacks who appeared over the brow of a hill as the driver of my carriage on the Hamadan road clicked five cartridges into an ancient revolver in anticipation of a welcome from some villainous horsemen occupying a sinister position on our line of route. The automobile from Julfa to Tabriz is not to be despised, but I should have welcomed a Russian railway, built with or without a concession. One could visit Persia, spend a pleasant fortnight in Teheran, and return with nothing but the most amiable feelings towards the Russian Bear, but then, of course, one must not talk to Persians, and—one must not visit Tabriz.

Tabriz is reached in six hours by motor-car on a new Russian road from Julfa, a Russian frontier town in the south of the Caucasus. The distance is only 80 miles, and the construction of a railway offers no difficulties. The city covers a large area, as most of the houses are surrounded by gardens enclosed by a high mud wall. The streets are commanded by these houses and walls, and this explains a great deal of the bloodshed which took place in the few days before last Christmas. On December 20th last, in accordance with a general plan for an advance in North Persia, as stated by Mr. Shuster, the Russians made arrangements for the disarming of the Persian Fidaïs. These are voluntary soldiers in the cause of constitutional government, and no praise can be too high for their courage and devotion. That the Russians anticipated some resistance is proved by two facts—their withdrawal from the mills, the day before, of all the grain supplies for their troops that had been sent to be ground, and the forced march of some 700 men in wintry weather from Ardebil; that they were not prepared for such stubborn resistance is shown by the result.

An examination of the events which followed reveals an appalling stupidity on the part of the Russians. Even if it were true, as they contend, that the attack was made by the Persians, nothing can excuse their incompetent management of their own troops. For the subsequent outrages by Persians, as punishment of which they explain and excuse their own brutality, they have nothing to blame more than their own insensate conduct of the whole affair. And when it is established, as beyond a doubt it is, that the Persian attack was in reality a resistance, then all blame must attach to the Russians, not only for the slaughter of hundreds of Persian Fidaïs and the disgraceful excursions which followed, but also for the massacre of innocent persons and their own heavy losses.

In preparation for their operations next day the Russians were during the night of the 20th repairing the telephone wire from the camp to the Consulate. To do so they had to climb on to a roof overlooking the police quarters, and to this the Persians not unreasonably objected, as it is considered "bad form" in Persia to go on a roof overlooking other houses at night. The Russians withdrew, but shortly afterwards a Russian officer, with some soldiers armed, demanded the man who had made the objection.

The man courageously spoke up and was promptly shot dead. This incident not only angered the Persians but put them on the alert, and next morning found them prepared for resistance when the work of disarmament began.

Throughout the whole of that day there was fighting in the streets. The Fidais went about in bands occupying strong positions in the houses and shooting down every Russian they saw. The Russians could not have been in a worse position; their camp was outside the town, and many of their troops were quartered in caravanserais throughout the city. These were surrounded by Persians, and for a while the Russians were at their mercy. Scores were shot down as they tried to make their way through the streets to the camp, others were captured and, it is alleged, tortured to death. The bodies of many Russians were mutilated, but there is no evidence that this mutilation took place before death.

Meanwhile the Russians kept up heavy firing from the camp on the Ark, a small fortress of enormous strength in the centre of the city. This firing did little damage except to surrounding houses, and the reply made by the Persians was similarly ineffective. Eventually the Persians occupied the houses in the neighbourhood of the Russian camp and kept up incessant sniping, while the Russian Consulate was almost untenable. Had the Fidais been under competent leadership they would have taken the Consulate and driven every Russian out of Tabriz. They seem, however, to have been actuated more by a blind desire to kill as many Russians as possible than by any hope of offering permanent resistance, and nothing frightened them more than their own success. On the night of the 22nd the Russian Consul succeeded in bringing about an armistice, but as it was impossible to convey messages to the Russian camp firing continued all next day.

