

Federalism and the Market

Intergovernmental Conflict and Economic Reform
in the Developing World

Erik Wibbels

CAMBRIDGE

Federalism and the Market

*Intergovernmental Conflict and Economic Reform
in the Developing World*

ERIK WIBBELS

University of Washington



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521843812

© Erik Wibbels 2005

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2005

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Wibbels, Erik, 1972–

Federalism and the market : intergovernmental conflict and economic reform in the developing world / Erik Wibbels.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-521-84381-2

1. Developing countries – Economic policy. 2. Federal government – Developing countries. I. Title.

HC59.7.W497 2005

338.9'009172'4–dc22 2004057009

ISBN-13 978-0-521-84381-2 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-84381-2 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this book and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Federalism and the Market

Intergovernmental Conflict and Economic Reform in the Developing World

This research develops a new comparative model of intergovernmental bargaining to account for variation in the capacity of federations in the developing world to undertake economic policy reform. The book suggests that many market reform policies are a function of a constant process of bargaining between national and regional leaders struggling for political survival. As the degree of national-regional disagreement mounts, collective action on reforms that require implementation at multiple levels of government becomes more difficult. The degree to which the two sets of actors conflict depends on four factors: the electoral interests that each brings to the game, a shared intergovernmental fiscal system, the manner in which regional interests are represented in national policy making, and the levers of partisan influence national leaders have over subnational politicians. In testing the argument with a combination of cross-sectional time-series and case study analysis, this book contributes to the broad literatures on development and the comparative political economy of federalism and decentralization.

Erik Wibbels is an associate professor of political science at the University of Washington. His research interests include market transitions, particularly in Latin America, and the political economy of federalism. His recent work has appeared in *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *International Organization*, *World Politics*, *Comparative Political Studies*, and *Studies in Comparative International Development*. He is currently working on two book projects – one on the comparative historical foundations of federal constitutions and the other on the relationship between the global economy and redistributive politics in the developing world.

For little Sed

Acknowledgments

My foremost intellectual debt is to Karen Remmer. I arrived to advanced studies with probably a poorer sense of what graduate political science is all about than your typical graduate student. Karen's patience, wry humor, irreverence, and exceedingly high standards helped me find my intellectual voice. Innumerable conversations with her laid the groundwork for this project when it was in the nascent stages of a dissertation proposal and shaped its subsequent development. Her example as a scholar and a human being sets a standard I am eager to follow.

I also would like to thank Ken Roberts, Wendy Hansen, and Alok Bohara. Ken was generous with encouragement during the inevitable periods when the end of my dissertation seemed very distant indeed. He was equally generous with thoughtful criticism when it was called for. Together with Karen, I am convinced that few students have been so lucky as to benefit from two advisors so thorough, patient, and thought-provoking. Without early training from Wendy, the statistical analyses in these chapters would have been impossible. Alok agreed to join my dissertation committee very late in the game. Above and beyond these individuals, I would like to thank all of my teachers at the University of New Mexico.

I also have benefited from incredible colleagues at the University of Washington. Most political scientists ultimately turn their dissertations into books. For some people, that process might be a fun and rewarding one. For me, it was painful. Absent Margaret Levi's words of astute

advice, good-natured prodding, and constant support, this book would not be a book. Tony Gill's support has been unwavering, even before I joined the faculty. Steve Hanson has read enough of my work that I feel sorry for him. Susan Whiting read the entire manuscript and provided wonderful comments. Mika Lavaque-Manty and Kevin Quinn were colleagues whose wit and intelligence were best plumbed over healthy quantities of beer and wine before they left for (supposedly) greener pastures. David Olson's wisdom has helped in areas academic and otherwise. Several research assistants made the completion of this project possible. Isik Ozel, Wongi Choe, Kristin Bakke, and Anthony Pezzola were all exceptionally helpful. The contributions of Wongi and Kristin are particularly noteworthy – both suffered the agony of reading the entire manuscript in an earlier stage of development and helped me make it better.

A handful of others have played a considerable role in the writing of this book. Jonathan Rodden, in particular, has been the kind of coauthor, intellectual, and friend that an academic dreams of. Barry Weingast's work on market-preserving federalism inspired my early thoughts on the political economy of federalism, and his breathtakingly detailed comments on a different manuscript forced me to go back and significantly revise this book. I am grateful on both counts. Susan Stokes and Tulia Falleti read the entire manuscript and provided some of the best comments I received – oh that I had received them earlier in the game! I'd also like to thank Francois Gelineau for sharing the public opinion data used in Chapter 5.

