Check for updates

scholarly work to consider parties in office. His consideration of how the Conservative Party made use of its time in opposition does not quite fit with current theory on the topic. As he himself states, those works that do look at the Conservatives' 'periodic spells in opposition [are], in the main, preoccupied with demonstrating how these were used to refresh Conservative ideas and organisations in preparation once again for government' (p. 5). In contrast, this text argues that there was far too little refreshing of Conservative policies and structures to make them ready for government.

In order to explore contemporary conservatism, Hayton makes use of a thematic approach; he examines four issues that pose dilemmas for the party, and which were critical components of the party's slow and painful steps towards reconstruction. Many of these debates involve truly cross-cutting issues that go beyond the left-right dimension and so are able to bring new perspectives to the Conservative Party. There are chapters on 'social liberalism versus social traditionalism' and the issues brought about by the political economy of 21st-century conservatism, but the more thorough and perceptive chapters are the first two. The 'European question' is explored thoroughly. Likewise, the chapter on national identity and what is referred to as the 'English question' is a proxy for immigration policy and the party's attempts (or lack of them) to keep up with a changing, and less homogeneous, society. Hayton explains clearly how these two long-standing issues were a double-edged sword for the party: tempting to exploit in the short term, yet dangerous in the long term. After all:

(i)n one sense, it would have been perverse for the Conservatives *not* to campaign on Europe and immigration – opinion polls suggested public support for the Conservative positions ... However, the focus on these issues reinforced the negative image of the Conservative Party, and failed to provide a convincing narrative about the purpose of the party. (p. 48)

In addition to primary policy documents, Hayton makes use of a number of personal interviews with key figures from the period in opposition, many of whom maintained their prominence, securing ministerial posts since 2010. Among them are former party leaders such as Michael Howard and the current Home Secretary Theresa May. Solid empirical data serve to illuminate certain puzzling stances that the Conservatives took. For example, why some issues the party had been associated with – to their detriment, such as Europe – had become less toxic over time but others had not. Howard saw the issue of Europe and the euro as having been 'neutralized' by Labour's pledge to hold a referendum on the issue, whereas this was not the case for immigration policy, so it seemed to make sense to use the issue to show dividing lines between the parties.

The text focuses on the Conservative Party largely through the actions of significant actors – including politicians and policymakers. It considers the impact of their 'actions, perceptions and strategies' as they sought to get a grip on the Party's repeated electoral failures at a national and local level during this period. There is a clear focus on the impact of different party leaders with regard to their preferred issues, their understanding of the party's poor image and how they tried to wrestle with competing electoral pressures. It is a nuanced look that is charitable towards the leaders of the Party between 1997 and 2005; they were not as inept and misguided as popular opinion might suggest. In fact, as Hayton states, the leaders were, to some extent, successful, in gradually building the party up into a (nearly) election-winning machine once again. Hayton argues that Hague is to be thanked for 'renewing the party organisation and reducing internal tensions over Europe' (p. 8), whilst Duncan Smith played a role in 'renewing policy' (p. 8), and Howard went some way towards bringing the party together. It is a pity, perhaps, that there is little attempt to focus on the party beyond the elite level, though understandable, given constraints of space. Future work that looks at the party at the level of activists, or even, ordinary party members, during this period would be a valuable companion to this work.

The book ends with a thoughtful chapter that scrutinizes Cameronism – or should that be 'Cameroonism'? – with a heavy emphasis on the modernization project with which Cameron has been associated. Much of Hayton's text serves to give context for the emergence of Cameron's particular brand of conservatism, which is regarded as a limited reconstruction, rather than a more comprehensive break with the past. For a party that often prides itself on having little interest in ideology, Hayton skilfully argues that the 'intellectual uncertainty' over the future of conservatism contributed to the complications that the Conservatives endured with regard to renewing their relevance.

