

WORLD POLITICS

*A Quarterly Journal of
International Relations*

Volume 69, Number 3 July 2017

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,
ELIZABETH J. PERRY, KENNETH R. ROBERTS, MICHAEL L. ROSS, KENNETH A. SCHULTZ,
KATHLEEN THELEN, NICHOLAS VAN DE WALLE, BARBARA F. WALTER, ANDREAS WIMMER,
ELISABETH JEAN WOOD, DANIEL ZIBLATT

Editorial Committee: MARK R. BEISSINGER, MIGUEL A. CENTENO, THOMAS J. CHRISTENSEN,
G. JOHN IKENBERRY, AMANEY A. JAMAL, HAROLD JAMES, ATUL KOHLI,
KRISTOPHER W. RAMSAY, DEBORAH J. YASHAR (*Chair*)

Associate Editors: FAISAL Z. AHMED, DAVID B. CARTER, RAFAELA DANCYGIER,
DAVID LEHENY, JACOB N. SHAPIRO, RORY TRUEX, 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. 69

• July 2017

• No. 3

CONTENTS

Diverging Solidarity: Labor Strategies in the New Knowledge Economy	<i>Christian Lyhne Ibsen and Kathleen Thelen</i>	409
Solidaristic Unionism and Support for Redistribution in Contemporary Europe	<i>Nadja Mosimann and Jonas Pontusson</i>	448
Political Competition and the Initiation of International Conflict: A New Perspective on the Institutional Foundations of Democratic Peace	<i>Benjamin E. Goldsmith, Dimitri Semenovitch, Arcot Sowmya, and Gorana Grgic</i>	493
Humiliation and Third-Party Aggression	<i>Joslyn Barnhart</i>	532
REVIEW ARTICLE		
Social Forces and Regime Change: Beyond Class Analysis	<i>Killian Clarke</i>	569
Erratum		603
The Contributors		ii
Abstracts		iii

THE CONTRIBUTORS

CHRISTIAN LYHNE IBSEN is an associate professor of sociology at FAOS, University of Copenhagen. His current research investigates collective bargaining systems and employers' associations in Sweden and Denmark. He can be reached at cli@faos.dk.

KATHLEEN THELEN is Ford Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. She is the author, most recently, of *Varieties of Liberalization and the New Politics of Social Solidarity* (2014), and coeditor, with James Mahoney, of *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (2015). Her current interests and projects focus on the American political economy in comparative perspective and comparative labor regulation in the gig economy. She can be reached at kthelen@mit.edu.

NADJA MOSIMANN is a doctoral candidate in comparative politics at the University of Geneva. Her research focuses on the impact of rising inequality on the policy preferences and political behavior of different citizens, and the effects of union politics and union membership in the context of labor market dualization in Europe. She can be reached at nadja.mosimann@unige.ch.

JONAS PONTUSSON is professor of comparative politics at the University of Geneva. He currently works on growth models and the politics of macroeconomic management in Western Europe, as well as the impact of rising inequality on the policy preferences of different citizens and their political influence in liberal democracies. A widely published author, Pontusson's most recent book, coedited with Nancy Bermeo, is *Coping with Crisis* (2012). He can be reached at jonas.pontusson@unige.ch.

BENJAMIN E. GOLDSMITH is an associate professor and Australian Research Council Future Fellow in the Department of Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney, where he also leads the Atrocity Forecasting Project. His research and teaching are in the areas of international security, international public opinion, and atrocity forecasting. He can be reached at ben.goldsmith@sydney.edu.au.

DIMITRI SEMENOVICH is the technical director of analytics for IAG Insurance in Sydney. He earned a Ph.D. in computer science from the University of New South Wales in 2013, and was a research associate at the University of Sydney from 2010 to 2013. He can be reached at dvsemenovich@gmail.com.

ARCOT SOWMYA is a professor in the School of Computer Science and Engineering at the University of New South Wales, where she teaches courses in computer vision and learning, pattern recognition, and robotics. Her research is in image analysis and recognition, software engineering, and machine-learning applications in conflict studies. She can be reached at a.sowmya@unsw.edu.au.

GORANA GRGIC is a lecturer in US politics and foreign policy in the United States Studies Center at the University of Sydney. Her teaching and research interests are in democratization, ethnic conflicts, third-party interventions in conflicts, and US foreign policy in Europe and Eurasia. She is the author of *Ethnic Conflict in Asymmetric Federations: Comparative Experience of the Former Soviet and Yugoslav Regions* (2017). She can be reached at gorana.grgic@sydney.edu.au.

JOSLYN BARNHART is an assistant professor of government at Wesleyan University. She is completing a book entitled, *The Consequences of Humiliation: Outrage, Status Threat, and International Politics*. She can be reached at joslynbarnhart@gmail.com.

KILLIAN CLARKE is a doctoral candidate in politics at Princeton University. His research examines contentious politics, revolutions, and regime change, with a regional focus on the Middle East. Clarke's current project examines regime trajectories in the aftermath of revolutions, and specifically why some revolutionary regimes are overthrown by counterrevolutions. He can be reached at kbclarke@princeton.edu.