After this there was very little resistance on the part of the Fidais. Their leaders fled, and on the 27th the Ark itself was evacuated, the Persian flag hauled down and Russian flag hoisted in its place. The Russians, however, did not cease their attack for some time. It was said that their soldiers received orders to shoot every Persian seen in a certain street, where a number of Russians had been killed, and it is certain that a number of non-combatant Persians were killed in this street as well as elsewhere. In some cases houses were entered and men, women, and children were shot indiscriminately. There were a great many women and children killed, but most of this happened during the shelling by the Russians of certain houses from which Persians had been firing. The Russian soldiers systematically looted and destroyed every house from which they had been fired upon. In some cases, of course, perfectly innocent people suffered. I saw one woman who had to flee from her house with a two days' old baby; her husband, who had taken no part whatever in the disturbance, had been shot down. Hundreds of women have in this way been turned on to the streets, many of them not only homeless but friendless. The American missionaries have been collecting funds for the relief of these, and have been able in some measure to lessen the distress.

On the evening of the 26th the first detachment of Russian reinforcements arrived from Julfa. This consisted of 800 men and four guns in command of a colonel, who was afterwards punished for his senseless performance. His action is on a level with the whole behaviour of the Russian officers in charge. With no plan of the city, or any idea where the



Consulate or even his own soldiers were located, he opened heavy firing on the city, aiming at everything and nothing in particular. It was pure accident that the Consulates escaped, though the flag of the American Consulate was shot down and several times European residents were in danger. He had begun operations without any reference to the Russian Consulate or the camp, and ceased only when he received peremptory orders to do so.

This marked the end of the fighting, but the relinquishment of rifle and bayonet was only the signal for the appearance of the gallows. Even before the installation by the Russians as Governor on December 30th of Samad Khan Shuja-ud-Dowleh the hangings began, and Russia is responsible not only for those carried out by her own officers but for those nominally directed by their appointed Governor. Nor can we hold Russia free from the responsibility for atrocities perpetrated by this same Governor, such as beating men to death in water ponds, sewing up the mouths of certain who had spoken in favour of the Constitution, nailing horseshoes on men's feet and driving them through the bazaar, and other unspeakable barbarities. Since last December the life of no man who was even supposed to be in favour of the Constitution has been safe, no matter how honourable his character or how high his position. It is not possible in this paper to give an account of more than two of those unfortunates who were cruelly done to death, but an eye-witness described to me with what heroism many met their execution. They walked bravely to the scaffold, where their eyes were not bandaged nor their hands and feet tied. Some leaped from the stools themselves, others spat in the faces of the Russians, and others used their last breath in declaring their unquestionable right to desire a Constitution. The executions were carried out in the most barbarous manner, and some of those hung lived for at least fifteen minutes after being hauled up.

The Sikat-ul-Islam was the chief Moslem ecclesiastic in Tabriz. He was a man of very unusual ability, of great personal charm, and singularly broad-minded. He was on excellent terms not only with his co-religionists but with the Christians of the city. Early in December he had called on the British Consul to ask if he might seek protection in the Consulate in the event of danger to himself: the reply was that unless he was in some immediate danger the Consulate could not promise protection. He called also at the Russian Consulate and was assured that whatever happened his safety would be respected. In the disturbances already described he took no part whatever, although he was in sympathy with the Constitution and the struggle for Persian independence. Nevertheless, he was seized by the Russians, his house was searched for a list of men in favour of Constitutional government, and a large sum of money extracted from him in return for a promise of his liberty.

His trial then followed, and I am told on good authority that it consisted of his being asked if he had written to a friend in Urumiah a letter something to the following effect: "The Russians have attacked us and we have resisted them, so far effectively. We trust that you will do the same." On admitting that it was his letter he was dragged off to the gallows. The gallows, as one can see in a photograph in my possession, was gaily painted like a barber's pole with Russian colours. Eight were hung together, the Sikat-ul-Islam in the middle and lowest of all. The Persian servants employed

as hangmen by the Russians refused to do their work in his case, until they were brutally beaten by Russian officers with their knouts. The Russian officers are to be seen standing in front of the bodies posing for their photograph. If anything could add to the horror of the proceeding it would be that it took place on the tenth day of Moharram, or the most sacred day of the Mahometan year. It should be added that this execution took place without the knowledge of the English Consul, probably in order to avoid a protest on his part.

