

PISCATORI, J. Quincy Wright's contribution
to Middle Eastern studies. *MEJ* 29(1975),
pp. 33-46.

QUINCY WRIGHT'S CONTRIBUTION TO
MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES

James Piscatori

Any effective and stable government regardless of its social base or élite structure has to be sensitive to existing or potential issues in the country; it has to create and/or maintain institutionalized processes by which politically important groups in society can: (1) communicate with one another, and (2) feel that they can participate at least partially in the formulation of policy and thereby legitimize the régime. In other words, those groups in society—tribal chieftains, religious or sectarian leaders, influential merchants, sectors of the armed forces, etc.—which hold substantial power regardless of who occupies the formal seats in government must feel that their basic interests are, at a minimum, not threatened and, preferably, somewhat advanced in the overall scheme of things.

In practical terms all this comes down to the following: During the initial period of roughly one to two years in power, the military is normally tolerated, read: "given a chance;" thereafter it faces one of two basic alternatives: (1) it can civilianize itself by various means, such as the Nāṣir, Ayub Khan, and Atatürk régimes did; or (2) if it retains its military character, it must also create political institutions and movements outside the military organization in order to enlist the active support of large segments of the population and to create the above-mentioned institutionalized processes of communication and, at least imagined, participation in public affairs.

If the junta is unwilling to do either, it is likely to experience consequences similar to that of the 'Abbūd régime: a loss of touch with what the general population considers to be the overriding issues of the day and, consequently, a rapid decrease of popular support for its measures. The régime of General Numayrī had reached a similar stage in early 1971, and appeared ripe to be overthrown, when in the curious and fascinating style of Sudanese affairs, it was saved by an initially successful, yet clumsily conceived, *coup* against itself.

IN THE PRE-WORLD WAR I period, international relations had not yet emerged as a formal academic study. Emphasis was largely placed on the theories of world order of the great political philosophers, such as St. Augustine, Dante, Machiavelli, Rousseau and Kant. In addition, students of international relations tended to focus on the particular fields of international law and diplomatic history.¹ Only when the United States became caught up in the main currents of world politics during the Wilsonian era did the contours of international relations as a separate discipline begin to emerge. Along with the appearance of new texts, several institutions and publications came into being as visible evidence of America's newly developed international interests. The Council on Foreign Relations and its journal, *Foreign Affairs*, first published in 1922, the Foreign Policy Association with its *Foreign Policy Information Service and Reports*, originally begun in 1925, and the *American Foreign Service Journal* first issued in 1924, joined the already established Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and *International Conciliation* published since 1907.

Despite this growth in general interest, the development of area studies was somewhat slower. In the case of the Middle East, the pre-World War I period is characterized by an emphasis on Oriental and Semitic studies with concentrations on languages, literature, and ancient and medieval history. Modern Middle Eastern history, particularly that of the Ottoman Empire, was limited only to partial examination within the context of general courses on European diplomacy. The Middle East, like Africa, was academically important only insofar as it was a milieu for great power maneuvers. In the inter-war period, however, the situation began to change, along with the development of international relations research in general. An early example of the linkage between general inquiry and specific Middle

1. See James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., *Contending Theories of International Relations* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1971), pp. 1-6.

△ JAMES PISCATORI is a doctoral candidate in international relations at the Woodrow Wilson Department of Government and Foreign Affairs of the University of Virginia. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Majid Khadduri of the School of Advanced International Studies for his generous assistance in discussing and reviewing the contents of this article with the author, and to Louise Leonard Wright for her kind cooperation.