Conservative Politics in Western Europe, by Z. Layton-Henry

Leon Hurwitz  
*Cleveland State University*, l.hurwitzl@csuohio.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clpolsci_facpub

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

*Publisher’s Statement*


*Original Citation*


*Repository Citation*

https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clpolsci_facpub/23

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science Department at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.
liography listing major country sources and detailed endnotes after each section that provide not only specialized entries but also useful annotations with more relevant detailed information. Contained herein are sources frequently overlooked in North American scholarship—the most important of which are West German in origin. Converted into textual material, it is the richness and completeness of Kohler’s sources that serve as the basis for the detailed country analysis.

This very detailed analysis of each country’s political and social forces, which is one of the book’s strengths, is also the source of its difficulties. Although there is a logic for grouping together Spain, Greece, and Portugal—without consideration for Italy—the author actually engages in little comparative analysis. Kohler uses parallel categories to examine each case, but leaves comparison itself up to the reader. Just as there is scant internal cross-national comparison, there is also little in the Introduction and Conclusion bringing together common patterns and explaining why the decade of the 1970s, which is examined in such detail, was a momentous one for all three countries. Whereas Spain, Greece, and Portugal entered the decade on the periphery of Europe, by the end of the 1970s there could no longer be any doubt that their future, their options, and their constraints have become irrevocably linked with those of Europe as a whole. Integration into the European Economic Community will be the most difficult for Portugal, but its structural problems are not all that different from those faced by Spain and Greece. Certainly Spain has come the farthest in its internal transformations, but the point at which it began in the 1950s is not all that different. Such parallels as these argue for further comparative analysis of the three countries as cases central to any discussion of the interplay between nationalism and modernization in the contemporary world.

Lawrence S. Graham

University of Texas at Austin

Conservative Politics in Western Europe. Edited by Zig Layton-Henry. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1982. Pp. xi + 352. $27.50.)

Conservative Politics in Western Europe is a collection of 14 essays, all written by European scholars. The introductory essay, written by the volume’s editor Zig Layton-Henry, is followed by essays on conservative politics and political behavior in Britain (Gillian Peele), Scotland (William Money), Sweden (Sten Berglund and Ulf Lindstrom), Denmark (Ib Faurby and Ole Kris-
tensen), Norway (Bjarne Kristiansen and Lars Svasand), the Federal Republic of Germany (Alf Mintzel), Belgium (Anthony Mughan), the Netherlands (Hermann von der Dunk), France (Jean-Claude Colliard on the Giscardians and Patrick Lecomte on Chirac’s Rassemblement), Italy (Mario Caciagli), Spain (Kenneth Medhurst), and in what is the most interesting essay in the volume, Geoffery Pridham deals with transnational conservative cooperation within the European Community and the European Parliament.

The volume makes a strong case for the resurgence of the conservative ideology across Western Europe, although the electoral failures of some conservative parties are also noted. As Layton-Henry comments, the conservative ideology has made a remarkable comeback since the end of World War II when the parties of the Right were discredited, rightly or wrongly, in most European countries due to the ties between conservatism and fascism and to the collaboration between conservative groups and the Nazis. But by the time of the early 1970s and continuing into the 1980s, the parties of the Right had regained their strength, even in such social democratic strongholds of Scandinavia.

But this swing to the Right can be overdrawn. There may have been a resurgence of conservatism in some specific countries in recent years, but when the European Community as a whole is analyzed by looking at the first (June, 1979) direct elections to the European Parliament, a different interpretation surfaces. Ronald Inglehart and Jacques-René Rabier, in “Europe Elects a Parliament,” in Leon Hurwitz (ed.), Contemporary Perspectives on European Integration (Greenwood Press, 1980, pp. 27-51), observe that only in Great Britain, where the Labour party put on a dismal show in the 1979 elections, was there any ground to support a conservative resurgence. The swing to the Right across Europe was anything but evident if the composition of the 1979 to 1984 European Parliament is compared to that of the previous assembly, if the votes cast in the European Parliament are compared to that of the previous assembly, and if the votes cast in the European election are compared to those in the most recent national elections. The swing was very limited in a geographical sense (the United Kingdom).

