

The Composition of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations

Background Paper #3

Published by

Committee for a Democratic U.N.

Berlin, Germany, March 2010

Copyright © Committee for a Democratic U.N., 2010

3rd edition

Cover designed by Jeannette Lee

www.kdun.org

ISBN 978-3-942282-04-8

The Composition of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations

A Background Paper of the Committee for a Democratic U.N.

Andreas Bummel

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC U.N.

A global parliamentary assembly has the potential to restructure the geopolitical setup of the United Nations. The composition of the body therefore is of fundamental importance. This analysis explores in detail principles and different models.

“If a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly is to become a reality, we need to move beyond general discussions regarding feasibility and desirability. We need to begin the concrete work of conceptualizing how an assembly can be structured. This is exactly what Andreas Bummel does in this analysis. This thoughtful background paper, explaining options for who the members of the assembly might be, and how they might be chosen, is certain to be an invaluable resource for all of us concerned with democratizing the international system.”

— *Andrew Strauss, Distinguished Professor of Law, Widener University School of Law*

“Given the increasing importance of the United Nations in a range of fields such as the promotion of human rights and democracy standards worldwide and its central role in the climate change agenda, it is now time to consider the establishment of a parliamentary assembly to provide democratic oversight of this global institution.”

— *Edward McMillan-Scott, Vice-President of the European Parliament for Human Rights and Democracy*

Contents

Summary.....	7
1. Introduction	9
2. Basic Considerations	
The Delegates and their Selection	12
Multifaceted Political, National and Geographical Groupings	14
The Independence of Delegates	16
Existing Parliamentary Assemblies	17
3. Models for the Distribution of Seats.....	21
(A): Proportional Distribution	25
(B): The Square Root Formula	27
(C): Population, UN Dues and Sovereignty I.....	29
(D): Population, UN Dues and Sovereignty II.....	30
4. The Democratic Character of the Assembly.....	32
5. Further Aspects	
Political Groups as Electoral Colleges	36
Representation of Regional Assemblies	37
Weighted Voting	39
6. Final Remarks.....	41
Annex Tables.....	42
References	56

Tables

1. International Poll: “How likely would you be to support a Global Parliament, where votes are based on country population sizes and the global parliament is able to make binding policies?”	24
2. Shares of selected units in world population, world GDP and in the seats of a UNPA in models (A) to (D).....	26
3. The distribution of seats in models (A) to (D) according to Freedom House categories.....	34
4. Proportional deduction of seats from EU member states in the example for the allocation of seats to the European Parliament under model (A)..	38
5. Allocation of seats to groups in the European Parliament in the example under model (A)	39

Annex Tables

1. Largest shares of seats per country in model (A).....	42
2. Largest shares of seats per country in model (B).....	43
3. Largest shares of seats per country in model (C)	43
4. Largest shares of seats per country in model (D)	44
5. Examples for the number of seats allocated per political group in selected parliaments in models (A) to (D)	45
6. Full country list for the distribution of seats in models (A) to (D)	48

Summary

The global financial crisis and the failure of the UN's Climate Conference in Copenhagen in December 2009 have once again shown that due to its design the United Nations is unable to bridge the imbalance between its large and small member states. In the UN General Assembly, all countries are equally represented with one vote. As a consequence, large countries tend to avoid the UN in certain policy sectors.

A UN Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA) could be a means to do away with the structural dysfunction of the UN. It could be added to the UN General Assembly as a second chamber in which the actual weight of the UN member states is reflected by the number of seats that are allocated to them.

A UNPA would not be a duplicate of the UN General Assembly, merely with different voting strengths. First of all, the assembly would not be composed of government diplomats but of autonomous delegates. These delegates could be chosen from within and by political groups that exist in national legislatures. An example to draw upon is the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. At a later stage, a transition to direct elections could take place. An example for such a development is provided by the European Parliament.

The delegates in a UNPA would organize themselves in multifaceted political, national and regional groupings. International groupings according to similar political camps would probably be most often and the delegates of a given country would not necessarily vote in the same way.

