

## THE EDITOR'S DESK

It is sometimes assumed that reform in the modern world inevitably includes the introduction of democratic institutions to provide the mass of the people with opportunities to participate in the process by which they are ruled. Yet it should not be forgotten that reform and modernization in the Ottoman Middle East during the nineteenth century often signified the reverse. The primary reform objective of many of the leading figures of the Ottoman *Tanzimat* reform movement (1839-1876) was to extend the scope and power of the central government to many areas formerly left to the subjects of the Sultan to deal with through the autonomous *millets* and other self-governing popular organizations which had evolved over the centuries, and to make government far more comprehensive and efficient than it ever had been in classical times. However the success of these reforms, particularly the modernization of the structure of government and the army, inevitably led to basic changes in the relationships which existed between the rulers and the ruled, as well as among the different groups who composed Middle Eastern society. Aspects of these changing relationships, and their impact on modernization and reform, are discussed by several of our contributors.

Kemal H. Karpat, Professor of Middle Eastern History at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, analyzes the impact of European diplomatic and economic imperialism, as well as that of the policies of the Ottoman reformers, on social and economic relationships in different parts of the Empire. He points to the situation in the Balkans, where government reform policies caused a subordination of the Muslim classes to their Christian counterparts, and elsewhere in the Empire, where they led to the rise of a Muslim middle class as well as of a new technical bureaucracy, both of which were far more distant from the mass of Muslim subjects than the older Ottoman ruling class had been.

Roger M. Savory, Professor of Persian at the University of Toronto, Canada, stresses the inbred tendency of Persian society to remain unchanged ('homeostasis'), regardless of efforts to reform it, and points out the importance of the Persian monarchy, as typified by Shah Mohammad Reza Shah, as the sole element of Persian society strong enough to overcome this tendency and introduce significant reforms despite the powerful opposition of those with vested interests in the old order. Dr Savory describes how opposition to the Shah today, led by a segment of the Persian intelligentsia, particularly Persian students outside the country, is based largely on the same romantic views of contemporary Iran which led Mohammad Mossadiq and others in the Iranian national movement to disrupt reform, and so join the opposition led by the great landowners, the *ulemâ*, and others who successfully frustrated reform until the Shah himself took the lead in his famous 'white revolution'. Dr Savory points out how the

Shah has gained the support of the mass of people benefiting from his reforms, particularly the peasants, and also the army and the younger civil servants.

Iliya Harik, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, describes in more detail the traditional Middle Eastern social system, particularly the *millet* system of autonomous religious communities, and analyzes its effect on the problems of modernization in the Arab world. Dr Harik concentrates particularly on the Lebanon, where the problems of ethnic separation are particularly great, and shows how this small country has solved the resulting problems in many respects.

Menahem Milson, Professor of Arabic and Chairman of the Department of Arabic at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, looks at modernization in the Arab world, and in Egypt in particular, through the eyes of one of its most outstanding contemporary writers, Najīb Maḥfūz, presenting us with a complete translation of one of his most important short stories, 'Walīd al-'Anā' or 'Child of Suffering'. Professor Milson analyzes how Maḥfūz expresses his views on political and social problems through allegory, and then interprets his parables as they apply to the relationship between various elements of Egyptian society, particularly that between the rulers and the mass of the people – the same question which has occupied so many other students of modernization in the area.

And finally, Ibrahim Poroy, Professor of Economics at San Diego State College, San Diego, California looks at the economic aspect of reform as applied in the Republic of Turkey. Dr Poroy concludes that in the Five-Year plan which ended in 1967, the public sector failed to provide sufficient capital investment to fully achieve its aims. This points up once again the lesson that in developing countries, and as a matter of fact even in highly developed countries, government can do only so much, and that without the participation of private capital, the stimulus of private enterprise and initiative, and the discipline of the profit motive, efforts to provide planned economic development never can be as successful as a judicious marriage of public control and private efforts.

STANFORD J. SHAW