A few days later, in the midst of the Armenian New Year's Day festivities, the most prominent Armenian of the city, Bedros Andreasian, was seized and dragged to the gallows. He was a Constitutionalist, but none of the Armenians had taken part either in the defence of Tabriz three years before by the Constitutional party or in the Fidai resistance, and his only crime was his political opinion. Eye-witnesses describe the bravery with which he walked along, dragged by mounted Cossacks, till the gallows was reached. He was a big, heavy man, and twice the rope of the hangman broke. A young Russian officer standing by protested that he had suffered enough, and that in any civilised country he would be released. For these remarks the officer was punished and the brave Armenian was finally done to death. That night Russian soldiers paraded the Armenian quarter singing songs, the intended effect being to terrorise the whole Armenian body. There was one event which caused exultant joy in the city and must have given the superstitious among the Russians food for thought. The number of victims on the Russian gallows had reached 42, when, as some Russian soldiers were handling a quantity of explosives in the Ark, a powder magazine blew up and 42 Russians were killed. This, however, has not stopped the work of the gallows, which stands high up in view of all near the centre of the city, since every few days claims some new victim of Russian hate. A great many Persian constitutionalists, fearing arrest, have gone into hiding or taken refuge in the different Consulates. A close watch is kept for these, and as one or other comes out he is caught and executed. One poor unfortunate had met his death in this way two days before I reached Tabriz, on August 5th.

Tabriz is completely under the domination of the Russians. They occupy every important place in the city, including the parade ground, the Governor's palace, the police head-quarters, and the Ark. They swagger through the streets armed to the teeth. As I was walking through the bazaar with a Persian he was suddenly roughly thrust aside by two Russian soldiers, who pushed their way between us. As I had also been a little hustled I turned round in amazement, and nothing but that same amazement kept me from striking the man nearest me. As it was, I caught him by the shoulders and, knowing no Russian beyond a few polite phrases, expostulated in honest English. How the Persians can stand the way they are treated can be understood only by realising to some degree the horror of the last nine months. Friends of mine in Tabriz have seen Russian officers walking down the streets striking with their whips at all Persians within reach: I myself saw a Russian in Teheran on a restive horse cut a Persian driver over the head with his whip because his own horse came too near the man's carriage. This same Russian had previously abused me for being in his way, and apologised when he saw I was English. Another friend in Tabriz



saw a Russian soldier lift a woman's veil in the street—an unpardonable insult, and I am told this is not uncommon. Indiscriminate looting of houses supposed to have been held by Fidais, and even barefaced pilfering from bazaar shops, have been every-day occurrences.

On the 30th of July I saw in Kazvin on his way to take up his appointment as Governor of Tabriz the Sipahdar, about whom Mr. Morgan Shuster has a great deal to say. Not unnaturally Shuja-ud-Dowleh has been greatly annoyed that his friends the Russians should have consented to his being superseded by the Sipahdar, and it is believed that it was only by the strong line taken by Sir Walter Townley that this appointment was made. From the outset Shuja-ud-Dowleh has signified his intention of resisting the Sipahdar. He coerced 400 Tabriz merchants into sending a telegram to Teheran protesting against the appointment and into holding a meeting where, much against their will, this protest was corroborated. In connection with this the bazaar was closed on two occasions and only opened under pressure from the Russian Consul. Now the Sipahdar has arrived, and his first action has been to inform the Russians that until they evacuate the Government buildings he will not enter Tabriz. He also demands possession of the Baghi-Shimal, which for three years has been the Russian camp, of the Ali Capoo, the official palace in the city, and of the Ark (Citadel).

On the Russian Consul refusing to comply with these perfectly reasonable demands, the Sipahdar has broken off negotiations with him and appealed direct to Teheran. If the Russians persist in their refusal to hand over these buildings, especially the official residence of the Governor, then all pretence that Tabriz has not been occupied is gone. Indeed, it is only in the high atmosphere of diplomatic falsehood that this pretence is still maintained. When I left Tabriz I travelled in company with the Quartermaster-General of the Russian troops in Azerbaijan, at present numbering 25,000. The automobile stopped at every building along the road to Julfa, while this Russian officer made an inspection of how many troops it would hold and made careful notes in his memoranda. His conversation let everyone know that 12,000 Russian troops were expected shortly—not to leave but to enter Persia. What are these ever-increasing forces for?

