

WORLD POLITICS

*A Quarterly Journal of
International Relations*

Volume 63, Number 1 January 2011

UNDER THE EDITORIAL SPONSORSHIP OF
PRINCETON INSTITUTE FOR
INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES

PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDITORIAL BOARD

ATUL KOHLI, *Chair*

NANCY BERMEO, MARY E. GALLAGHER, ANNA GRZMALA-BUSSE, JEFFREY HERBST,
TORBEN IVERSEN, STATHIS KALYVAS, JONATHAN KIRSHNER, LISA L. MARTIN,
MICHAEL MASTANDUNO, KEVIN O'ROURKE, JONAS PONTUSSON, DANIEL N. POSNER,
KENNETH SCHEVE, EDWARD S. STEINFELD, MICHAEL TOMZ, JOHN WATERBURY

Editorial Committee: MARK R. BEISSINGER, CHRISTINA L. DAVIS, JOANNE GOWA,
G. JOHN IKENBERRY, AMANEY A. JAMAL, HAROLD JAMES, ATUL KOHLI (*Chair*),
DOUGLAS S. MASSEY

Associate Editors: DELIA BALDASSARRI, DANIELA CAMPELLO, RAFAELA DANCYGIER,
DAVID LEHENY, XUN PANG, GRIGORE POP-ELECHES, KRISTOPHER W. RAMSAY,
JACOB N. SHAPIRO, BRADLEY SIMPSON, ANDREA VINDIGNI, LYNN T. WHITE III

Executive Editor: ILENE P. COHEN *Assistant Editor:* JOY M. SCHARFSTEIN
Office Support: PATRICIA D. ZIMMER

The editors invite submission of articles, research notes, and review articles bearing upon problems in international relations and comparative politics. Manuscripts and notes should be double-spaced and submitted through the Web-based submission system, Manuscript Central, at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/wp>. *World Politics* guidelines permit submissions of up to 12,500 words in length, including notes and references (excluding tables, figures, and appendixes); research notes may be up to 10,000 words in length, including notes. Word count should be indicated. Manuscripts that exceed the limit *will not be considered*. Guidelines for review articles, guidelines for special issues, tables of contents, and other information can be found the *World Politics* home page, at http://www.princeton.edu/~piirs/publications/world_politics.html.

Authors can expect to receive decisions on their submissions within four months. Procedures for reviewing manuscripts are based on the anonymity of the author and the confidentiality of readers' and editors' reports; author anonymity is preserved, as well, during the editorial decision-making process. Self-references should therefore be removed. Referees are drawn from Princeton and other institutions; published articles have usually been reviewed by at least one editor and two readers from other institutions. In the case of an article deemed to be inappropriate for *World Politics*, the editors strive to notify the author within three weeks of submission that the article has been withdrawn from consideration.

Referees for the previous calendar year are acknowledged annually in issue 4 of the journal. *World Politics* does not accept manuscripts that have already been published, are scheduled for publication elsewhere, or have been simultaneously submitted to another journal; this applies to both print and online formats. Statements of fact and opinion appearing in the journal are made on the responsibility of the authors alone and do not imply the endorsement of the editors or publisher. The journal does not publish communications to the editor or rejoinders to specific articles. Scholars who believe they have been challenged are encouraged to submit an article that will advance the scholarly debate.

WORLD POLITICS

Vol. 63

• January 2011

• No. 1

CONTENTS

Constructing Interethnic Conflict and Cooperation: Why Some People Harmed Jews and Others Helped Them during the Holocaust in Romania	<i>Diana Dumitru and Carter Johnson</i>	1
The Latin American Left's Mandate: Free-Market Policies and Issue Voting in New Democracies	<i>Andy Baker and Kenneth F. Greene</i>	43
Gonna Party Like It's 1899: Party Systems and the Origins of Varieties of Coordination	<i>Cathie Jo Martin and Duane Swank</i>	78
Regimes of Ethnicity: Comparative Analysis of Germany, the Soviet Union/ Post-Soviet Russia, and Turkey	<i>Şener Aktürk</i>	115
Electoral Reform and Public Policy Outcomes in Thailand: The Politics of the 30-Baht Health Scheme	<i>Joel Sawat Selway</i>	165
The Contributors		ii
Abstracts		iii

THE CONTRIBUTORS

DIANA DUMITRU is an associate professor of history at Ion Creangă State University of Moldova. She is the author of *Great Britain and the Union of the Romanian Principalities* (2010), and she is currently finishing a book on the relationship between Jews and gentiles during the Holocaust in Romania. Her articles have been published in various journals. She can be reached at didumitru@yahoo.com.

