

# WORLD POLITICS

*A Quarterly Journal of  
International Relations*

Volume 63, Number 3 July 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 GRZYMAŁA-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](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

July 2011

No. 3

## CONTENTS

An Institutional Theory of Direct and Indirect Rule *John Gerring, Daniel Ziblatt, Johan van Gorp, and Julián Arévalo* 377

Embedded Mobilization: Nonstate Service Provision as Electoral Strategy in India *Tariq Thachil* 434

The Rise of Indirect Affirmative Action: Converging Strategies for Promoting “Diversity” in Selective Institutions of Higher Education in the United States and France *Daniel Sabbagh* 470

Globalization, Party Positions, and the Median Voter *Hugh Ward, Lawrence Ezrow, and Han Dorussen* 509

### REVIEW ARTICLE

International Relations Theory and the Rise of European Foreign and Security Policy *Ulrich Krotz and Richard Maher* 548

The Contributors ii

Abstracts iv

## THE CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN GERRING is a professor of political science at Boston University. He is the author of *Party Ideologies in America, 1828–1996* (1998), *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework* (2001), *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (2007), *A Centripetal Theory of Democratic Governance* (2008), *Concepts and Method: Giovanni Sartori and His Legacy* (2009), *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework* (2012), “Global Justice: A Prioritarian Manifesto” (in process), and “Democracy and Development: A Historical Perspective” (in process), along with numerous articles. He can be reached at [jgerring@bu.edu](mailto:jgerring@bu.edu).

DANIEL ZIBLATT is a professor of government at Harvard University. He is the author of *Structuring the State: The Formation of Italy and Germany and the Puzzle of Federalism* (2006) and coeditor of *The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies* (2010). He is currently completing a book entitled, “Conservative Political Parties and the Birth of Modern Democracy in Europe.” He can be reached at [dziblatt@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:dziblatt@fas.harvard.edu).

JOHAN VAN GORP is a fifth-year doctoral candidate in the Political Science Department at Boston University. He is currently working on his dissertation, “Discursive Institutionalism and Political Change in the Netherlands.” He can be reached at [johan.van.gorp@gmail.com](mailto:johan.van.gorp@gmail.com).

JULIÁN ARÉVALO received his Ph.D. in political science from Boston University in May 2011. His work focuses on Latin American political economy and studies the interplay between ideas and the formation of political values and attitudes. He can be reached at [jarevalob@gmail.com](mailto:jarevalob@gmail.com).

TARIQ THACHIL is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Yale University. His research interests include examining the linkages between political parties and ordinary voters, ethnic and religious politics, and patterns of public spending in poor democracies. He is currently completing a book manuscript based on his doctoral dissertation, examining how religious nationalists can win over poor communities using social services. He can be reached at [tariq.thachil@yale.edu](mailto:tariq.thachil@yale.edu).

DANIEL SABBAGH is a senior research fellow at Sciences Po, Centre d'études et de recherches internationales (CERI) UMR CNRS no. 7050. He is the author of *Equality and Transparency: A Strategic Perspective on Affirmative Action in American Law* (2007). He can be reached at [sabbagh@ceri-sciences-po.org](mailto:sabbagh@ceri-sciences-po.org).

HAN DORUSSEN is a professor in the Department of Government at the University of Essex. His current research interests include the relationship between trade and conflict, peacekeeping operations and the governance of postconflict societies, and policy convergence and burden sharing in the European Union. He can be reached at [hdorus@essex.ac.uk](mailto:horus@essex.ac.uk).

LAWRENCE EZROW is an associate professor in the Department of Government at the University of Essex. He has written on democracy, political representation, elections, political parties, party strategies, and political institutions. His most recent book is *Linking Citizens and Parties* (2010). He can be reached at [ezrow@essex.ac.uk](mailto:ezrow@essex.ac.uk).

HUGH WARD is a professor in the Department of Government at the University of Essex. His recent work applies social network theory to international cooperation and conflict. He can be reached at [hugh@essex.ac.uk](mailto:hugh@essex.ac.uk).

ULRICH KROTZ is a fellow at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, and an assistant professor of political science at Brown University. He is author of *Flying Tiger: International Relations Theory and the Politics of Advanced Weapons* (2011) and *History*

*and Foreign Policy in France and Germany* (forthcoming). He is now working on two different book projects and a range of articles in the areas of European foreign and security policy and “Europe in the world”; Franco-German relations and their impact on the history and politics of European integration; and shifts and continuities in contemporary world politics. He can be reached at [ukrotz@wcfia.harvard.edu](mailto:ukrotz@wcfia.harvard.edu).

RICHARD MAHER is a Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute for the 2011–12 academic year. He recently completed a Ph.D. in the Political Science Department at Brown University. His dissertation examines the alliance security dilemma under unipolarity. His research areas include alliances, nuclear weapons, and energy security. He can be reached at [richard\\_maher@brown.edu](mailto:richard_maher@brown.edu).