It is recommended that the determination of the number of seats per country in a UNPA should be based on the principle of "degressive proportionality", corresponding to the example of regional parliaments and parliamentary assemblies. Degressive proportionality allows to achieve a reasonable balance between the principles of democratic representation on the one hand and of the equality of states on the other.

The concrete models for the apportionment of seats that are presented in this analysis illustrate possible approaches. None of them is recommended as a preferred solution.

The models are all designed in a way that they do not exceed an upper limit of around 800 seats. One of the basic purposes of a UNPA is to reflect the political plurality of the population of the UN member

states. In consideration of this, a minimum of two seats is allocated to every country, one to be selected by the majority, the other by the minority in parliament.

In model (A), two seats are allocated to each country in a first step. The remaining seats of the fixed total number are then allocated directly proportional to population size. In model (B), the formula for the distribution of seats is the square root of a country's population size divided by one million. In addition, countries that get less than two seats under that formula are allocated the missing number of one or two seats. In model (C), the share of seats is based on a country's percentage share of the total population of all UN member states, its percentage share of the total UN budget and its share of the total UN membership (1/192). In model (D), every country gets two seats and any country having a population of more than one per cent of the total world population would be entitled to select one extra member for each further full one percent. In addition any nation that contributes more than one per cent to the UN budget would be allowed to select one extra member for each further full one percent.

This analysis assumes that a UNPA would be open for participation of all UN member states. In the case of autocratic regimes with one-party systems, the delegates would act, to a certain degree, according to the instructions of their home government. One procedural measure to make control by home governments more difficult in such cases could be that voting has to be by secret ballot.

More importantly, in each of the four models, a majority of delegates would come from countries classified by Freedom House foundation as "electoral democracy". The percentage ranges between 55.5 and 66 percent. The highest percentage of delegates coming from countries classified as "not free" is 29.8 percent in model (A).

In order to have regional parliaments and regional parliamentary assemblies represented, it could be provided that groups of countries are allowed to cede a certain number of seats allocated to them to such international regional parliamentary assemblies or parliaments.

1 Introduction

The global system of intergovernmental institutions lacks adequate participatory mechanisms for elected parliamentarians that involve means of oversight and regulation.¹ Neither the United Nations nor any of its specialized agencies and programs, nor the World Trade Organization or the international financial institutions possess a formal parliamentary body, not even in an advisory capacity.² This flaw is a main source for the democratic deficit of global governance. The primary means to correct this deficiency is the establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA). In addition, a reasonably designed UNPA might be able to contribute in a decisive way to doing away with one of the UN's core malfunctions. It could enable the UN to become a more effective and more democratic hub for global multilateralism. It would have the potential to “profoundly restructure the current geopolitical situation.”³

The international response to the global financial crisis or the failure of the UN Conference on Climate Change in December 2009 in Copenhagen have shown once again that the UN suffers from a sharp contrast between its large and small member states and that its current design is unable to offer a working solution to bridge this divide.

To thrash out a coordinated response to the global financial crisis, the heads of states and governments of the largest industrialised and emerging economies in the world met in the framework of the G-20 summits in Washington D.C., London and Pittsburgh. The UN, on the other hand, played a distinctly secondary role. The “United Nations Conference at the Highest Level on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and its Impact on Devel-

¹ The author would like to thank Fergus Watt, Tony Fleming, Claudia Kissling, Joseph Schwartzberg and Larry Kazdan for their comments and Gregory Gihoul for the help in gathering the underlying data.

² As was shown in an earlier analysis, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, an international association of national parliaments, does not fulfill this function. See Bummel (2008).

³ Cf. Onesta (2007: 34).

opment” in June 2009 in New York that was convened by Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann as President of the General Assembly had almost no importance.

The derailment of the Climate Conference in Copenhagen was due to a whole set of factors. But the described imbalance within the UN membership was one of the reasons here as well. As the plenary was not ready to accept the compromise negotiated by a group of finally five large countries, the document was merely “taken note of”. Some small countries threatened to veto any decision. The negotiations on a new framework for climate change mitigation may now be removed away from the UN to a different forum, possibly to the G-20, whose members account for over 70 percent of the world's CO2 emissions.