ABSTRACTS

DIVERGING SOLIDARITY

LABOR STRATEGIES IN THE NEW KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY

By CHRISTIAN LYHNE IBSEN and KATHLEEN THELEN

The transition from Fordist manufacturing to the so-called knowledge economy confronts organized labor across the advanced market economies with a new and more difficult landscape. Many scholars have suggested that the future of egalitarian capitalism depends on forging new political coalitions that bridge the interests of workers in the “new” and “old” economies. This article explores current trajectories of change in Denmark and Sweden, two countries that are still seen as embodying a more egalitarian model of capitalism. The authors show that labor unions in these countries are pursuing two quite different strategies for achieving social solidarity—the Danish aimed at equality of opportunity and the Swedish aimed at equality of outcomes. The article examines the origins of these different strategic paths and explores the distinctive distributional outcomes they have produced. The conclusion draws out the broad lessons these cases hold for the choices currently confronting labor movements throughout the advanced industrial world.

SOLIDARISTIC UNIONISM AND SUPPORT FOR REDISTRIBUTION IN CONTEMPORARY EUROPE

By NADJA MOSIMANN and JONAS PONTUSSON

Using data from the European Social Survey (2002–14), this article explores the effect of union membership on support for redistribution. The authors hypothesize that the wage-bargaining practices of unions promote egalitarian distributive norms, which lead union members to support redistribution, and that this effect is strongest among high-wage workers. Consistent with the authors’ expectations, the empirical analysis shows that the solidarity effect of union membership is strongest when unions encompass a very large share of the labor force or primarily organize low-wage workers. The authors also show that low-wage workers have become a significantly less important union constituency in many European countries over the time period covered by the analysis.

POLITICAL COMPETITION AND THE INITIATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF DEMOCRATIC PEACE

By BENJAMIN E. GOLDSMITH, DIMITRI SEMENOVICH, ARCOT SOWMYA, and GORANA GRGIC

Although some scholars claim that the empirical evidence for the very low instance of interstate war between democracies is well established, others have raised new challenges. But even if democratic peace is observed, its theoretical explanation remains unresolved. Consensus has not emerged among competing approaches, some of which are criticized for offering monadic logic for a dyadic phenomenon. This article synthesizes recent literature to advance a simple, but distinct, explicitly dyadic theory about institutionalized political competition, leading to expectations that it is the most important source of democratic peace. While the authors are far from the first to consider political competition, their approach stands out in according it the central role in a dyadic theory focused on the regime type of initiators and target states. They argue that potential vulnerability to opposition criticism on target-regime-specific normative and costs-of-war bases is more fundamental than mechanisms such as audience costs, informational effects, or public goods logic. Incumbents in high-competition states will be reluctant to initiate conflict with a democracy due to anticipated inability to defend the conflict as right, necessary, and winnable. The authors present new and highly robust evidence that democratic peace is neither spurious nor a methodological artifact, and that it can be attributed to high-competition states’ aversion to initiating fights with democracies.

HUMILIATION AND THIRD-PARTY AGGRESSION

By JOSLYN BARNHART

There is a growing consensus that status concerns drive state behavior. Although recent attention has been paid to when states are most likely to act on behalf of status concerns, very little is known about which actions states are most likely to engage in when their status is threatened. This article focuses on the effect of publicly humiliating international events as sources of status threat. Such events call into question a state's image in the eyes of others, thereby increasing the likelihood that the state will engage in reassertions of its status. The article presents a theory of status reassertion that outlines which states will be most likely to respond, as well as when and how they will be most likely to do so. The author argues that because high-status states have the most to lose from repeated humiliation, they will be relatively risk averse when reasserting their status. In contrast to prior work arguing that humiliation drives a need for revenge, the author demonstrates that great powers only rarely engage in direct revenge. Rather, they pursue the less risky option of projecting power abroad against weaker states to convey their intentions of remaining a great power. The validity of this theory is tested using an expanded and recoded data set of territorial change from 1816 to 2000. Great powers that have experienced a humiliating, involuntary territorial loss are more likely to attempt aggressive territorial gains in the future and, in particular, against third-party states.

SOCIAL FORCES AND REGIME CHANGE:

BEYOND CLASS ANALYSIS

By KILLIAN CLARKE

This article discusses three recent books that analyze patterns of political conflict and regime change in postcolonial Asia and Africa using a social forces approach to political analysis. The social forces tradition, originally pioneered by Barrington Moore, studies the social origins and political consequences of struggles between social groups whose members hold shared identities and interests. The works under review examine, respectively, the varied regime trajectories of Southeast Asia's states, divergent regime outcomes in India and Pakistan, and the institutional origins of social cleavages and political conflict in sub-Saharan Africa. Although historically the social forces paradigm has focused on conflict between class actors, the author argues that these three works fruitfully extend the social forces approach to encompass struggles between nonclass social groups, including those defined along the lines of ethnicity, religion, nationality, region, and family. This pluralized version of the social forces approach is better suited to studying patterns of regime change in Asia and Africa, where the paradigm has been less frequently applied than it has been to cases in Europe and Latin America.