CARTER JOHNSON received his Ph.D. in Government and Politics from the University of Maryland, College Park, in 2010. His has published articles on institutional solutions to ethnic conflict, and he is currently writing a book on partition as a solution to ethnic civil war. He can be reached at johnsoncarter@gmail.com.

ANDY BAKER is an associate professor in the political science department at the University of Colorado at Boulder. He has published in a number of journals on Latin American politics, mass political behavior, and international political economy. His book, *The Market and the Masses in Latin America* (2009), is about the nature and causes of citizens' attitudes toward free-market policies in eighteen Latin American nations. He can be reached at andy.baker@colorado.edu.

KENNETH F. GREENE is an associate professor of political science at the University of Texas at Austin. His current work focuses on political clientelism and party-system development in new democracies. He has published widely on competitive authoritarianism, spatial theory, and voting behavior. His book, *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective* (2007), won the 2008 Best Book Award from the Comparative Democratization Section of the American Political Science Association. He can be reached at kgreene@austin.utexas.edu.

CATHIE JO MARTIN is a professor of political science at Boston University and chair of the Council for European Studies. She is the author of *Stuck in Neutral: Business and the Politics of Human Capital Investment Policy* (2000), *Shifting the Burden: The Struggle over Growth and Corporate Taxation* (1991), and *Aktivering af arbejdsgiverne: Arbejdsmarkedets svage i Danmark og Storbritannien* [Activating Employers] (2004). Her articles have appeared in major American and European political science journals. She can be reached at cjmartin@bu.edu.

DUANE SWANK is a professor of political science at Marquette University. He is the author of *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States* (2002). He is currently finishing a book with Cathie Jo Martin on the origins, evolution, and policy impacts of employers' organizations in democratic capitalist political economies. He can be reached at duane.swank@marquette.edu.

ŞENER AKTÜRK is an assistant professor in the Department of International Relations, College of Administrative Sciences and Economics, at Koç University in Istanbul, Turkey. He is currently working on a book manuscript on regimes of ethnicity and has published articles on ethnicity and nationalism in various journals. He can be reached at sakturk@ku.edu.tr.

JOEL SAWAT SELWAY is an assistant professor of political science at Brigham Young University. His work focuses on ethnicity and political institutions, and he looks at a variety of outcomes such as civil war, public goods, economic growth, and political parties. He is finishing a book manuscript entitled, "Ethnicity, Institutions and Public Goods Provision in Developing Countries." He can be reached at joel_selway@byu.edu.

ABSTRACTS

CONSTRUCTING INTERETHNIC CONFLICT AND COOPERATION

WHY SOME PEOPLE HARMED JEWS AND OTHERS HELPED THEM DURING THE HOLOCAUST IN ROMANIA

By DIANA DUMITRU and CARTER JOHNSON

The authors draw on a natural experiment to demonstrate that states can reconstruct conflictual interethnic relationships into cooperative relationships in relatively short periods of time. The article examines differences in how the gentile population in each of two neighboring territories in Romania treated its Jewish population during the Holocaust. These territories had been part of tsarist Russia and subject to state-sponsored anti-Semitism until 1917. During the interwar period one territory became part of Romania, which continued anti-Semitic policies, and the other became part of the Soviet Union, which pursued an inclusive nationality policy, fighting against inherited anti-Semitism and working to integrate its Jews. Both territories were then reunited under Romanian administration during World War II, when Romania began to destroy its Jewish population. The authors demonstrate that, despite a uniform Romanian state presence during the Holocaust that encouraged gentiles to victimize Jews, the civilian population in the area that had been part of the Soviet Union was less likely to harm and more likely to aid Jews as compared with the region that had been part of Romania. Their evidence suggests that the state construction of interethnic relationships can become internalized by civilians and outlive the life of the state itself.

THE LATIN AMERICAN LEFT'S MANDATE

FREE-MARKET POLICIES AND ISSUE VOTING IN NEW DEMOCRACIES

By ANDY BAKER and KENNETH F. GREENE

The rise of the left across Latin America is one of the most striking electoral events to occur in new democracies during the last decade. Current work argues either that the left's electoral success stems from a thoroughgoing rejection of free-market policies by voters or that electorates have sought to punish poorly performing right-wing incumbents. Whether the new left has a *policy* or *performance* mandate has implications for the type of policies it may pursue in power and the voting behavior of Latin American electorates. Using a new measure of voter ideology called vote-revealed leftism (VRL) and a time-series cross-sectional analysis of aggregate public opinion indicators generated from mass surveys of eighteen countries over thirteen years, the authors show that the left has a clear economic policy mandate but that this mandate is much more moderate than many observers might expect. In contrast to the generalized view that new democracies are of low quality, the authors reach the more optimistic conclusion that well-reasoned voting on economic policy issues and electoral mandates are now relevant features of politics in Latin America.

