Vol. 66 · No. 3 WORLD POLITICS

July • 2014

https://doi.org/10.1017/50043887114000173 Published online by Cambridge University Press

WORLD POLITICS

A Quarterly Journal of International Relations

Volume 66, Number 3 July 2014

UNDER THE EDITORIAL SPONSORSHIP OF

PRINCETON INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES

PUBLISHED BY CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDITORIAL BOARD

DEBORAH J. YASHAR, Chair

Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Anna Grzmała-Busse, Torben Iversen, Stathis Kalyvas, Gary King, Jonathan Kirshner, Michael Mastanduno, Jonas Pontusson, Daniel N. Posner, Kenneth M. Roberts, Michael L. Ross, Kenneth A. Schultz, Beth A. Simmons, Edward S. Steinfeld, Michael Tomz, Lily L. Tsai, Nicolas van de Walle, John Waterbury, Daniel Ziblatt

Editorial Committee: Thomas J. Christensen, Christina L. Davis, Aaron L. Friedberg, Amaney A. Jamal, Stephen M. Kotkin, Evan S. Lieberman, Grigore Pop-Eleches, Andreas Wimmer, Deborah J. Yashar (*Chair*)

> Associate Editors: Rafaela M. Dancygier, David Leheny, Kristopher W. Ramsay, Jacob N. Shapiro, Keren Yarhi-Milo

Executive Editor: Ilene P. Cohen Assistant Editor: Joy M. Scharfstein Office Coordinator: Carole Frantzen

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. Research articles and review articles may be up to 12,500 words in length, including notes and references; research notes may be up to 10,000 words, including notes and references. Tables, figures, and appendixes need not be included in the word count. 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 and other information can be found the World Politics home page, at http://www.princeton.edu/piirs/worldpolitics-journal.

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. 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 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.

Copyright 2014 ©Trustees of Princeton University Volume 66

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887114000173 Published online by Cambridge University Press

WORLD POLITICS

Vol. 66 • July 2014 • No. 3

CONTENTS

Immigration, Integration, and Support for Redistribution in Europe	Brian Burgoon	365
Defying the Law of Gravity: The Political Economy of International Migration	Jennifer Fitzgerald, David Leblang, and Jessica C. Teets	406
Why Do States Commit to International Labor Standards? Interdependent Ratification of Core ILO Conventions, 1948–2009		446
The Effect of Authoritarian Regime Type on Exchange Rate Policy	David A. Steinberg and Krishan Malhotra	491
Review Article		
Securitizing Immigration in the Age of Terror	Anthony M. Messina	530
The Contributors		ii
Abstracts		iii

THE CONTRIBUTORS

BRIAN BURGOON is a professor of international and comparative political economy in the Department of Political Science and Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research at the University of Amsterdam. His research focuses on political conflict surrounding international trade, investment, and migration. He can be reached at b.m.burgoon@uva.nl.

JENNIFER FITZGERALD is an associate professor of political science at the University of Colorado, Boulder. She is currently writing a book exploring radical right party support in Europe; complementary articles on voting and public opinion have been published recently in various journals. She can be reached at jennifer.fitzgerald@colorado.edu.

DAVID LEBLANG is the J. Wilson Newman Professor of Governance and Chair of the Department of Politics at the University of Virginia. He is currently working on a variety of projects related to international labor migration with recent work appearing in various journals. He can be reached at leblang@virginia.edu.

JESSICA C. TEETS is an assistant professor of political science at Middlebury College. Her research focuses on governance and policy diffusion in authoritarian regimes, specifically the role of civil society. Her work has been published in various journals. She can be reached at jteets @middlebury.edu.

LEONARDO BACCINI is an assistant professor of international political economy at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His research interests are in the areas of international political economy and comparative political economy. The author of several articles, his book, Cutting the Gordian Knot of Economic Reform: How International Institutions Promote Liberalization, is forthcoming. Information about his publications and working papers can be found at https://sites.google.com/site/leonardobaccini. He can be reached at l.baccini@lse.ac.uk.

MATHIAS KOENIG-ARCHIBUGI is an associate professor of global politics at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His research focuses on the governance of global issues, especially in the area of health and labor rights, and on the possibility of democratizing global politics. He can be reached at m.koenig-archibugi@lse.ac.uk.

David A. Steinberg is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Oregon. He is completing a book on exchange rate policymaking in developing countries. He can be reached at steinbe2@uoregon.edu.

KRISHAN MALHOTRA is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania. His dissertation examines the impact of domestic politics on the outcomes of counterinsurgency wars, with a focus on the role of political parties and elections. He can be reached at krishanm@sas.upenn.edu.

Anthony M. Messina is John R. Reitemeyer Professor of Politics at Trinity College in Hartford, Conn. He the author of *Race and Party Competition in Britain* (1989), *The Logics and Politics of Post–World War II Migration to Western Europe* (2007), and several edited volumes. His latest book, *Europe's Contending Identities: Supranationalism, Ethnonationalism, Religion, and New Nationalism* (2014), is coedited with Andrew C. Gould. He can be reached at anthony.messina @trincoll.edu.