According to Mark Malloch Brown (2008: 8) who previously served as UN Deputy Secretary-General, Chef de Cabinet to the Secretary-General, and for six years as administrator of the UN Development Programme, “the intergovernmental gridlock between the big contributors and the rest of the membership concerning governance and voting is the core dysfunction.” The sociologists Patrick Nolan and Gerhard Lenski (2006: 352) took the same line and noted that “the greatest obstacle to the effectiveness of [the United Nations] is probably the system of representation in the General Assembly which provides for an equal vote for the People's Republic of China, with its population of 1.3 *billion*, and for Tuvalu with its population of 10 *thousand*.” According to Pascal Lamy (2005: 24), the principle of equal representation “is completely out of step with contemporary geopolitical realities.”

Indeed, most countries are tiny dwarfs with regard to population size and economic power and only few contribute in a significant way to the UN's budget. The members of the G-20 alone represent about two thirds of the world population and almost 90 percent of the global gross domestic product. Still, in the General Assembly they are by far outnumbered by small states and the proceedings at UN meetings often are strongly ritualized and tedious.

As Geoffrey McNicoll (1999: 422) already noted some time ago, powerful states under such conditions tend to “shrug off Lilliputian efforts to trammel them and conduct their business elsewhere.”

Considering the failure of Copenhagen, the Chairs of the Delegations of the European Parliament and the Pan-African Parliament to the climate conference noted in a joint statement that “a Parliamentary Assembly at UN level with parliamentary working methods linked with open discussion and majority votes could be helpful for the global decision-making process.” (Leinen/Mugenyi 2009)

Among other things, a UNPA could serve to reflect the actual weight of countries in the UN system. The number of seats allocated to each country in a UNPA could be based on criteria such as population size, economic power

or other factors. The assembly thus could compensate for the overly dominance of small countries in the General Assembly and other UN fora. The General Assembly and the Parliamentary Assembly could form a two-chamber system.⁴ It could be provided that certain decisions would have to pass both bodies with certain qualified majorities in order to have effect.

The question about how the relationship of a UNPA to the General Assembly and other UN entities in fact should look like in detail is one of many complex issues that are involved with the establishment of the body.

The focus of this paper is on the composition of a global parliamentary assembly. While the determination of such a body's power structure, defined through the distribution of seats and the underlying apportionment formula, will be the subject of political negotiations during an intergovernmental preparatory process, the purpose of this paper is first to discuss and identify basic principles, and second to illustrate some different models. We want to show that realistic and reasonable solutions are possible. None of the models or figures in this paper, however, is recommended as a preferred approach. They are instead offered as a starting point intended to stimulate discussion on the composition of a global parliamentary body.

Finally, this analysis will eliminate a major misconception about a UNPA that any such assembly necessarily would be dominated by a few populous countries, and that a majority of seats would be held by authoritarian regimes. As the models discussed in this analysis reveal, these assumptions are not substantiated.

⁴ Such a setup was suggested by the Czech President Vaclav Havel (2000) at the UN's Millennium Summit.

2 Basic Considerations

The Delegates and their Selection

The opening question which has a major impact on the functioning and structure of the assembly concerns the nature of its membership. By definition, the membership of contemporary intergovernmental organizations, such as the United Nations or World Trade Organization, consists of independent sovereign states. These are represented in the organization's organs through government delegates which are bound by their government's instructions. Although the procedure for establishing a UNPA would be an intergovernmental process, perhaps through a vote of the UN General Assembly or the creation of a new stand-alone international treaty,⁵ the UNPA's membership itself would not be state-based.⁶ Rather, to reflect its parliamentary nature, the assembly would need to be composed of autonomous delegates, constituting a democratic link between the assembly and the world's citizens and able to act as their legitimate representatives.⁷ In order to achieve this, the selection of the delegates in principle would need to accrue from a democratic decision-making process.

