

WORLD POLITICS

Vol. 53

April 2001

No. 3

CONTENTS

Does Oil Hinder Democracy?	<i>Michael L. Ross</i>	325
Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond	<i>Ashutosh Varshney</i>	362
Green by Choice? Cross-National, Variations in Firms' Responses to EMS-Based Environmental Regimes	<i>Kelly Kollman and Aseem Prakash</i>	399
Modernization in Historical Perspective: The Case of Imperial Germany	<i>Sheri E. Berman</i>	431
The Social Construction of an Imperative: Why Welfare Reform Happened in Denmark and the Netherlands but Not in Germany	<i>Robert Henry Cox</i>	463
The Contributors		ii
Abstracts		iii

THE CONTRIBUTORS

MICHAEL L. ROSS is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He is the author of *Timber Booms and Institutional Breakdown in Southeast Asia* (2001). He is currently writing a book on the resource curse.

ASHUTOSH VARSHNEY is Associate Professor of Government and International Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Recent books are *Democracy, Development and the Countryside* (1995 and 1998), *India in the Era of Economic Reforms*, coedited with Jeffrey Sachs (1999 and 2000), and *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life* (forthcoming). He is currently working on two projects: one on ethnic conflict and civic engagement in Indonesia, Nigeria, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka; and the other on political economy of subnational economic reforms in India.

KELLY KOLLMAN is a Ph.D. candidate in political science at The George Washington University. She is writing her dissertation on the implementation and use of international environmental management system standards in Germany and the United Kingdom.

ASEEM PRAKASH is Assistant Professor of Strategic Management and Public Policy at the School of Business and Public Management, The George Washington University. He also serves on the faculty of the Department of Political Science and The Elliott School of International Affairs. He is the author of *Greening the Firm: The Politics of Corporate Environmentalism* (2000) and coeditor (with Jeffrey A. Hart) of *Globalization and Governance* (1999), *Coping with Globalization* (2000), and *Responding to Globalization* (2000).

SHERI E. BERMAN is Assistant Professor of Politics at Princeton University. The author of *The Social Democratic Moment: Ideas and Politics in the Making of Interwar Europe* (1998), she is currently working on a book entitled, "The Primacy of Politics: Social Democracy and the Ideological Dynamics of the Twentieth Century"; it explores the origins of and the relationships between the great ideologies of the last century.

ROBERT HENRY COX is Associate Professor and Director of International and Area Studies at the University of Oklahoma. He is the author of *The Development of the Dutch Welfare State* (1993) and has published widely on the historical and contemporary development of welfare states, especially in the smaller democracies of Europe. He is currently engaged in a comparative, historical study of welfare retrenchment in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Germany.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by The Johns Hopkins University Press for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided that the fee of \$3.25 per article is paid directly to CCC, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. 0043-88 71/94 \$03.25

ABSTRACTS

DOES OIL HINDER DEMOCRACY?

By MICHAEL L. ROSS

Some scholars suggest that the Middle East's oil wealth helps explain its failure to democratize. This article examines three aspects of this "oil impedes democracy" claim. First, is it true? Does oil have a consistently antidemocratic effect on states, once other factors are accounted for? Second, can this claim be generalized? Is it true only in the Middle East or elsewhere as well? Is it true for other types of mineral wealth and other types of commodity wealth or only for oil? Finally, if oil does have antidemocratic properties, what is the causal mechanism?

The author uses pooled time-series cross-national data from 113 states between 1971 and 1997 to show that oil exports are strongly associated with authoritarian rule; that this effect is not limited to the Middle East; and that other types of mineral exports have a similar antidemocratic effect, while other types of commodity exports do not.

The author also tests three explanations for this pattern: a "rentier effect," which suggests that resource-rich governments use low tax rates and patronage to dampen democratic pressures; a "repression effect," which holds that resource wealth enables governments to strengthen their internal security forces and hence repress popular movements; and a "modernization effect," which implies that growth that is based on the export of oil and minerals will fail to bring about the social and cultural changes that tend to produce democratic government. He finds at least limited support for all three effects.