ABSTRACTS

Immigration, Integration, and Support for Redistribution in Europe By Brian Burgoon

Immigration poses individual or collective economic risks that might increase citizen support for government redistribution, but it can also generate fiscal pressure or undermine social solidarity to diminish such support. These offsetting conditions obscure the net effects of immigration for welfare states. This article explores whether immigration's effects are mediated by the economic and social integration of immigrants. Integration can be conceptualized and measured as involving the degree to which immigrants suffer unemployment rates, depend on welfare-state benefits, and harbor social attitudes similarly to the native population. Such integration may alter how immigration reduces solidarity and imposes fiscal and macroeconomic pressures, but does not much alter how immigration spurs economic risks for natives. Where migrants are more integrated by such measures, immigration should have less negative or more positive implications for native support for government redistribution and welfare states than where migrants are less integrated. The article explores these arguments using survey data for twenty-two European countries between 2002 and 2010. The principal finding is that economic integration, more than sociocultural integration, softens the tendency of immigration to undermine support for redistributive policies.

Defying the Law of Gravity

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

By JENNIFER FITZGERALD, DAVID LEBLANG, and JESSICA C. TEETS

Bilateral flows of international migrants exhibit tremendous variance both across destination countries and over time. To explain this variance, studies of international migration tend to focus on economic determinants such as income differentials or on social conditions such as the presence of coethnics in certain destination countries. The authors argue that migration is driven not solely by economic or social determinants; rather, the political environment across destinations plays a substantively large role in influencing bilateral migration flows. They test the importance of the political environment—citizenship rights and the prominence of right-wing parties—using data on migration flows from 178 origin countries into 18 destination countries over the period 1980–2006. They find, even after controlling for a variety of economic, social, policy, and international variables, that variation in political environments across time and destination plays a key role in observed patterns of international migration.

Why Do States Commit to International Labor Standards? Interdependent ratification of core ilo conventions, 1948–2009

By LEONARDO BACCINI and MATHIAS KOENIG-ARCHIBUGI

Ratifying core conventions adopted by the International Labor Organization (ILO) creates legal obligations to improve labor standards in the domestic economy, notably with regard to union rights, minimum age and discrimination in employment, and forced labor. Why and when do states choose to ratify them? Two influential theoretical approaches lead to the expectation that states are influenced by the ratification behavior of other states. Drawing on rationalist institutionalism, the authors expect states to use institutions such as the ILO to improve or consolidate their preferred standards domestically while reducing the risk of suffering competitive disadvantages in world markets. In this view, ILO conventions are devices for the prevention and mitigation of regulatory races to the bottom among trade rivals. Drawing on sociological institutionalism, they expect states to ratify ILO conventions if doing so conforms to a norm of appropriate behavior that is prevalent in a state's peer groups. This article develops observable implications of these hypotheses and tests them by applying spatial regression models to seven core ILO conventions and 187 countries between 1948 and 2009. The analysis yields strong evidence in support of both hypotheses.

THE EFFECT OF AUTHORITARIAN REGIME TYPE ON EXCHANGE RATE POLICY By DAVID A. STEINBERG and KRISHAN MALHOTRA

Conventional wisdom holds that autocracies are more likely than democracies to adopt interventionist and protectionist economic policies, including fixed and undervalued exchange rates. This article suggests that this view is only partially correct: nondemocracies are a heterogeneous grouping, and only some types of authoritarian regimes adopt different foreign economic policies from those of their democratic counterparts. Using the example of exchange rate policy, the authors show that foreign economic policy varies across monarchic, military, and civilian dictatorships. More specifically, they hypothesize that monarchies and military regimes are more likely than democracies and civilian dictatorships to maintain fixed exchange rate regimes because the former regimes have smaller "selectorates" than the latter. The authors also expect that monarchies and civilian dictatorships maintain more undervalued exchange rates than democracies and military regimes because the former regimes provide their leaders with greater tenure security than the latter regimes. These hypotheses are evaluated using a time-series-cross-sectional data set of a large sample of developing countries from 1973 to 2006. The statistical results accord with these predictions. These findings indicate that the ways in which democracies engage with the global economy may be less unique than many believe.

SECURITIZING MIGRATION IN THE AGE OF TERROR By ANTHONY M. MESSINA

In the context of the evidence presented in both the collected scholarship under review and other select works, this article asks *if* and *to what extent* migration-related issues have been securitized in Europe and the United States. In addressing these questions it executes three tasks. First, it critically assesses the four major dimensions across which contemporary immigration purportedly is securitized: on one side, rhetorically addressing immigration-related issues through political elite discourse, public opinion, and the mass media; and on the other, the policy processes through which immigration is securitized. Second, this article identifies the strengths and weaknesses of securitization theory as it has been applied to immigration. Finally, it draws mostly negative conclusions about the veracity of the central claims of the securitization of immigration literature and, specifically, its causal story.