Yunus Emre, *The Emergence of Social Democracy in Turkey: The Left and Transformation of the Republican People's Party in Turkey*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2014; xv + 325 pp.: ISBN 1 780 764 391, £ 62 (hbk)

Reviewed by: Güneş Murat Tezcür, *University of Central Florida, USA*

The *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* (CHP – Republican's People Party) ruled Turkey from the foundation of the Republic in 1923 until 1950 and has remained one of the most influential political actors in the country for most of the period since then. The CHP continues to be the main opposition party under the rule of the *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (AKP – Justice and Development Party). While scholarship

on the AKP has been enormous, systematic studies of the CHP have been sparse despite the latter's centrality to Turkish electoral democracy that goes back to 1950. In this regard, Yunus Emre's *The Emergence of Social Democracy in Turkey*, analyzing the CHP's ideological transformation in the 1960s, is a welcome addition.

Emre seeks to answer the question of the causes of the ideological transformation of the CHP from the party of the Republican establishment into a social democratic force in the mid-1960s. With the 18th Congress of the CHP in October 1966, 'the left of the centre' became the party's official platform. The 1960 military intervention heralded a new era of political pluralism in Turkey and led to the 1961 Constitution that had strong liberal and pluralistic characteristics. The CHP was heavily involved in the new constitutional order and formed a series of coalition governments after the 1961 elections. At the same time, the CHP's electoral support eroded throughout the 1960s. Its vote share declined from 37% in the 1961 parliamentary elections to 27% in 1969. As the nascent socialist movement gained popularity among the Turkish intelligentsia, the centre-right *Adalet Partisi* (AP – Justice Party), with its strong anti-communist platform, emerged as the hegemonic electoral party in the second half of the decade.

In this historical context, Emre argues that '(t)he emergence of a strong socialist movement became the main reason for the RPP's shift to the left of the centre' (p. 227). He identifies four socialist actors: contentious labour mobilization that facilitated the enactment of relatively progressive labour laws in 1963, the *Türkiye İşçi Partisi* (TİP – Turkish Workers Party) that won 14 seats in the 1965 parliamentary elections, the illegal and clandestine *Türkiye Komünist Partisi* (TKP – Turkish Communist Party) and the influential *Yön* magazine published between 1961 and 1967. Drawing on a rich variety of primary sources, Emre suggests that the CHP developed its left of the centre platform both to distinguish itself from these socialist actors and to reinvent itself as a progressive force of political change. He meticulously studies the CHP and other political actors' positions on three issues to describe its increasing commitment to social democracy: land reform linked to agricultural equality and productivity, anti-Americanism associated with a nationalist foreign policy and planned developmentalism that aimed to achieve rapid economic growth with state guidance. His argument that the rise of social democracy was a function of these broader social and political developments is generally compelling and scholars of Turkish politics will benefit from Emre's in-depth analysis of the CHP's internal dynamics and its relations with the broader political forces in this period.

The book has four major shortcomings. First, it lacks a well-articulated comparative perspective that would enrich the discussion of social democracy in Turkey. Whilst the first chapter offers a historical overview of the evolution of social democracy in Europe, it fails to inform the subsequent chapters on Turkey in a meaningful way. The rise of social democracy as a political force in modern Turkey has very different roots than in Europe, given the CHP's authoritarian origins, the weakness of the working class and Turkey's position as a developing country. A more stimulating and interesting comparison would be with the Latin American countries with robust socialist and social democratic movements.

Second, the book does not engage with the scholarly literature on party change that leaves its theoretical observations about the reorientation of the CHP in the mid-1960s under-developed. In particular, a discussion of the scholarship on the interaction between mainstream and niche parties would be useful, given Emre's argument that the ideological transformation of the CHP, a mainstream party, was decisively influenced by the rise of the TİP, a niche party. Such a theoretical move would also increase the relevance of the book to scholars beyond experts of Turkish politics.

Third, the book does not offer any analysis of shifts in electoral support for the CHP. It would be highly instructive to explore how the CHP performed at province and district level in the four elections from 1961 to 1973. Such an electoral analysis would provide valuable insights about not only the electoral dynamics of the CHP's ideological transformation into a force of social democracy but also the scope of the appeal of the left of the centre platform among different groups of voters (e.g. urban vs. rural, Western vs. Eastern, etc.). In the absence of such an analysis of electoral cleavages, the CHP's social democratic turn is puzzling in the light of its electoral defeats in the 1965 and 1969 elections.

