

WORLD POLITICS

*A Quarterly Journal of
International Relations*

Volume 70, Number 1 January 2018

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

PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDITORIAL BOARD

DEBORAH J. YASHAR, *Chair*

NANCY BERMEO, KRISTIAN SKREDE GLEDITSCH, ANNA GRZYMALA-BUSSE, TORBEN IVERSEN,
STATHIS KALYVAS, GARY KING, DAVID LEBLANG, EVAN S. LIEBERMAN, ELLEN LUST,
LISA MARTIN, ELIZABETH J. PERRY, KENNETH R. ROBERTS, MICHAEL L. ROSS,
KATHLEEN THELEN, NICHOLAS VAN DE WALLE, BARBARA F. WALTER, ANDREAS WIMMER,
ELISABETH JEAN WOOD, DANIEL ZIBLATT

Editorial Committee: THOMAS J. CHRISTENSEN, RAFAELA DANCYGIER,
G. JOHN IKENBERRY, AMANEY A. JAMAL, HAROLD JAMES, ATUL KOHLI, STEPHEN KOTKIN,
GRIGORE POP-ELECHES, KRISTOPHER W. RAMSAY, DEBORAH J. YASHAR (*Chair*)

Associate Editors: FAISAL Z. AHMED, ALISHA HOLLAND,
JACOB N. SHAPIRO, RORY TRUOX, KEREN YARHI-MILO

Executive Editor: JOY M. SCHARFSTEIN *Editorial Assistants:* JOAN HSIAO, KILLIAN CLARKE

The editors invite submission of research articles and review articles bearing upon problems in international relations and comparative politics. Manuscripts should be double-spaced and submitted through the Web-based submission system, ScholarOne Manuscripts, at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/wp>. Articles may be up to 12,500 words in length, including notes and references. Tables, figures, appendixes, and supplementary materials need not be included in the word count. Word count should be indicated. Manuscripts that exceed the limit *will not be considered*. Guidelines for articles and special issues, abstracts of forthcoming and recently published articles, and other information can be found on the *World Politics* Web page, at piirs.princeton.edu/wpj.

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 two non-Princeton reviewers and often, but not in all instances, one of the editors. Referees for the previous calendar year are acknowledged annually in issue 4 of the journal. In the case of an article deemed to be inappropriate for *World Politics*, the editors strive to notify the author within a month of submission that the article has been withdrawn from consideration.

World Politics does not consider material that has already been published (including in a foreign language), has been concurrently submitted elsewhere, or is already slated for publication even in a somewhat different form, such as a chapter of a book. This policy applies to both print and online formats. For these purposes, an online format that would preclude consideration by the journal refers to a refereed presentation and/or a copyrighted working paper. Examples of pre-published materials that may be considered are print working papers and online papers on an author's own homepage or Web site. Certain material already scheduled for publication, such as a chapter of a book, may be considered by *World Politics* if it is to appear no earlier than nine months after the likely date of publication in the journal. Dual submission and dual publication are not permitted while a piece is under consideration at *World Politics*. These restrictions apply to all copyrighted publications (including book chapters, journal articles, and/or working papers). Statements of fact and opinion appearing in the journal are the responsibility of the authors alone and do not imply 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. 70

• January 2018

• No. 1

CONTENTS

International Trade and Coordination: Tracing Border Effects	<i>David B. Carter</i> and <i>H. E. Goemans</i>	1
Historical Institutionalism and Judicial Decision-Making: Ideas, Institutions, and Actors in French High Court Hate Speech Rulings	<i>Erik Bleich</i>	53
Endogenous Participation: Strengthening Prior Consultation in Extractive Economies	<i>Tulia G. Falleti</i> and <i>Thea N. Riofrancos</i>	86
The Pursuit of Social Welfare: Citizen Claim-Making in Rural India	<i>Gabrielle Kruks-Wisner</i>	122
Corrigendum		164
The Contributors		<i>ii</i>
Abstracts		<i>iii</i>

THE CONTRIBUTORS

DAVID B. CARTER is an associate professor of political science at Washington University in St. Louis. His recent research addresses territoriality and conflict and how the historical legacies of boundary institutions shape patterns of conflict and cooperation among states. A widely published author, Carter's ongoing projects explore topics such as how instability in the international system, that is, crises involving great powers, influence the emergence and character of territorial claims and the shape and consequences of secessionist groups' territorial claims. He can be reached at davidcarter@wustl.edu.

H. E. GOEMANS is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Rochester. His recent work examines the role of territory, territoriality, and borders in international disputes. His previous research focused on the role of leaders in war termination and war initiation. His most recent book, *Leaders and International Conflict*, coauthored with Giacomo Chiozza, was published in 2011. He can be reached at henk.goemans@rochester.edu.

ERIK BLEICH is a professor of political science at Middlebury College. His research focuses on topics related to race and ethnicity in liberal democracies. Bleich is the author of *Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s* (2003) and *The Freedom to Be Racist? How the United States and Europe Struggle to Preserve Freedom and Combat Racism* (2011). His most recent book, *Migrants, Minorities, and the Media: Information, Representations, and Participation in the Public Sphere* (2017), is coedited with Irene Bloemraad and Els de Graauw. Bleich's current projects focus on hate speech adjudication and the media's coverage of minorities. He can be reached at ebleich@middlebury.edu.