## ABSTRACTS

### AN INSTITUTIONAL THEORY OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT RULE

By JOHN GERRING, DANIEL ZIBLATI, JOHAN VAN GORP, and JULIÁN ARÉVALO

Most governance arrangements involve spatial units with highly unequal powers, for example, a feudal monarchy and its principalities, an empire and its colonies, a formal empire and an informal empire (or sphere of influence), a national government and its subnational entities, or a regional government and its local entities. In this situation, the dominant unit (*A*) usually enjoys some discretion about how to institutionalize its authority over the subordinate unit (*B*). An important element of this decision concerns how much authority should be delegated to the weaker unit. The authors simplify this dimension of governance along a continuum of “direct” and “indirect” styles of rule. Why, in some cases, does one find a relatively direct (centralized) system of rule and in others a relatively indirect (decentralized) system of rule? While many factors impinge on this decision, the authors argue that an important and highly persistent factor is the prior level of centralization existing within the subordinate unit. Greater centralization in *B* is likely to lead to a more indirect form of rule between *A* and *B*, all other things being equal. The authors refer to this as an *institutional* theory of direct/indirect rule. Empirical analyses of this hypothesis are applied to patterns of direct and indirect rule (1) during the age of imperialism and (2) across contemporary nation-states. The article concludes by discussing applications of the theory in a variety of additional settings.

### EMBEDDED MOBILIZATION

NONSTATE SERVICE PROVISION AS ELECTORAL STRATEGY IN INDIA

By TARIQ THACHIL

How do elite parties win over poor voters while maintaining their core constituencies? How can religious parties expand their electoral base? This article argues that social service provision constitutes an important electoral strategy for elite-backed religious parties to succeed in developing democracies. The study demonstrates how the upper caste, Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) won unexpected support from lower-caste voters in India, due to services provided by its grassroots affiliates. Using a combination of original survey data and extensive interviews, the author tests whether services win votes and identifies the mechanisms by which they do so. Beneficiaries of services were found to be far more likely to support the party, even when accounting for piety, income, and ideological orientation. The author argues that service provision as an electoral strategy cannot be conceptualized as being predicated purely on material exchange. It should instead be understood as a socially embedded tactic especially well suited to helping elite parties with organizational resources, but without pro-poor policy agendas, win over underprivileged electorates.

### THE RISE OF INDIRECT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

CONVERGING STRATEGIES FOR PROMOTING “DIVERSITY” IN SELECTIVE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE

By DANIEL SABBAGH

A growing trend in the comparative politics literature on patterns of minority incorporation emphasizes the emerging policy convergence in this area, conventional oppositions between national models notwithstanding. This convergence is further illustrated by drawing upon the cases of two countries often analyzed within an “exceptionalist” framework and generally viewed as polar opposites as far as the political legitimacy and legal validity of race-based classifications are concerned: the United States and France. The analysis of recent programs designed to increase the “diversity” of the student body in selective institutions of higher education demonstrates that *indirect affirmative action* is the instrument around which French and U.S. policies have tended to converge. This increasingly visible convergence obtains in part because of the current move toward color-blindness as a matter of law in the United States. Yet it is also a reflection of the

fact that the ultimate purpose of affirmative action in liberal democracies requires a measure of indirection and/or implicitness.

### GLOBALIZATION, PARTY POSITIONS, AND THE MEDIAN VOTER

By HUGH WARD, LAWRENCE EZROW, and HAN DORUSSEN

The authors argue that the effects of economic globalization on social democratic parties in Western Europe are conditional on the position of the median voter. If the median is far enough to the right, such parties will adopt business-friendly policies because they are required to win office. Only when the median is relatively far to the left will globalization constrain social democratic parties, forcing them to adopt policies further to the right in order to retain credibility. It is on this basis the authors argue that empirical studies are misspecified unless they include an interaction between measures of globalization and the position of the median. In addition to presenting formal theoretical arguments, the article reports empirical findings from fifteen countries in the period from 1973 to 2002 that support the conclusion that the effects of globalization are indeed contingent on the median. The authors find that the effects of globalization are significant for social democratic parties only in circumstances in which the median is relatively far to the left.

### INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY AND THE RISE OF EUROPEAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

By ULRICH KROTZ and RICHARD MAHER

The historical rise of European foreign, security, and defense policy marks an important development in European politics and world politics more broadly. Long thought unlikely to amount to much, European integration in the domains of traditional “high politics” has consolidated bit by bit since the mid-1990s, under the auspices of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and a pan-European security and defense policy (ESDP). Accordingly, European affairs in these areas have attracted increased scholarly interest. In a variety of books as well as journal articles, scholars from diverse theoretical and intellectual backgrounds have argued that European integration in these policy areas has gained considerable substance—while offering very different causal accounts for why this has occurred. These different theoretical and empirical investigations together produce a new field of study with its own research questions, vocabulary, and search for causal explanations. IR theory is now engaging fully with European integration studies and vice versa. Paradoxically, this takes place in precisely those policy areas in which European integration had long been the weakest and least developed. This article explores and evaluates this new literature that analyzes why, compared with even the very recent past, a European foreign and security policy has emerged and apparently solidified.