A number of people provided crucial help and friendship during my field research in Argentina. Sergio Berensztein and Carlos Gervasoni were important sounding boards and provided useful contacts. More important, they were drinking buddies who contributed to my passion for Argentine politics. Mariano Tommasi and Pablo Sanguinetti generously shared their provincial data, which is used in Chapter 6. Mariano subsequently has helped me think more thoroughly about intergovernmental fiscal issues in Argentina and beyond. Alejandra Pratt helped me understand provincial politics from the point of view of the national Ministry of Economy. In Córdoba, Dr. Ricardo Vergara, Dr. Jorge Jaimovich, and Dip. Norberto Bergami helped open many doors. Horacio Camerlingo and Mariel Cagnolo helped make my time in Córdoba something more than just work. In Mendoza, Dip. Ana

María Mosso was extremely generous with her insights and contacts, and Dr. Juan Antonio Zapata provided the most insightful interview during my eight months of research. Fabio Bertranou provided useful advice and connections. In Río Negro, Carlos Olivas, Roberto Meschini, and Hernan Perafan went above and beyond the demands of courtesy in providing data, contacts, and reports. A special thanks goes to Fer, Majo, Javier, Batata, Maxi, Piza, Mono, and Edi. They provided no research assistance but showed me how to have a good time in Argentina.

A number of institutions (and individuals therein) also have helped make this book a reality. In particular, I would like to thank the people associated with Cambridge University Press. Lew Bateman's support has meant a great deal both professionally and personally. Two Cambridge reviewers provided thorough and insightful comments. I thank them both. The National Science Foundation (SBR-9809211), the Latin American Institute of the University of New Mexico, and the Royalty Research Fund of the University of Washington helped fund this research.

For me, familial acknowledgments are the most important. Thanks to my mom, whose intellectual curiosity infected me long before I knew a thing (thankfully) about political science. My dad, whose passion for his work has woven its way into everything that I do, would have been more proud of this book than anyone were he here today. Finally, oodles of appreciation go to my wife, Cas. Despite my earnest and ongoing efforts to be something of a "normal" person, the fact is I remain a dedicated academic. She has dealt with the long hours, mood changes, and social dysfunction with judicious dispensations of humor, warmth, and castigation.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page ix</i>
1 Intergovernmental Bargaining and Economic Policy in Federations	I
2 From Market-Preserving to Market-Distorting Federalism: Divergent Incentives and Economic Reform in Developing Nations	17
3 Federalism and the Decentralized Politics of Macroeconomic Policy and Performance	53
4 Testing the Model: Macroeconomic Reform Beyond the Federal-Unitary Distinction	86
5 Partisan Harmony, Intergovernmental Coordination, and Market Transitions: The Case of Argentina	123
6 Regional Competition, Fiscal Dependence, and Incentives in the Argentine Provinces	162
7 The View from Below: The Politics of Public Sector Reform in Three Argentine Provinces	197
8 Conclusion: Federalism, Reform, and Enduring Puzzles	223
<i>References</i>	249
<i>Index</i>	273

Intergovernmental Bargaining and Economic Policy in Federations

Federations across the developing world are in economic trouble. Argentina, Russia, India, Brazil, Nigeria, Pakistan, Mexico, and others are all struggling to varying degrees with profound economic challenges.¹ Only recently, however, have academics, journalists, and the international financial community begun to recognize the distinctly federal roots of some of these problems. In Argentina, which recently experienced one of its worst economic crises of the last one hundred years, chronic provincial overspending and intergovernmental conflicts have been crucial ingredients in that nation's economic freefall.² In a less spectacular but equally telling case, the popular press reported throughout 2000 and 2001 that the Indian states were obstructing the federal government's economic reform agenda by renegeing on agreements to

¹ The exact definition of federalism is discussed below. Suffice to say that by my criteria, there are ten federal nations in the world of developing and emerging market nations: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia (since 1991), India, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, and Venezuela.