Some proponents have recommended that electoral districts, all of even size, should be created for the purpose of direct elections to a world parliament.⁸ Many of these constituencies would be supranational in nature⁹, and

⁵ Strauss (2007) names four possible approaches: Amendment of the UN Charter; creation by the UN General Assembly under Article 22, civil society organized elections and an interstate treaty process. A variation is also to transform the Inter-Parliamentary Union into a UNPA, Bummel (2010: 19ff.). This question, however, is not subject of this paper.

⁶ If it is established through a new stand-alone treaty there might also be provisions for an Assembly of States Parties (ASP) which comprises those states which accede to the treaty. Together with the actual parliamentary body the ASP might play a role regarding treaty amendments. This would assure acceding states that the UNPA could not change its key features on its own without their approval.

⁷ Cf. Heinrich (1993: 12).

⁸ Monbiot (2004: 87) suggests 600 constituencies at 10 million people each; the thought was probably first formulated by Johann B. Sartorius (1837: 250f.).

as such, this does not seem to be a viable option at this time from a pragmatic point of view. There is not a single precedent for the idea. To date, all democratic elections across the planet, even those for members of the supranational European Parliament, are still carried out within the framework of the nation-state. Added to this would be the unresolved decision on a proper electoral method, in particular the question of how these global electoral districts could be integrated in an electoral system for proportional representation.¹⁰ More would also have to be known about whether and which small states actually would agree to set up or be involved in a UNPA in which they are “clubbed together in a single parliamentary constituency.”¹¹ Though Erskine Childers and Brian Urquhart (1994: 180) suggest that “small island states of common culture and limited means might choose combined representation through a common election,” such states might choose not to do so if this results in an allocation of fewer seats which they otherwise, as single entities, would be entitled to. Given these practical concerns, this analysis assumes the world’s nation-states as a starting point.

As to the selection of the individual delegates one option would be to have them chosen from within and by existing political groups or parties constituted in national legislative branches.¹² These political groups or parties would thus act as electoral college-type bodies with the individuals selected to serve in the UNPA concurrently serving as national MPs.¹³ The provision that the selection of delegates thus would not require the approval of the full parliament in each state where such groups exist would strengthen the autonomy of minority political groups. However, if no political groups exist, which is the case in some legislatures, the UNPA delegates could be selected by parliament directly. In any case, the selection would have to reflect the different political currents existing in the house. A similar procedure has been successfully implemented in various regional assemblies such as the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE). While this option may improve democratic legitimacy, by providing delegates to a

⁹ A proposal put forward by Joseph Schwartzberg (2003: 92) includes, for example, 12 electoral districts which together would combine 76 small nations and dependencies. One such suggested group is, for example, “Southern Africa”, composed of Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland; another one is “Indian Ocean Islands” composed of Christmas Island, Comoros, East Timor, Maldives, Mauritius, Mayotte, Reunion and Seychelles.

¹⁰ The European Parliament is elected at the national level through party-list and single transferable vote systems.

¹¹ Schwartzberg (2003: 83).

¹² If no “constitutionally embodied parliament” exists, participation from that country would be impossible. This is also the recommendation of the Committee for a Democratic U.N., in Bummel (2010: 23).

¹³ Cf. CEUNPA (2007a).

UNPA that would be national MPs at the same time, it is not the only possible approach. As recently suggested by Olivier Giscard d'Estaing, "the delegates do not necessarily need to be elected MPs themselves. The cumulation of the global mandate with another parliamentary mandate at the national level would be to the disadvantage of the former" (CEUNPA, 2009).

At a later stage, a transition to direct elections might take place.¹⁴ This could occur gradually, with some countries using elections for the selection of their UNPA delegates, while others would follow only later, and some would retain the indirect procedure. Obviously, this question is also connected to the degree of democratic development of respective countries at the national level. This flexibility is also necessary to give national conditions due consideration. If, for example, a small country only has three or even fewer delegates, their direct election could give them a degree of political legitimacy and importance that might be inconsistent with the overall constitutional arrangements at the national level.

