

Karpat, Kemal H., *Turkey's Politics: the Transition to a Multi-Party System*. Princeton: University Press, 1959, 522 pp.

In this long and detailed study, Kemal H. Karpat, who presently teaches at New York University but, in the past, was a member of the UN Secretariat, then acting Director of the School of Public Administration in Ankara, then professor of political science at Montana State University, deals with the emergence of the multi-party system in Turkey between 1946 and 1950, and analyses some of the problems of Turkish domestic politics as these appeared from the viewpoint of a thoughtful Westernized Turkish intellectual writing at the eve of the downfall of the ten-year regime of the Democratic Party, headed by President Celal Bayar and with the late Adnan Menderes as premier.

Using not only Western materials but also Turkish sources in abundance, the author surveys in great detail the impact of Western democratic standards of government on the republican form of regime, based on a single party system, that was set up in Turkey by Kemal after World War I, a regime which, politically, was a strange hybrid between Western European institutions and the single party Soviet system that recognized no checks and balances, just as its economic system was a cross between the USSR's state capitalism and the "free enterprise system" of the West. In this deliberate government-sponsored step toward a multi-party system, Karpat sees another link in the chain of Turkish attempts at democratic organization, and views this phenomenon as "the synthesis of various interacting cultural, economic, social, and personal conflicts."

His study is divided in three parts. The first deals with the historical background of the transition to the multi-party system, primarily but not exclusively—because he also proceeds, especially in his chapter entitled "The Social Classes and Wartime Developments," to the account of certain social developments well beyond the wartime period mentioned in the chapter's title. The second part consists of a chronological study of the relevant domestic political developments in 1945-1950. The third part covers the changes in the regime's ideology, various cultural, political, economic, and social problems. It concludes with a description of the country's main parties (prior to 1959) and with a chapter that summarizes the author's findings and includes certain recommendations aimed at strengthening Western-style democracy in Turkey.

In his appraisal of the political developments in his country, the author resorts to the criteria of democratic multi-party systems in the West, arguing that Turkish national goals were set according to Western standards. In this connection it is interesting to note that the particular standards proclaimed in the UN Charter—that document which expresses Western welfare state ideals—constituted an important factor that was conducive to Turkey's new trend toward democratization toward the end of World War II and in the postwar period.

Of course, a careful correlation of internal Turkish developments with the international setting as this was shaping up toward the end of World War II, would have revealed more clearly than does this study the close, quite intimate connection between the internal developments that led toward a multi-party system in Turkey and environmental developments—Soviet pressures on Turkey coming clearly to the surface by March 1945, and the subsequent bipolarization between the USSR and the United States in the global arena. Nowadays, domestic problems can be isolated from their international milieu only for study purposes, so blurred has become in reality the line between domestic and foreign affairs. In this connection, the critical period for Turkey was not, as Karpas writes, the one between the Turkish elections of July 12, 1946 and President İnönü's declaration of July 12, 1947, but the period between İnönü's declaration of May 19, 1945, concerning the need for democratic developments in Turkey and the aforementioned statement of that same statesman in July, two years later—after the "Truman Doctrine" was passed by the United States Congress. United States influence—not through diplomatic channels though, as former Ambassador Edwin Wilson once assured this reviewer—thus inextricably mingled with the influence of many American ideals as these were enshrined in the UN Charter.

Influenced by these same ideals, Karpas holds that democracy in Turkey should strive to combine "progressive socio-economic cultural thinking with political liberalism and national values." While recognizing that Turkish "excesses in respect to communism" are due to Turkey's position as an immediate neighbor of the USSR and acknowledging that the appeal of communist ideas in Turkey may be gauged by the strenuous measures taken to suppress them, he maintains that "the fear of communism and the extreme caution it entails annihilate spontaneity and daring in planning, especially in the social field." In domestic affairs, the mission of Turkish nationalism, he finds, has ended. After the attainment of national independence, the creation of a national consciousness, the start of the drive toward modernization, nationalism, in his opinion, "tends to become an obstacle to the individual's cultural and political development, and to modernization as a whole."

While the revolution of May 27, 1960, highlights the extremely scant treatment which Karpas devotes to the question of the role of the military in Turkish politics as well as his very gingerly handling of the many repressive measures which the Democratic Party, once in power inflicted upon its opponents, it is noteworthy that some of his suggestions for strengthening democracy in Turkey—for instance, the need for Proportional Representation and for a Supreme Court, to act as a judge of the constitutionality of laws—appear in the Constitution of 1961, which forms the base of the second Turkish republic.

Hunter College, New York

STEPHEN G. XYDIS