² For examples from the popular press, see *The Wall Street Journal*, "An Argentine Province, Fresh Out of Cash, Pushes an Alternative," August 21, 2001; *La Nación*, "De la Rúa se enojó con los gobernadores," June 7, 2000; *The Economist*, "The Austerity Diet," August 23, 2001; *Novedades Económicas*, "Los desafíos: Reducir gastos, aumentar la eficiencia y reestructurar la deuda," January 1996; *Novedades Económicas*, "El efecto de la crisis financiera en el mercado provincial: Una lección para no olvidar," October 1995. For an academic account of the disfunctionality of Argentina's intergovernmental fiscal system, see Saiegh and Tommasi (1999) or Remmer and Wibbels (2000).

privatize state-owned electricity companies.³ Similarly, in 1999 inter-governmental conflicts over state debt in Brazil helped trigger the run on that nation's currency, the *real*.⁴ More recently, the new Worker's Party government of Lula da Silva faces an awe-inspiring debt burden caused in large part by a decade of federal bailouts of overspending states. Post-Soviet analysts of Russia tell an analogous story of Russia, suggesting that the strength of regional bosses has precluded a coherent national approach to privatization, government restructuring, and fiscal policy.⁵

What is striking about these (and other) federations is how important regional governments are in shaping economic reform processes aimed at giving market mechanisms greater sway. In case after case, conflicts between national and regional leaders stymie or complicate the market reforms that have been at the very heart of developing nation political economies for two decades. Although in some cases national leaders might have strong interests in reforming trade regimes, addressing fiscal imbalances, deregulation, privatization, and so on, subnational politicians often have political incentives that run in just the opposite direction. Consistent with the institutional design of federations, regional decision makers have responded to their own electoral incentives and in doing so have often eschewed the austerity and political uncertainty associated with major economic initiatives. In other cases, national governments resistant to market-friendly initiatives have hamstrung entrepreneurial regional governments. In federal nations, which typically devolve significant fiscal and functional responsibilities to regional leaders, the result is that many policy changes that fall under the market reform umbrella suffer from collective action problems. Thus, in many of the largest and most important emerging

³ See *The Economist*, "Enron, and on, and on: Indian Power and Enron's Indian Troubles," April 21, 2001; *The Economic Times*, "Endgame for Enron," August 19, 2001; *The Hindu*, "Reform in the States," January 24, 2001.

⁴ See *The New York Times*, "Brazil's Government Pays Foreign Debt Owed by One of Its States," February 11, 1999; *The New York Times*, "Brazil's Economic Crisis Pits President Against Governors," January 25, 1999; *The Economist*, "No Peace for Brazil's President," January 21, 1999.

⁵ See *Moscow News*, "Regional Budget Spending to be Cut," May 21, 1998; *The Economist*, "The Bridling of Russia's Regions," November 9, 2000; *The Economist*, "Edward Rossel, Russia's Ungovernable Governor," November 5, 1998. Academic accounts include those by Solnick (2000) and Stoner-Weiss (1997).

market and developing nations in the world, economic reforms depend on subnational as well as national economic reform policies and each phase of market liberalization becomes subject to complex intergovernmental bargaining.

Existing academic literatures tell us little about how these federal conflicts influence market reform processes. On one hand, the voluminous literature on the politics of economic reform in developing nations has overwhelmingly focused on national politics. National executives, bureaucracies, legislatures, and interest groups – these, most research tells us, hold the keys to understanding the fate of market reforms.⁶ One common theme that emerges from tests of these national-level explanations is the importance of fusing power to initiate and sustain difficult reforms. It is a bit surprising, therefore, that researchers have paid less attention to the geographic dispersal of power, which is the *sin qua non* of federations. As a result, the economic reform literature has failed to appreciate (though with mounting exceptions) the role of decentralized politics for market reform processes. The key comparative factors that exacerbate or ameliorate intergovernmental economic conflicts remain something of a mystery.

On the other hand, the literature on federalism (both fiscal and political), although aware of the potential for intergovernmental conflict, traditionally has focused on a small number of economically successful cases in the OECD cases (and particularly the United States), with little attention to comparative theory building. Given the lack of a comparative lens, it is not surprising that the conventional wisdom emerging from these success stories has been a supposed affinity between federalism and markets. Unfortunately, that conventional wisdom jibes little with the experience of many federations in the developing world. Even the most influential and profound recent exception to the atheoretical tradition in the federalism literature, namely Weingast's (1995) integration of the fiscal federalism and political economy literatures under the moniker of "market-preserving federalism," undertheorizes the crucial factors that determine the degree to which intergovernmental conflict impedes (rather than contributes to) the development of markets. Thus, although analysts working in the market-preserving tradition

⁶ For noteworthy works in this vein, see Przeworski (1991), Haggard and Kaufman (1995), and Nelson (1990).

have fastidiously defined some general conditions under which federalism is most likely to produce good economic outcomes, they have not theorized the tremendous diversity in economic outcomes across federations. In this literature, political systems are either market-preserving or they are not, with little attention to either the conditions for a shift toward market-friendly policies or the diversity of economic experiences *across* and *within* federations through time.