Finally, the book would be more insightful with a more extensive discussion of the CHP's trajectory since the mid-1960s. Emre rightfully notes that the CHP oscillates between authoritarian state-led modernization and social democracy. Whilst the CHP's pursuit of social democratic platforms resulted in its electoral victories in the 1970s, it failed to achieve similar performances in the last four decades. Yet Emre does not provide an explanation of the failure of the CHP to carry the mantle of social democracy in Turkey in contemporary times. The question of the CHP as a progressive and popular force remains central to the question of Turkish democratization, as the AKP leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, elected president in August 2014, increasingly monopolizes political powers in his hands and aims to replace the parliamentary system with a presidential one.

Overall, *The Emergence of Social Democracy in Turkey* offers a well-researched study of the revitalization of

the founding party of the Turkish Republic as a social democratic force in the 1960s. Scholars interested in Turkish politics and social democratic movements outside of Europe will find it informative.

Heather Stoll, *Changing Societies, Changing Party Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013; x + 340 pp.: ISBN 9781107030497, £55 (hbk), 9781107675742, £19.99 (pbk)

Reviewed by: Reuven Y Hazan, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*

This is an ambitious book that attempts to combine an analysis of both the social and the institutional determinants of politics while it eschews the common wisdom in the field. Both tasks are a daunting undertaking, which together pose a significant challenge for the author. Impressively, this challenge is met quite successfully. As such, this book should become a staple for all those interested in party politics.

The central argument of this book is that the electoral system alone cannot explain when sectarian parties will emerge to represent a new social group and if they will be successful. In line with its title, the book attempts to explain how social heterogeneity shapes the number of parties. This is done in an extremely well thought-out manner, building block-by-block a sound argument that scholars will have to either take into account or attempt to refute.

Stoll begins with a masterful presentation of the diverse literature relating social heterogeneity to party system fragmentation and then raises her own theoretical perspective. She asks if *all* new social groups will obtain representation via a sectarian party if the electoral system is favorable, or vice versa if it is restrictive, and replies in the negative. There is a positive relationship between social heterogeneity and the number of political parties, but not all new groups will create their own party, and of these not all will succeed. *Which* new groups are likely to succeed—that is, *when* does an increase in social heterogeneity leads to party system fragmentation—is the thrust of her book. Stoll identifies seven factors, in addition to the electoral system, that condition the effect of social heterogeneity on party system fragmentation. Some factors are characteristics of the social group itself, such as the group's politicization and size, while others are systemic characteristics of the polity, such as the regime type and existing party strategy. In short, Stoll counters the existing literature's rather narrow focus on the electoral system as the sole, or dominant, factor conditioning the relationship between social heterogeneity and the number of political parties—such predictions are likely to be in error—and argues for a broader socio-institutional theory.

The new theoretical argument is subjected to two levels of empirical scrutiny. The first is based on cross-national longitudinal quantitative analyses of the relationship between social heterogeneity and the party system, for which Stoll delineates a new cross-sectional index. This is then followed by two qualitative case studies: (immigration to) Israel and (African American enfranchisement in) the United States. The choice of these two cases is to be applauded, since they are two of the most institutionally different democracies in existence; the former serves as the "crucial" case while the latter is the least likely case for testing the hypotheses in this book. The mixing of both quantitative and qualitative methods allows Stoll to validate her argument in a significantly better manner than any one method could have achieved.

There are, of course, some drawbacks in this book. Some of the chapters are a bit difficult to read since the footnotes are as lengthy as the text itself, without real justification. There are also some empirical errors, such as in her coverage of Israeli elections from 1949 to 2009, but they are minimized by Stoll's ability to comprehend a complex and developing political constellation in a way that enlightened me more than once—and she correctly concludes that regime change in Israel in the mid-1990s is the primary explanatory factor for fragmentation. She also surprisingly suggests that when existing parties adopt either an adversarial or a partially accommodative strategy toward the new social group both can be dangerous, since the better strategy to head off the entry and success of a new social group is to be fully accommodative. Both of these findings, concerning regime type and existing party strategy, were also supported in her case study of the United States.

Democratic societies change over time, largely due to processes such as immigration and changes in the franchise, among other reasons. Adding new groups of citizens will make democracies more heterogeneous, but only some will also reshape the party system. With Stoll's book, we can now say more about which groups will manage to form their own parties and which of these will succeed. There are several systemic factors, beyond the electoral system, combined with those of the new social group itself that determine the likelihood that these groups will change the party