GONNA PARTY LIKE IT'S 1899

PARTY SYSTEMS AND THE ORIGINS OF VARIETIES OF COORDINATION

By CATHIE JO MARTIN and DUANE SWANK

This article explores the origins of peak employers' associations to understand why countries produce highly centralized corporatist groups, weaker national associations but stronger industry-level groups, or highly fragmented pluralist associations. The authors suggest that the structure of partisan competition played a vital causal role in the development and evolution of these peak associations. The leadership for peak employers' association development came from business-oriented party activists and bureaucrats, who sought both to advance industrial development policy and to solve specific problems of political control. Business-oriented party leaders and bureaucrats in both predemocratic and democratic regimes feared the rising tide of democracy and labor activism and viewed employer organization as a useful tool for political control, to secure parliamentary advantage, and to serve as a societal counterweight to working-class activism. Because leadership for association building came from the state, the political

rules of the game were crucial to outcomes. The structure of party competition and state centralization shaped incentives for strategic coordination for both political actors and employers. Dedicated business parties were more likely to develop in countries with multiparty systems and limited federal power sharing than in countries with two-party systems and federalism: in a multiparty context where no single party was likely to gain power, each party had an incentive to cooperate with other social groups. Moreover, business-oriented party leaders and bureaucrats in multiparty systems were motivated to delegate policy-making authority to coordinated societal channels for industrial relations, because they anticipated that employers would win more in these channels than in parliamentary settings where the center and left could form a coalition against the right. Again, centralized party systems were more likely than federal ones to develop a dedicated national business party that transcended regional cleavages and to retain a strong role for the state in the governance of industrial relations.

REGIMES OF ETHNICITY

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GERMANY, THE SOVIET UNION/POST-SOVIET RUSSIA,
AND TURKEY

By ŞENER AKTÜRK

How do state policies that regulate the relationship between ethnicity and nationality change? This article examines the dynamics of persistence and change in state policies toward ethnicity. In order to better comprehend the nature of political contestation over these state policies, the author first develops a new typology, “regimes of ethnicity,” and categorizes states as having monoethnic, multiethnic, and antiethnic regimes. These regimes are defined along dimensions of membership and expression. Second, he develops a theory of ethnic regime change. He explains the persistence and change in policies related to ethnicity and nationality in Germany, the Soviet Union/post-Soviet Russia, and Turkey since the 1950s by reference to the presence or absence of three independent variables: counterelites, new discourses, and hegemonic majority. He argues that if counterelites representing constituencies with ethnically specific grievances come to power equipped with a new discourse on ethnicity and nationality and garner a hegemonic majority, they can change state policies on ethnicity. These three factors are separately necessary and jointly sufficient for change. Reform in the German citizenship law, removal of ethnicity from Russian internal passports, and the beginning of public broadcasting in Kurdish and other minority languages on state television in Turkey are examined as major changes in state policies.

ELECTORAL REFORM AND PUBLIC POLICY OUTCOMES IN THAILAND

THE POLITICS OF THE 30-BAHT HEALTH SCHEME

By JOEL SAWAT SELWAY

How do changes in electoral rules affect the nature of public policy outcomes? The current evidence supporting institutional theories that answer this question stems almost entirely from quantitative cross-country studies, the data of which contain very little within-unit variation. Indeed, while there are many country-level accounts of how changes in electoral rules affect such phenomena as the number of parties or voter turnout, there are few studies of how electoral reform affects public policy outcomes. This article contributes to this latter endeavor by providing a detailed analysis of electoral reform and the public policy process in Thailand through an examination of the 1997 electoral reforms. Specifically, the author examines four aspects of policy-making: policy formulation, policy platforms, policy content, and policy outcomes. The article finds that candidates in the pre-1997 era campaigned on broad, generic platforms; parties had no independent means of technical policy expertise; the government targeted health resources to narrow geographic areas; and health was underprovided in Thai society. Conversely, candidates in the post-1997 era relied more on a strong, detailed national health policy; parties created mechanisms to formulate health policy independently; the government allocated health resources broadly to the entire nation through the introduction of a universal health care system, and health outcomes improved. The author attributes these changes in the policy process to the 1997 electoral reform, which increased both *constituency breadth* (the proportion of the population to which politicians were accountable) and *majoritarianism*.