These shortcomings bring to mind William Riker's seminal work *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*. Published nearly fifty years ago, he stressed in the Preface both the importance and difficulty of comparative research on political federalism. He wrote that:

Years ago, when I first thought of writing something like this book, I wanted to make a truly comparative study of federalism, which seemed to me to be exactly the kind of subject about which we might easily utter testable generalizations. . . . In time, however, I came to realize this far too pretentious a project for one man. (1964: xi–xii)

Instead, Riker basically utilized a single case to generate general hypotheses. For decades, Riker's implicit challenge to engage in a theoretically driven comparative inquiry of federalism went all but unheard – a fact that contributes to the poor state of knowledge on the relationship between federalism and everything from economic policy to representation to ethnic conflict in many of the world's federations. In recent years, however, an eclectic blend of comparative political scientists and economists has begun to fill the void, particularly with respect to developing and emerging market federations.⁷ If the delay brings to mind the adage “better late than never,” the recent explosion of research suggests a widespread desire to make up for lost time. As often is the case in the social sciences, events of the moment (such as historic moves to free markets) have driven the proliferation of studies on federalism.

⁷ The comparative federalism literature has expanded exponentially in recent years. Some of that research has focused to varying degrees on the role of federalism in shaping market reforms. See Treisman (1999b, 1999c, 2000), Stepan (2000), Shleifer and Treisman (2000), Blanchard and Shleifer (2000), Solnick (2000), Rodden and Rose-Ackerman (1997), Remmer and Wibbels (2000), Wibbels (2000), Saiegh and Tommasi (1998, 1999); Rao (1997); Huang (1996b), Gibson and Calvo (2000), and Chhibber and Eldersveld (2000).

This research contributes to this rich area of research by developing a comparative theory of intergovernmental conflict designed to account for variations in the degree to which federations are able to make the difficult transition to market-based economies. Although focused on the specifics of market transitions in the developing world, the study also contributes to the more general search for the conditions under which decentralized governance contributes to or obstructs the development of markets. The work's central insight is that the intergovernmental checks and balances deified by theorists from the writers of the *Federalist Papers* to many contemporary social scientists generate institutional obstacles to economic reform policies under fairly common conditions. Although federalism may check the central government's expansive tendencies and foster market-friendly competition among subnational governments under certain circumstances, it need not. Indeed, federalism will only function as traditionally envisioned when both national *and* decentralized governments are attuned to the demands of the market. Such is quite rarely the case in the developing world. In the ideal case, governments can compete without fundamental conflict over the appropriate role of the market in shaping economic relations. Under conditions common in many of the developing world's federations, by contrast, profound disagreements across levels of government over the role of the public sector in the economic sphere create a more insidious version of intergovernmental conflict and serious collective action problems vis-à-vis policy reform. Far from generating efficiencies, such conflict is likely to contribute to policy intransigence, poor economic performance, as well as deep-seated antagonism over the very rules of federalism's intergovernmental game.

The analytical challenge, then, is to understand the key features of federations that shape the degree of intergovernmental conflict over economic policy. In brief, the theory developed here suggests that many market reform policies are a function of a constant process of bargaining between national and regional leaders struggling for political survival. As the degree of national-regional disagreement mounts, collective action on reforms that require implementation at multiple levels of government becomes more difficult. The degree to which the two sets of actors conflict depends on four crucial factors: the electoral interests that each brings to the game, a shared intergovernmental fiscal system, the manner in which regional interests are represented in

national policy making, and the levers of partisan influence national leaders have over subnational politicians. Below, I briefly sketch how these factors interact to shape the federal bargaining context.

Consistent with their distinct electoral considerations, each actor in this federal game comes to the bargain with political interests and policy preferences of their own. National governments often come to the intergovernmental bargaining table with incentives to promote national economy stability. In recent decades such stability often requires market reforms, the likes of which international markets demand (Kahler 1986, 1992) and for which voters have often rewarded incumbents in many nations (Stokes 2001a, 2001b). In other cases, however, the distributional consequences of reform are prohibitive in the short term (Przeworski 1991), thus generating national incentives to resist reform. Each regional politician – be they senators, national representatives, or governors – responds to their own electoral incentives generated by a particular subset of the electorate, which may or may not recognize the relationship between regional policy and the fate of broader reforms. Building on arguments developed by Geddes (1994), Remmer (1998), Hellman (1998), Alt, Lassen, and Skilling (2001), De Figueiredo (2002), and others, I suggest that political competition primarily determines those incentives. Where competition is keen, regional electorates and leaders will be more closely attuned to the efficient provision of public goods and the demands of the market. By contrast, where regional politics are uncompetitive and clientelistic (quite common in the developing world's federations), subnational political considerations are likely to militate against economic reforms that would limit public sector patronage and challenge the political survival of incumbents. In short, representatives from competitive regions are more likely to have political incentives consistent with market reforms than their counterparts who lead politically hegemonic regions.