For the long-term future, once "direct universal suffrage global elections" could be held, Robert Sheppard (2000: 11) made an interesting suggestion. The world parliament thus could be structured in a way

in which a very large body numbering in the thousands is directly elected to meet rather infrequently, but itself elects a 'standing Committee' numbering in the hundreds to meet more frequently and work more intensively than the more multitudinous plenary body would allow.

Multifaceted Political, National and Geographical Groupings

A UNPA is expected to reflect a broad political spectrum, particularly enabling members of diverse opposition parties to be represented. This analysis assumes providing political and other minorities who are limited in their ability to participate in their national governments a voice at the UN as an inherent characteristic of a UNPA.

With this in mind, it is important to consider how delegates could be organized within the body. Basic rules for the formation of groups and their procedural rights will have to be set in the Statutes of a UNPA.

First of all, delegates from one party or political persuasion would most likely not like to caucus with colleagues from opposing parties from their

¹⁴ Cf. PAP (2007), para. 13.

own country, but rather organize themselves internationally with those from the same political camp. While individual delegates would remain the primary constituent element of a UNPA, the administrative and political structure of the body would organize not around member nationalities, but rather along cross-border political groups. In this way even an advisory UNPA contributes to the maturing of global politics.

For example, the lower chamber of the Indian parliament currently consists of more than 20 political groups. Delegates in a UNPA from India, irrespective of their common nationality, would most probably not like to form a uniform voting bloc in the Assembly as Joseph S. Nye (2002) alleges. Rather they would likely form at least two main blocs from India, one led by the Indian National Congress and the other by Bharatiya Janata Party. Similar situations would arise if we were look at Indonesia or Brazil, which, like India, are populous countries with multi-party systems. Although in some cases delegates of a common nationality may vote alike, it is still not reasonable to assume that they would naturally wish to form one single group in a UNPA which includes the political majority and minority at the same time.

Depending on the eventual apportionment of seats, some national party groups like those mentioned from India may be sufficiently large to comprise UNPA political groups by themselves. Governing rules on the establishment of political groups in the body initially might need to allow for flexibility in this regard, given that the preferred mode could differ according to country and group. Delegates from the United States, for instance, initially may prefer to form a large national bloc in a UNPA which includes Republicans and Democrats alike. Still, for delegates from smaller countries there is a clear incentive, even a need, to form international party groupings because together with like-minded colleagues they would be able to exert much more influence in the assembly than being on their own. The Statutes in fact could provide that certain procedural rights could be reserved for groups only in order to make the assembly's business routine more effective. Keeping in mind that the business of the UNPA would be broken down into smaller Committees and Sub-Committees, groupings of some kind will be necessary in order to organize a reasonable political division of labor.

One obvious possibility would be that existing international party networks such as the Centrist Democrat International, the Socialist International, the Liberal International or the Global Greens would facilitate the establishment of affiliated groups in the UNPA. Authors such as Jan Aart Scholte (2007: 32) have complained of their "very modest impacts on global politics" so far. The need to establish international parliamentary groups in a UNPA could certainly strengthen the importance of these global party networks, a development that might also contribute to cosmopolitan democracy.

It is thus actually no surprise that these three networks have already spoken out for the creation of a UNPA, in 2003, 2005 and 2008, respectively.¹⁵

The pace and extent of the development of international political groups in a UNPA is of course difficult to predict. In the Pan-African Parliament (PAP), for example, established 2004, the members so far still group in country delegations and geographic caucuses. However, a similar development as envisaged for the UNPA has taken place in the European Parliament (EP). In the current legislature elected in June 2009, for example, MEPs have organized themselves in seven Pan-European political groups and one group for non-attached members. In the EP, 25 Members are needed to form a political group, and at least one-quarter of the member states must be represented within the group. This means that from the outset, national groups are not possible in the EP. A similar approach should be considered for a UNPA.

The Independence of Delegates

As outlined before, the delegates in a UNPA will organize in a broad spectrum of diverse ideological groupings. Irrespective of their group affiliation or country origin, delegates would need to be able to vote individually according to their personal judgment and only bound by their conscience. Governments, in particular, must be discouraged from influencing or instructing them. For this reason, too, it is less likely that delegates from any given country would exercise a uniform and consistent voting behavior, all the more if they come from multi-party systems as they exist in Brazil, India or Indonesia.