TULIA G. FALLETI is an associate professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. She is the author of *Decentralization and Subnational Politics in Latin America* (2010) and coeditor, with Orfeo Fioretos and Adam Sheingate, of *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (2016), and with Emilio Parrado, of *Latin America Since the Left Turn* (2017). Her articles on decentralization, federalism, authoritarianism, and qualitative methods have been widely published. Falletti was the *World Politics* visiting fellow in 2013–14. She can be reached at falletti@sas.upenn.edu.

THEA N. RIOFRANCOS is an assistant professor of political science at Providence College. Her research focuses on the politics of resource extraction, social movements, and radical democracy in Latin America. She is currently working on a book manuscript entitled "Resource Radicals: From Petro-Nationalism to Post-Extractivism in Ecuador." She can be reached at triofran@providence.edu.

GABRIELLE KRUKS-WISNER is an assistant professor of politics and global studies at the University of Virginia. Her research examines citizen-state relations and social welfare provision. Her book, *Claiming the State: Active Citizenship and Social Welfare in Rural India*, will be published in 2018. She is currently engaged in work that builds on this study of claim-making and examines strategic interventions aimed at strengthening citizen voice and increasing official accountability in public service provision. She can be reached at gkk5x@virginia.edu.

ABSTRACTS

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND COORDINATION

TRACING BORDER EFFECTS

By DAVID B. CARTER and H. E. GOEMANS

This article examines how the institutional design of borders affects international trade. The authors explore variation in the effects of borders by comparing new international borders that follow precedent and thus have a prior institutional history with new international borders that lack such an institutional history. The former minimally disrupt—or restore—previous economic networks, while the latter fundamentally disrupt existing economic networks. A variety of empirical tests show that, consistent with this institutional perspective on borders, new international boundaries that follow precedent are associated with significantly faster recovery and greater increase in subsequent trade flows. By contrast, when new international borders are truly new, they disrupt local economic networks, introduce new transaction costs, and impose higher adjustment costs on states, which the authors show to have long-term deleterious effects on trade.

HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM AND JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING

IDEAS, INSTITUTIONS, AND ACTORS IN FRENCH HIGH COURT HATE SPEECH RULINGS

By ERIK BLEICH

This article integrates insights from different veins of historical institutionalism to offer an analytical framework that specifies how ideas, institutions, and actors account for key aspects of judicial decision-making, including change over time. To the extent that ideas are widely distributed, highly salient, and stable among actors in the judicial field, they can affect patterns of rulings in a particular issue area. The distribution, salience, and stability of norms, however, may change over time for reasons embedded in the institutional structures themselves. Existing policies, laws, or treaties create the potential for new actors to enter the judicial field through processes that theorists of institutional change have identified as intercurrency, displacement, conversion, layering, and drift. New actors can shift the relative salience of ideas already rooted in the judicial field. This ideational salience amplification can alter patterns of judicial decision-making without the fundamental and often costly battles involved in wholesale paradigm change. French high court hate speech decisions provide the context for the development of this framework and serve to illustrate the dynamic. The author uses evidence from an original data set of every ruling by the French Court of Cassation regarding racist hate speech from 1972 through 2012 to explain the varying propensity of the high court to restrict speech that targets majorities compared to minorities.

ENDOGENOUS PARTICIPATION

STRENGTHENING PRIOR CONSULTATION IN EXTRACTIVE ECONOMIES

By TULIA G. FALLETTI and THEA N. RIOFRANCOS

Why and how do institutions strengthen? This article offers an explanation of institutional strength based on the study of participatory institutions. Combining the insights of historical institutionalism and participatory democracy literatures, the authors propose an endogenous theory of participation and argue that the strength of participatory institutions depends on the historic process of their creation and the subsequent political incorporation of the mobilized groups that bring them about. The authors comparatively study prior consultation in Bolivia and Ecuador since its inception in the 1990s. This institution is highly relevant in Latin America, particularly as countries in the region intensify the extraction of nonrenewable resources. The article shows that different paths of political incorporation of the groups mobilized for institutional adoption were consequential to the resulting institutional strength. The findings shed light on the tensions between participatory democracy and resource extraction in Latin America and have important implications for the study of participatory and political institutions worldwide.

THE PURSUIT OF SOCIAL WELFARE:

CITIZEN CLAIM-MAKING IN RURAL INDIA

By GABRIELLE KRUKS-WISNER

Who makes claims on the state for social welfare, and how and why do they do so? This article examines these dynamics in the rural Indian context, observing that citizens living in the same local communities differ dramatically in their approaches to the state. The author develops a theory to explain these varied patterns of action and inaction, arguing that citizen claim-making is best understood as a product of exposure to people and places beyond the immediate community and locality. This social and spatial exposure builds citizens' encounters with, knowledge of, and linkages to the state. This in turn develops their aspirations toward the state and their capabilities for state-targeted action. The author tests the theory in rural Rajasthan, drawing on a combination of original survey data and qualitative interviews. She finds that those who traverse boundaries of caste, neighborhood, and village are more likely to make claims on the state, and that they do so through broader repertoires of action than those who are more constrained by the same boundaries. The article concludes by considering the extensions and limitations of the theory and the role of the state itself in establishing the terrain for citizen action.