Given these political incentives distinct to each actor at both levels of government, a shared intergovernmental fiscal system provides incentives for both sets of politicians. Although some fiscal systems encourage market-friendly behavior, others promote overspending on the part of regional politicians and post hoc bailouts by national leaders. A long-standing finding in the public finance literature holds that as the share of subnational revenues coming from central transfers rather

than their own tax effort increases, governments spend more (Oates 1972; Bird 1986). Because regional voters, politicians, and representatives in the central legislature all receive benefits from grant programs without internalizing their full cost, they demand more expenditures funded by grants than by taxes raised by their own level of government (Weingast, Shepsle, and Johnson 1981; Rodden 2003c). As a result, such transfers encourage regional politicians to compete for resources from the common pool of national revenues, and the fiscal system itself becomes the subject of intense intergovernmental bargaining. The very ground rules of the federal system become the subject of political gamesmanship. One central implication is that regional government resistance to market reforms will mount as their dependence on transfers increases, which will vary both across regions within federations and across federations themselves.

Such fiscal systems also have implications for the behavior of national politicians. Most important in this respect is that in nations where central governments bear the burden of financing regional governments, they often succumb to regional demands for fiscal bailouts (Rodden 2002). As transfers accentuate the importance of intergovernmental bargaining, the national government finds itself the subject of intense lobbying – the end result of which is often politically motivated rescue packages for friends at the regional level. Of course, all such post-hoc bailouts provide incentives for regions to spend extravagantly in the future (Wibbels 2003). Broadly speaking, therefore, the weaker the link between regional taxing and spending, the greater the incentives for both regional and national politicians to engage in the kind of fiscal expansion that can threaten market reforms (von Hagen and Eichengreen 1996; Rodden 2002).

Given their electoral and fiscal incentives, actors at both levels of government have political mechanisms for influencing the other. Regional leaders have leverage through representation (be it formal or otherwise) in the national policy-making process. In federal systems, this traditionally occurs through the Senate, although in nations such as Argentina and Russia, the governors themselves are the crucial bargainers. Given the nature of regional representation, the size of the regional coalition for and against market reforms becomes key to determining their relative influence with national leaders. When antireform regions represent a solid majority in the national legislature, for instance, they

are likely to be quite capable of forcing chief executives to put market reforms on the back burner. Alternatively, in cases where regional majorities are market-friendly, they will smooth the path for presidents and prime ministers intent on policy change. This emphasis on the manner in which regional interests are represented at the national level underscores both the leverage regions have over central politicians and the ways in which coalitions of regions can come to check each other.

National leaders themselves are not defenseless in this intergovernmental game. Most important, they have varying capacity to discipline regional leaders through the party system. Fiscal resources and appointment powers allow national politicians to shape the incentives of their regional copartisans. Where national leaders hold a strong partisan position in the regions and head a centralized party, their capacity to foster subnational reform increases. The incentives for reform need not, however, come from the top down. When the electoral success of regional politicians depends in part on the fate of their national compatriots through coattail effects, for instance, they have incentives to contribute to the collective good of economic policy coordination. Although some recent literature has emphasized the importance of strong, national parties to discipline profligate regional governments, I argue that intergovernmental partisan harmony achieved via coattails is a more reliable foundation for extending market reforms to the subnational level. In the former case, subnational reforms reflect central calculations, which may be incompatible over the long term with regional political realities. In the latter case, reforms emerge out of the electoral considerations of regional leaders themselves, resulting in a kind of policy ownership that can help sustain reforms over the long haul.

Together, these factors provide a dynamic account of the intergovernmental politics associated with market reforms that improves on the current literature in several ways. First, the model allows for variance in the degree of intergovernmental economic conflict across federations and within federations through time. Traditionally, most federalism research has been case-study driven and/or focused on categorizing systems as market-preserving or not. The first approach pays insufficient attention to the range of economic outcomes across federations, whereas the second ignores the ebb and tide of market-friendly policies