Nonetheless, given the inherently global nature envisioned for a UNPA, such independence needs to take into consideration states without multi-party systems and weak legislatures. This aspect underscores where the regional example of the European Parliament does not fit entirely. The European Community and later the European Union did not include or admit autocratic regimes such as Franco's Spain in which no independent legislative chamber existed. The democratic legitimacy and independence of MEPs therefore was generally guaranteed. If the UNPA is open to participation from all UN member states as this analysis assumes, in line with the suggestion by the Campaign for the Establishment of a UNPA (CEUNPA, 2007b), some consideration must be given to the fact that some participating countries would

¹⁵ See Chapter 3.3. in Socialist International (2003) as well as Liberal International (2005) and Global Greens Second Congress (2008).

not possess fully democratic and independent legislative branches. Most problematic would be one-party systems. Consequently, the delegates dispatched from such countries would be, more or less, bound to the instructions of their government which, in practice, also selected them in the first place. This, of course, contradicts the very idea of a parliamentary body that consists of independent delegates intended to complement the UN General Assembly consisting of member states.

There are a number of procedural measures that could ameliorate, if not remedy entirely, the impact of such “pseudo-parliamentarians.” First, to avoid the most obvious conflict of interest, MPs who concurrently hold national-level government positions, especially in the national cabinet, should not be eligible to sit in the UNPA. Secondly, delegates should be required to vote by secret ballot, reducing the ability for autocratic governments to control delegates and directly monitor their voting behavior. A drawback would be, however, that secret voting at the same time would make it more difficult for citizens from democracies to hold their parliamentarian accountable.

In addition, once an MP is accredited as a UNPA member, it should not be possible for his home parliament or political group, let alone the government, to relieve the delegate from his office prior to the end of his elected term. These procedural arrangements might alleviate the problem to a certain degree but certainly will not eliminate it. Some delegates will still act on behalf of their government. In case of some tightly organized authoritarian systems, it could be expected that the appointed delegates form national voting blocs controlled by government. This aspect will be considered below when assessing specific formulas for the apportionment of seats.

Existing Parliamentary Assemblies

It is important to note that there are existing parliamentary assemblies at the regional level with tested apportionment models. For this reason, the Committee for a Democratic U.N. pointed out five years ago that the determination of the number of delegates per country in a UNPA should be based on a graduation oriented according to population size, “corresponding, in principle, to existing parliamentary assemblies.”¹⁶ In fact, in the decades after the Second World War, multilateral parliamentary assemblies have proliferated. Lluís Maria de Puig (2008) recently surveyed forty of them.¹⁷ Examples

¹⁶ See conclusion no. 9, cf. Bummel (2010: 27).

¹⁷ Kissling (2006: 341-407) names 47 parliamentary bodies and commissions of international and regional organizations.

which could be useful to draw upon in this analysis are, in particular, the European Parliament as most advanced supranational legislative body in the world and Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), established in 1949. In both, the European Parliament and PACE, the number of representatives per country is adjusted according to population size. The Pan-African Parliament and the Latin-American Parliament, to name two examples from other regions, provide for equal representation of national delegations.

The apportionment of seats in the European Parliament, based on Article 190 of the EC Treaty,¹⁸ is not strictly proportional to the population size of the 27 EU member states. First of all, the EU members have politically agreed to limit the total number of MEPs to 736, to set a minimum number of 5 seats for every state, even the smallest ones, and a maximum number of 99 seats.¹⁹ The seats are then distributed according to “degressive proportionality.” In other words, the larger the population of a state, the more people per MEP are represented. The EC treaty does not include a formula. It provides the exact numbers of MEPs per country which were negotiated. Malta as the smallest EU member has 5 seats, that is one MEP per 81,000 inhabitants while Germany, the largest country, has 99 seats, that is one per 831,000 and France, the second largest, has 72 seats, that is one per 890,000.