Doubt has been cast in some quarters on the authenticity of the photographs which have reached this country of the atrocities in Tabriz. These are the photographs alluded to in Professor Browne's letter in the "Manchester Guardian" of August 13th. I acquired those in my possession, which include all those mentioned by Professor Browne, and more, in the following way. Wandering alone through the Tabriz bazaar I came on a shop where picture postcards were displayed. I entered and sat down, and began to talk to the shopkeeper and examine his cards. I kept asking him for more cards, pictures, and photographs, in the hope of coming across something curious. Eventually he unlocked a drawer and brought out the photographs, which I purchased at three kran each (a kran is 4½d. or 5d.). He would not tell me who had taken them. It is quite apparent, however, that some at least were taken by a professional photographer for the Russian soldiers, who appear, with their victims, posing for their pictures, and I am told that these they sent to their friends at home.

I asked the shopkeeper to write on the back of the photographs the names of the victims, which he did with the help of his assistant. I have

since compared these with the names which Professor Browne has on his photographs, and except in one or two cases they tally. The photographs were recognised by residents in Tabriz, to whom I showed them, as being genuine pictures of the hangings of the last nine months in the city. Further, a few photographs were given me by Europeans in Tabriz which confirm the others.

Some of those hung were known personally to Europeans in Tabriz, who are positive that they took no part in the fighting. They were hung simply because they were constitutionalists, although the charge brought against them probably was that they incited or encouraged the Fidaïs to resistance. One man was not even arrested, but was seized when he came to plead for his nephew, and was hung beside him.

GEORGE DOUGLAS TURNER.

Despite all that has happened, Shuja-ud-Dowleh remains in authority in Tabriz. The Russian Government has repeatedly urged that the Persian Government should formally appoint him to the position of Governor—this even after the atrocities of January—but the Persian Government has refused. Thus on February 26th, the British Minister at Teheran telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey: "The opposition of the Persian Government to Shuja as governor is as strong as ever." But so far from the British Government doing anything to remove Shuja from Tabriz or to assist Persia in her opposition to Russian pressure on this point, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed on February 25th to the British Minister: "Is there any prospect, in view of our combined action concerning the ex-Shah, of obtaining the consent of Persian Government to the appointment of Shuja-ud-Dowleh to the post of Governor-General; and, if so, what confidence could they place in his loyalty to them?" The Persian Government has stood out for another governor, but Shuja-ud-Dowleh remains in authority, supported by Russia, and even, it would seem, by the British Foreign Office, too.\*

What are Englishmen to think of these facts and of the part taken by their own Government in relation to them? It cannot be supposed that Sir Edward Grey and the Foreign Office have been fully informed as to what has been going on. But that does not relieve us or them of our duty now that the facts are known.

---

\* From the latest information received it would appear that the Sipahdar, the Governor nominated by the Persian Government, has now assumed office at Tabriz, but Shuja-ud-Dowleh remains, nominally as his assistant. This information is contained in a letter received from Constantinople on October 5th.



It is surely intolerable that for a single day we should continue to acquiesce in the presence of a ruffian such as Shuja-ud-Dowleh in any position of authority in Tabriz. It may be said that Tabriz is in the so-called Russian "sphere," and that is true. But this does not relieve us of indirect responsibility as partners and fellow-workers with Russia in the whole of the transactions of the last five years since the conclusion of the 1907 agreement as to Persia. Instead of pressing, as we have been doing, on the defenceless Government of Persia the recognition of Shuja as Governor, we ought, in sackcloth and ashes, to apologise to it for the part we have had in retaining him for so long in that position, and urge upon our partner in this shameful business his immediate dismissal and complete replacement by the nominee of the Persian Government.