As with any collective and collaborative work, some technical problems surface. The essays are of uneven quality, ranging from first-rate analyses (the essay on conservative party activists in Denmark by Faurby and Kristensen, for example) to what I interpret to be graduate student papers. Although not identified, several of the essays have been translated into English from the original, and some appear in that stilted academic English
that has been described by the London Times (in an entirely different context) as "techno-English"—the language is correct but it does not make for easy reading. Some of the essays are overdocumented (one has some 64 notes in 19 pages of text), and it is difficult to follow the thread of the argument with so many side diversions. Finally, an index that contained some concepts and themes rather than just names of people and parties would have been more helpful. These criticisms, however, are really only cosmetic. The book, although not suited for the introductory student, serves as an important contribution for the specialist in the field of European party politics.

LEON HURWITZ

Cleveland State University


Nahirny's objective is to increase our comprehension of the development of the Russian intelligentsia, particularly of the nineteenth century. His method is sociological in the tradition of Mannheim. Nahirny exposes the role playing and agonies of the "men of conviction" of Russian society with particular attention given to their social origins and to aspects of generational change. He avoids a simplistic class analysis by establishing a model of social differentiation appropriate to Russia of the time. Unfortunately, the reader must wait to the conclusion of the book to see the model comprehensively displayed. An earlier presentation of the model, together with clearer identification of time periods of his chosen examples of members of the intelligentsia, would have assisted the organization of the book.

Despite these problems, Nahirny's work is a success. The ideologization of the intelligentsia is portrayed skillfully and with ample documentation from primary sources including fascinating quotations from diaries. At times Nahirny's penchant for quoting the words of the intelligentsia without translating their French or German will cause the less literate of us to tremble; but both the style of his writing and his analysis are convincing, comprehensible, and thorough.

What makes Nahirny so successful is his consistency in avoiding the substance and passion of the great debates of the Russian intelligentsia. Those have been written about and analyzed by students of literature, history, and politics for almost a century. Nahirny is making a distinctive contribution by methodically investigating and analyzing the "mode of orientation" toward ideas by the Russian intelligentsia. By this he means exploring hypotheses regarding both individual and group reactions to ideas and theories, particularly reactions that transformed ideas into "causes" and ideologies. Nahirny does not neglect the great issues of Russian intellectual debate, but rather uses these issues as the backdrop of his analysis. The variety of Russian responses to Western ideas is well elaborated, yet Nahirny moves consistently to a concluding theme that, despite this variety, a unified consequence emerges—ideologization of a total sort.

It is Nahirny's "mode of orientation" to this theme that will cause some readers to reflect on Western intellectual development instead of Russian. Nahirny appears to be restating some of the arguments about the "origins of totalitarianism," although with some distinctive convolutions. Lenin is portrayed as the culmination of the ideologization of the Russian intelligentsia in the crucial generation following the reforms of the 1860s. Nahirny gives those reforms immense importance, especially in terms of their consequence for urban life in Russia. The combination of those changes and the historical development of the intelligentsia provide the fertile ground for Leninism and terroristic ideology, according to Nahirny. Those who have difficulty with the totalitarian model of Soviet politics will have some misgivings regarding this aspect of the book.

But the scholarship that produced the book will not be questioned, nor will be the judgment that this book will be regarded as one of the most important on Russian historical-political development of this decade.

PATRICK DRINAN

University of San Diego


The thesis of Organized Democracy is multi-faceted. Olsen asserts first that "political institutions have modified in significant ways since 1945" (p. 7); second, that current analytical models have not kept up with these changes; and third, that our interpretation of these changes might reflect a theoretical misunderstanding rather than behavior that may have been viewed as pathological. Finally, what is needed, says Olsen, is a framework so that scholars might "better understand the role of organizational factors in political life" (p. 7). In essence, he has