This inequality was the subject of constitutional complaints in Germany. Two rulings of the German Federal Constitutional Court, the Bundesverfassungsgericht, have dealt with the issue and contain important statements, even though they are based on German constitutional law only. In a decision on the Maastricht treaty in 1993, the Court remarked, among other things, that in a community of states “democratic legitimacy cannot be established in the same way as within a state order which is self-contained and coherently regulated by a state constitution.”²⁰ In a decision on the Lisbon treaty in 2009, the Court again dealt with the question of democratic legitimacy in the EU and ruled:

As a representation of the peoples in a supranational community which as such is characterized by a limited will to unify, the composition [of the European Parliament] cannot and need not meet the requirements

¹⁸ A good overview is provided by Chopin and Jamet (2007).

¹⁹ The rules are due to be changed under the Treaty of Lisbon. Under Lisbon, there would be a total maximum of 751 members, the maximum per state would be 96 and the minimum would be raised to 6.

²⁰ Own translation, BVerfG, 2 BvR 2134, 2159/92, 12 October 1993; 89, 155 - Maastricht, p. 182, para. 93.

which arise from the right for an equal political vote of all citizens at the state level.²¹

and, furthermore:

The elementary democratic rule of equal opportunities in electoral franchise (“one man, one vote”) does only apply within a people and not in a supranational organ which ... remains a representation of peoples which are connected with each other by treaty.²²

A graduated apportionment of seats in a global parliamentary assembly thus, according to the Court, cannot be rejected as being plainly “undemocratic.” The Court, however, noted that the inequality in the European Parliament is only acceptable as long as the national parliament, the Bundestag, retains “own functions and powers of substantial political weight.”²³ The necessary level of democratic legitimacy at the EU level corresponds with the depth of supranational integration. From this perspective, a graduated apportionment of seats in a UNPA would not constitute the slightest problem at the beginning since its legal powers would initially be very limited compared to those of the European Parliament today. The issue would have to be analysed more closely once the UNPA would be vested with more extensive global legislative functions. CEUNPA (2007b) has stated that “direct elections of the UNPA’s delegates are regarded as a precondition for vesting the body with legislative rights.” In fact, the introduction of direct elections was a crucial measure to strengthen the democratic legitimacy of the European Parliament and thus an important step to give it more powers. As Joseph Schwartzberg (2009) pointed out,

The chief lesson is that we can best move forward incrementally. One could begin with a less-than ideal, but politically acceptable, Assembly consisting of appointed members and endowed with only advisory powers. At an intermediate stage, or stages, one could introduce popular elections and give the Parliamentary Assembly increasing authority to enact binding legislation in concert with the UN General Assembly.

Our second example is the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), a largely advisory body. The currently 318 members are elected or appointed from the membership of the 47 national parliaments of the Council of Europe (CoE) member states, according to Art. 25 of the CoE Statute. The number of seats allocated per country is fixed in Art. 26. The list

²¹ Own translation, BVerfG, 2 BvE 2/08, 30 June 2009 - Lisbon, para. 271.

²² Own translation, *ibid.*, para. 279.

²³ *Ibid.*, para. 246. Cf. also para. 263.

shows that there is a minimum allocation of two seats per country and the maximum number is set at 18. With two exceptions²⁴, the number of seats per country is allocated degressively proportional to the population size. Among CoE member states, the number of inhabitants are more unequally distributed than within the EU. As a result, the distribution of seats is also more unequal. The smallest country, San Marino, gets one representative per 15,000 people while the largest, Russia, has only one per 7.7 million. In a global parliamentary assembly including all UN member states, the range would be between Tuvalu with 12,000 inhabitants and China with 1.3 billion.

²⁴ Serbia has 7 seats although larger countries such as Sweden and Austria only have six. Turkey has 12 seats although it has a larger population size than Italy, United Kingdom and France, all of which have 18 seats.