Nor is this all. Ought not events like these to open the eyes of the British public, and of all who have some regard for justice and the common decencies of life, to the iniquities almost necessarily involved in the task of strangling the liberties of a nation? And ought it not to arouse among us some doubt as to the wisdom of the whole policy which bears such fruits?

The photographs which follow are some of them very terrible, but it seemed right not to suppress them. They tell their own dumb but eloquent tale.





## THE FIRST EXECUTION OF CONSTITUTIONALISTS AT TABRIZ.

The first execution of Persian Constitutionalists at Tabriz took place on the tenth of Muharram (the Good Friday of the Persian, corresponding with last New Year's Day, "in accordance with the decision of the Russian Court-martial, established by order from superior quarters." (See the last White-book on Persia. [Cd. 6264], No. 44, pp. 15-16.)

The names of the victims from right to left are:—

- (1) Hasan, the son of a well-known leader of the Tabriz Constitutionalists, aged 18.
- (2) Ziya-ul-Ulama, a learned man, well skilled both in Eastern and Western sciences.
- (3) Muhammad-Kuli Khan, uncle of the last-mentioned, for whom he came to make intercession, and was thereupon seized and hanged.
- (4) Sadik-ul-Mulk, a young engineer, trained in the Military School at Constantinople. He had served on the Turco-Persian Boundary Commission, was attached to the Persian Foreign Office and had held several responsible posts.
- (5) Sikat-ul-Islam, the highest ecclesiastic in the Province of Azerbaijan, a man universally respected alike for his learning, his piety, and his tolerance.
- (6) Agha Muhammad Ibrahim.
- (7) Kadir, brother of Hasan, whose name stands first in this list.
- (8) Shaykh Salim, another learned man.



THE FIRST EXECUTION ANOTHER VIEW.  
Another picture of the first execution. The Russian colours, with which the gallows is decorated, are clearly visible.





**THE RUSSIAN GALLOWES.**

The Russian gallows near the Ark, or Citadel, with five victims.



**FOUR CONSTITUTIONALISTS HANGED BY THE RUSSIANS.**

The names from right to left are as follows: (1) Mirza Ali "Natik" ("The Orator"); (2) Hajji Samad "Khayyat" ("The Tailor"); (3) Mashhadi Hajji Khan; (4) Mashhadi Shukur Kharrazi.

Three Russian soldiers and a Persian attendant are seen in the foreground.





THE NEPHEWS OF SATTAR KHAN.

The two nephews of Sattar Khan (the hero of the Siege of Tabriz in 1908-9) were hanged by the Russians in January, 1912. The one on the right is Muhammad Khan, "Amir-Tuman" ("Commander of Ten Thousand") and the one on the left, his elder brother, Karim Khan.



**YUSUF OF HUKMABAD.**

Yusuf of Hukmabad was cut in two, and the halves of the body were hung up like a sheep's carcase by order of Shuja-ud-Dowleh.





**YUSUF OF HUKMABAD.**

The other half of the body of Yusuf of Hukmabad, hung up in the bazaar.



Masihadi Abbas Ali "Kand-furush" ("The Sugar-seller") hanged by Shuja-ud-Dowleh.





Ghulam Khan Charandabi Muavin, hanged by Shuja-ud-Dowleh.



Mirza Agha Bala Khan Khiyabani, strangled and then hanged head downwards by Shuja ud-Dowleh.





The dead body of Takioff, a Caucasian, surrounded by the soldiers and executioners of Shuja-ud-Dowleh.



The dead bodies of Sayyid Muhammad and Khusrav-Shaha, lying on the ground and surrounded by the executioners of Shahr-ul-Bowleh.





The dead body of Chapukh Muhammad, with dagger planted in breast; killed by Shuja-ul-Dowleh.



Hajji Ali Dawa-furnsh ("The Druggist") and Mirza Ahmad Sulhayli, a poet and journalist, hanged by the Russians.





THE CITADEL IN TABRIZ.

The Ark, or Citadel, with the Russian flag hoisted over it, after its bombardment and before the Russians attempted to blow it up.



THE EXPLOSION IN THE CITADEL.

Explosion in the Ark, or Citadel, caused by careless handling of shells by the Russians.