

Designing Federalism

A Theory of Self-Sustainable Federal Institutions

Because of the redistributive nature of institutions and the availability of implementable alternatives with different distributive consequences, the desire of federation members to change institutional specifics in their favor is a permanent feature of the federal political process. This is so for two reasons. First, states or their equivalents in democratic federations usually can succeed in renegotiating the rules if they feel sufficiently motivated to do so, albeit sometimes at the cost of secession and civil war. Second, in the case of a federation it is more or less clear who stands to benefit from any change in institutions, and coalitions in favor of renegotiation can be easily formed depending on the content of the proposal. Thus, the existence of an equilibrium of constitutional legitimacy at the popular and elite levels cannot be taken for granted. The authors show that the presence in the political process of agents who are "naturally committed" to the status quo institutional arrangement can suffice to coordinate voters to act as if they support existing constitutional arrangements, even if this is not the best option.

Mikhail Filippov received his Ph.D. from the California Institute of Technology in 1998 and is Assistant Professor of Political Science and a Research Fellow at the Center in Political Economy at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. He has published articles in *Public Choice*, *Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies*, *Constitutional Political Economy*, and other journals.

Peter C. Ordeshook earned his Ph.D. from the University of Rochester in 1969 and is currently Professor of Political Science at the California Institute of Technology. He has authored and coauthored many books including *Game Theory and Political Theory* (Cambridge, 1986), *The Balance of Power* (Cambridge, 1989), *An Introduction to Positive Political Theory, Lessons for Citizens of a New Democracy*, and *A Political Theory Primer*. He is a member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Olga Shvetsova received her Ph.D. from the California Institute of Technology in 1995 and is a Fellow at the Micro Incentives Research Center at Duke University. She has published articles in *American Journal of Political Science*, *Law and Society Review*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, and other journals and edited volumes.





Designing Federalism

A Theory of Self-Sustainable Federal Institutions

MIKHAIL FILIPPOV

Washington University, St. Louis

PETER C. ORDESHOOK

California Institute of Technology

OLGA SHVETSOVA

Duke University





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521016483

© Mikhail Filippov, Peter C. Ordeshook, and Olga Shvetsova 2004

This publication 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 2004

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Filippov, Mikhail.

Designing federalism: a theory of self-sustainable federal institutions / Mikhail Filippov, Peter C. Ordeshook, Olga Shvetsova.

```
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-521-81618-1 (hard) – ISBN 0-521-01648-7 (pbk.)

1. Federal government. 2. Comparative government. 3. World politics – 1989–
I. Ordeshook, Peter C., 1942– II. Shvetsova, Olga (Olga Vitalievna) III. Title.
```

```
JC355.F55 2003
321.02'3 - dc21 2003043938
```

ISBN 978-0-521-81618-2 Hardback ISBN 978-0-521-01648-3 Paperback

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



Contents

List of Figures		<i>page</i> vii
Lis	et of Tables	viii
	Pface	ix
	knowledgments	xi
I	Federations and the Theoretical Problem	I
	1.1 Why Federalism	I
	1.2 Definitions	5
	1.3 The Long Search for Stability	16
	1.4 The Fundamental Problem of Stability	26
	1.5 Basic Premises and Conclusions	33
2	Federal Bargaining	42
	2.1 Alliances versus Federations	44
	2.2 The Private Character of Public Goods	50
	2.3 Equilibrium Selection and Redistribution	52
	2.4 The Federal Problem	55
	2.5 Bargaining for Control of the Center	61
	2.6 Allocating Jurisdictions	68
	2.7 Three Levels of Institutional Design	71
3	Two Cases of Uninstitutionalized Bargaining	76
	3.1 The Czechoslovak Dissolution	79
	3.2 The Soviet Disintegration	88
	3.3 The Feasibility of Success in Initial Bargaining	101
	3.4 Secession: The Special Road to Renegotiation	104
4	Representation	III
•	4.1 Two Alternative Models of Federalism	III
	4.2 A National Venue for Bargaining	116
	4.3 Within versus Without	119

V



vi			Contents
	4.4	Direct versus Delegated Representation	125
	4.5	Other Parameters of Design	127
	4.6	Bilateral Decision Making and the Case of Russia	131
5	Incentives		142
	5.1	Institutional Enforcement	142
	5.2	The Court	151
	5.3	Some Simple Rules of Constitutional Design	157
	5.4	Voters versus Elites	161
	5.5	Desirable Imperfection and a Democratic As-If Principle	169
6	Poli	tical Parties in a Federal State	177
	6.1	An Extreme Hypothesis	177
	6.2	•	182
	6.3	The Idealized Party System	186
	6.4	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	190
	6.5	Integration outside the United States	196
	6.6	India	213
7	Insti	itutional Sources of Federal Stability I	226
	7 . I	Introduction	226
	7.2	L	229
	, ,	Level 3 Institutions	236
	7.4	Australia, Canada, Germany, and India Revisited	241
	7.5	Local and Regional Design Parameters	252
8		itutional Sources of Federal Stability II	259
	8.1	Electoral Mechanisms and Societal Structures	260
	8.2	Level 2 Again and a Proper Federal Structure	268
	8.3	Level 1 and the Scope of the Federal Mandate	289
	8.4	Level o – Things beyond Design	294
9		igning Federalism	299
	9.1	Introduction	299
	-	Russia	301
	9.3		315
	9.4	Conclusion	331
Re	ferenc	es	337
Name Index		367	
Subject Index		374	