ETHNIC CONFLICT AND CIVIL SOCIETY

INDIA AND BEYOND

By ASHUTOSH VARSHNEY

Scholars have worked either on civil society or on ethnic conflict, but no systematic attempt has yet been made to connect the two. In an attempt to explore the possible links, this article makes two interconnected arguments. First, *interethnic* and *intraethnic* networks of civic engagement play very different roles in ethnic conflict. Because they build bridges and manage tensions, interethnic networks are agents of peace. But if communities are organized only along intraethnic lines and the interconnections with other communities are very weak (or do not exist), ethnic violence is then quite likely. Second, civic networks, both intra- and interethnic, can also be broken down into two other types: *associational forms of engagement* and *everyday forms of engagement*. This distinction is based on whether civic interaction is formal or not. Both forms of engagement, if robust, promote peace: contrariwise, their absence or weakness opens up space for ethnic violence. Of the two, however, the associational forms turn out to be sturdier than everyday engagement, especially when confronted with attempts by politicians to polarize the people along ethnic lines. Both arguments have significance for theories of ethnic conflict and social capital.

GREEN BY CHOICE?

CROSS-NATIONAL VARIATIONS IN FIRMS' RESPONSES TO EMS-BASED ENVIRONMENTAL REGIMES

By KELLY KOLLMAN and ASEEM PRAKASH

Environmental Management Systems (EMSs) represent a new generation of voluntary "beyond compliance" environmental policies that neither set substantive goals nor specify final outcomes. As a result, many stakeholder groups are lukewarm toward them. Since 1993 two major supranational EMSs—ISO 14001 and the European Union's Environmental Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS)—have been introduced. Firms receive formal accreditation after their EMS has been certified by outside verifiers. This accreditation can potentially bestow monetary and nonmonetary benefits on these firms.

Firm-level EMS adoption patterns in the United Kingdom, Germany, and the United States vary, thereby suggesting that national contexts influence firms' responses to them. In Germany and the U.K. a significant number of sites have become either ISO 14001 or EMAS certified, while the take-up of ISO 14001 in the U.S. (EMAS is available only to European sites) has been less enthusiastic.

This article begins with the hypothesis that firms in countries with adversarial economies—where regulators and business are on less than friendly terms—are less likely to adopt EMS-based programs. This hypothesis explains why ISO 14001 take-up has been relatively high in the U.K. and relatively low in the U.S. However, it cannot explain (1) the high rate of take-up of both ISO 14001 and EMAS in Germany, where the stringency of environmental legislation has been a contentious issue between the government and industry and (2) why EMAS has been more popular in Germany than in the U.K. This article argues that the original hypothesis, while largely correct, is underspecified. To better explain the cross-national differences in EMS adoption, one must take into account the type of adversarial economy (adversarial legalism versus prescriptive interventionism) and the nature of the policy regime (procedural versus substantive).

MODERNIZATION IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

THE CASE OF IMPERIAL GERMANY

By SHERI E. BERMAN

In recent years historical research on Imperial Germany has called into question traditional interpretations of this case at the same time that political science research on the “third wave” has transformed the study of political development. This article argues that combining the insights of these two literatures offers benefits to both. For historians, the exercise provides a fresh perspective on the purported distinctiveness of Imperial Germany's political system and the relationship between its economic and political development. For political scientists, the German case has important lessons to teach about the role of structure versus agency in driving political liberalization, the time frame necessary for genuine political development to occur, and the role of war and the nature of the international system as wild cards in changing the outcome of the game. Most interestingly, perhaps, it also shows that a weak version of modernization theory holds true, namely, that it is not possible *over the long term* for a simple authoritarian regime to maintain control over an increasingly economically developed society.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF AN IMPERATIVE

WHY WELFARE REFORM HAPPENED IN DENMARK AND THE NETHERLANDS BUT NOT IN GERMANY

By ROBERT HENRY COX

This article seeks to explain why Denmark and the Netherlands made dramatic progress reforming their welfare systems in the 1990s and why Germany had a relatively slow start. Some possible explanations found to be incomplete are institutional differences in welfare programs, the uniqueness of circumstances (for example, German unification), and the balance of political power in governing institutions. An important part of the puzzle is an increasing perception of the need to reform that was more widespread in Denmark and the Netherlands. The social construction of an imperative to reform in these countries generated a political consensus that was elusive in Germany but that may be developing under Gerhard Schröder's government.