Figures

I.I	Cooperation problem without redistribution	page 29	9
1.2	Cooperation problem without redistribution, with		
	increased net benefits	30	S
1.3	Cooperation problem with redistribution	30	S
3.1	Durability of federal regimes created after 1945	80	S
3.2	Durability of all federal regimes	80	S
5.1	Constitutional legitimacy problem when popular mandates		
	are received by perfect agents of the voters	167	7
5.2	Transformation of the constitutional legitimacy problem		
	with the introduction of imperfect political agency	168	3
8.1	Constitutional legitimacy problem when some federal benefits		
	to groups are popularly perceived as mutually exclusive	264	4
8.2	Relationship between the presence of an oversized federal		
	subject and stability, in federations created between		
	1945 and 1990	269	9
8.3	Relationship between the number of federal units and stability,		
_	in federations created between 1945 and 1990	270	2

vii



Tables

	of total government revenue	page	6
1.2	Fiscal arrangements and the state role in national		
	tax decisions in the late 1990s		7
2.1	Control of the center at the time of regime failure		
	(federations founded after 1945)		64
4.1	Types of representation and venues of bargaining	I	17
6.1	Labor and Liberal Party performance in Australian		
	state elections, 1945–2001	I	98
6.2	Average vote for Liberals and Conservatives and for federal		
	governing party in Canadian provincial elections, 1947-1995	2	07
6.3	Regional representation: Governing party, 1896–2000	2	ΙI
6.4	India's first four general elections	2	19
7 . I	Number of local governments and elected officials in the		
	United States, 1992	2	37
7.2	Number of statewide executive offices, in addition to governor,		
	filled by direct election	2	38
7.3	Term lengths of state officers	2	58
8.1	Number of electoral jurisdictions at subnational and local		
	levels in selected federations, 1998	2	74
8.2	Average number of elected local offices and number of		
	represented parties by size and linguistic type of a commune	2	77
8.3	Number of elected officials in Canada and selected		
	federal countries, 1998	2	79
8.4	The three levels of institutional design	2	94
9.1	Party vote shares as a function of position on European		
	integration	3	23
9.2	Comparison of elite and mass support for European		
	integration	3	24

Subnational governments' revenues as a percentage

viii



Preface

It is natural, when thinking of democratic federalism, to begin with the classic and most successful examples - the United States, Germany, Australia, Switzerland, Canada, India, and even the more economically underachieving ones of Brazil and Argentina - and to assume that designing a federal state is a well-understood exercise of finding a suitable balance between regional autonomy and federal authority. But focusing on such examples obscures the fact that of seven European federations of the last decade of the twentieth century (Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Russia, the USSR, and Yugoslavia), three (Czechoslovakia, the USSR, and Yugoslavia) no longer exist, one is hardly guaranteed to remain democratic or federal except in name only (Russia), and another (Belgium) is arguably surviving as a linguistically divided state largely by virtue of its position as the bureaucratic "capital" of a nascent federation, the European Union. Add to this the fact of the American Civil War, Canada's struggle with Quebec separatism, the bloody conflicts that plagued the Swiss Confederation in the first half of the nineteenth century, India's descent to virtual despotic rule under Indira Gandhi, the earlier near disappearance of meaningful Australian federalism, wholly dissolved or disrupted federations (e.g., Mali, Uganda, Cameroon, British West India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Ethiopia), and Europe's often bumpy road to integration, and we can only conclude that the requirements of a successful design are neither trivial nor well understood.

This volume, in fact, is prefaced on the assumption (belief) that successful design, and specifically democratic design, requires something more than the mere negotiation of regional versus central authority or the establishment of a "fair" system of regional representation in the national legislature – the common foci of federal constitutional craftsmanship. Indeed, a second premise of this volume is that the institutional parameters most commonly assumed to be critical to federal success are not sufficient to implement a successful design and may not even be the ones that are of primary importance. We hasten to add that we are not about to argue that success or failure rests

ix



x Preface

with socioeconomic circumstances. We would not deny the importance of such things as ethnic, linguistic, religious, or racial divisions; experience with democratic governance; and the maturity and efficiency of domestic markets. But if, in attempting to implement a stable federal state, we assume that only directly manipulable institutional parameters are at our disposal, then, in addition to the usual variables of federal design, we must consider seemingly tangential matters such as the authority of the federal center's chief executive; the timing of local, regional, and national elections; the bicameral character of the national legislature or appropriately designed substitutes for bicameralism; and the content of regional charters and constitutions.

Our rationale for reaching beyond even constitutional parameters lies in the fact that the essential difficulty with political design generally is that political institutions are, by their very nature, redistributive – different institutions imply different winners and losers so that in the long and short run different people will prefer different institutional arrangements. And the particular difficulty with federal design is that, in addition to those social cleavages with which a designer must often deal, by definition it establishes, coordinates, and legitimizes specific competing interests – notably those of federal subjects as well as the federal center. Add to this the requirement of citizen sovereignty in a democratic state whereby politicians are required to somehow accommodate the potentially myopic self-interest of their constituents, and federalism becomes especially problematic in terms of sustaining a stable institutional structure. Addressing the redistributive nature of design directly, by manipulating only a limited subset of institutional parameters artificially labeled "federal" is unlikely to yield an adequate result. Instead, we argue, the *uniquely* theoretically justifiable approach is to induce a principal-agent relationship between citizens and their elected representatives that is imperfect but nevertheless satisfies the requirements of democratic governance, that redirects political elite motives away from divisive bargaining even if such bargaining serves the myopic interests of those who elect them, and that encourages society generally to reward such imperfect agency. We are led then to those institutional variables that impact the entity that serves as the primary intermediary between citizens acting as voters and political elites acting as election candidates, the political party. Although various scholars note the importance of parties to the operation of federalism, we argue that a properly designed party system encourages the imperfect agency essential to federal success. Put simply, implementing a federal system that is self-sustaining requires that we cast our institutional net widely so as to address those things which impact politicians' strategies as they strive to win and maintain office in a democracy.



Acknowledgments

The ideas for this volume began germinating among us soon after the Soviet Union's collapse in the early 1990s, when academics and politicians within its constituent parts and in the West alike began wrestling with the problems of design and implementability of new democratic orders. The task at hand concerned more than the general and abstract issues of constitutional stability and design; the goal, with Russia especially in mind, was to identify if not the exact parameters of design, then the key substantive mechanism by which choice of such parameters could influence the survival of a federal democratic regime. In the progress that we made since then, we are greatly indebted to the vast literature on the subjects of both federalism and institutional design, historical as well as contemporary. Any study of the subject begins, of course, with The Federalist Papers. But what other guideposts to federal design could we identify, what propositions about the sources of constitutional stability, and what additions to the practical discipline of political institutional design (political engineering) had been erected in the two hundred plus years since their authorship? Gems of insight could be found scattered throughout the literature we surveyed, but doubtlessly the most influential contemporary piece of scholarship in our thinking was William H. Riker's Federalism, whose words had lingered only half appreciated in the consciousness of one of us for most of an academic career but whose full meaning materialized as our collaboration proceeded.

Among the colleagues who were with us throughout the project, we want to thank Thomas Schwartz first. Much of our thinking about constitutions, constitutional stability, and dimensions of constitutional design was influenced by his suggestions, arguments, and some might even say intellectual badgering. Russian scholars Vyacheslav Nikonov and Leonid Smyrniagin in Moscow challenged us to make our theoretical models consistent with the practical concerns encountered by nascent federations.

We owe intellectual debts to a great many others: to Russell Hardin's essay on constitutions as mechanisms of political coordination, which provided the

хi



xii Acknowledgments

fundamental insight for us into the perplexing matter of constitutional stability; to George Breslauer, Carol Leonard, Thomas Remington, Phil Roeder, Brian Silver, and Steve Solnick, who shared freely their ideas, insights, and depth of expertise; to William Keech, Thomas Koenig, and Simon Hug for their detailed comments on this volume; to Randal Calvert, James Endersby, Jack Knight, Krishna Ladha, Gary Miller, and Sunita Parikh for their input into its earlier versions; to Viktor Vanberg, Leonid Polishchuk, Itai Sened, Melvin Hinich, and Stephan Voigt, who encouraged the enterprise and cheered us on. We also owe a special debt of gratitude to Norman Schofield for his continued encouragement and support and for the many discussions we have held with him both about the book's material and more generally in the context of constitutional design.

Of the various conferences that proved especially valuable wherein some of the ideas offered here were set before colleagues in preliminary form, we would like especially to note Washington University Center in Political Economy's "Constitutions, Voting and Democracy" (St. Louis, 2001) and Leonid Smyrnagin's workshop on regional constitutional design (Moscow, 1995). Our work was in part supported by the National Science Foundation (Shvetsova) and the National Council for East European and Eurasian Research (Ordeshook).

Of course, the faults of the volume are of our own making, our only excuse being that the subjects of federalism and constitutional design are of such scope and complexity that no single contribution can do all things. We ask only that readers proceed with the idea that this volume merely offers a hypothesis about parties, democracy, and federalism that, like any other in the practical science of political institutional design, can only be "tested" to the extent that it raises the salience of certain matters in the minds of those who would actually design and implement a democratic federal state.