3 Models for the Distribution Seats

Before looking into exemplary models for the composition of a UNPA, an upper limit of the total number of delegates should be considered, as the example of the European Parliament suggests. If the assembly has too many members, this would undermine its practicability and efficiency. The Committee for a Democratic U.N. recommends that largest possible total number should probably lie between 700 and 900 delegates.²⁵ All models discussed more closely in this paper therefore will consider bodies with a range of between 700 and 800 delegates.²⁶

In principle, an exploration of possible options for the apportionment of seats in a global parliamentary assembly can also draw upon proposals for weighted voting in international organizations. As Elizabeth McIntyre pointed out (1954: 484), “weighted voting is a system which assigns to members of international organizations votes proportioned on the basis of predetermined relevant criteria.” Many formulas that were suggested to calculate voting strengths of states in international bodies could just as well be used as a basis to calculate the distribution of seats in a global parliamentary body. Newcombe et. al. (1971a: 455) compared 20 weighted voting formulas that earlier proponents and scholars had suggested.²⁷ Besides the principle of equality (“one nation, one vote”), criteria proposed in various formulas include population size (democratic principle), share of UN budget (shareholder principle) and gross national product (economic principle). Further factors that have been suggested are, among others, energy consumption²⁸

²⁵ This is the Committee for a Democratic U.N.’s recommendation, see Bummel (2010: 27). Schwartzberg (2003: 83) suggested a number of 1,000.

²⁶ As a deliberative body, the UNPA, in order to increase its reach, could still include non-members such as other MPs, experts and civil society representatives in its work at Committee and Sub-Committee level. See Bummel (2010: 15) and Höffe (2002: 314).

²⁷ Abstracts are collected in Newcombe (1971a).

²⁸ Suggested by Robert Betchov in 1970, see Newcombe (1971a: 80).

and, more recently, military capability.²⁹ However, a basic precondition to actually use any criterion needs to be that the underlying figures are indisputable. It is doubtful whether such figures can be established for each country with regard to GDP, energy consumption and above all, military capability. These and similarly difficult criteria should therefore be ruled out from the beginning. Since a country's share of the UN budget is supposed to be closely related to its share of the world's combined GDP, the share of UN dues may be a suitable substitute for GDP.³⁰ The economic and shareholder principle thus could be combined.

Given that the purpose of a UNPA is to represent the political diversity of the world population as best as possible, population size is an indispensable criterion.³¹ It is obvious that in the process of drafting UNPA statutes, small states will tend to emphasize the importance of the principle of equality, giving all the same number of delegates,³² while more populous countries will stress the need to take population size into account appropriately. In practice neither of these two approaches is sufficiently balanced, as shall be briefly illustrated.

According to the principle of equality, each UN member state (there are 192 in total) would get, for example, four delegates in an approximately 800-member assembly. The roughly 12,000 inhabitants from Tuvalu would then have the same number of delegates as the 1.3 billion inhabitants of China.³³ Mathematically, if they would vote the same way, the delegates from the 100 least populous countries would be able to take majority decisions although they only represent 3.9 percent of the world population and 6.4 of the world's combined GDP. The delegates from the 128 least populous countries mathematically would be able to take two-thirds decisions although they represent merely 8.4 percent of the world population and 11.3 percent of the world's combined GDP. Larger countries would be put at a big disadvantage. The democratic legitimacy of such a body could not be sufficient to justify that it is vested with notable powers.

If delegates are distributed instead in direct proportion of a country's share of the world's total population, the threshold for a country to get at least one seat in an assembly of 800 would be at a size of at least 4 million inhabitants. Because of the extreme unequal distribution of the world popula-

²⁹ Derviş and Özer (2005: 58ff.).

³⁰ Cf. Schwartzberg (2004: 12).

³¹ See also Sohn (1970: 59).

³² This position was put forward, for example, by a former Rwandan foreign minister in a joint hearing of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of Rwanda in Kigali on 20 February 2009.

³³ All population figures used in this analysis are taken from CIA (2009a).

tion among the world's countries, this approach would provide that 153 countries, or 79.7 percent of UN member states, would each be apportioned three or fewer seats. 71 of these countries would not qualify for any representation at all. At the upper end of such a body, China would fill 159 seats, or 19.9 percent of the total assembly, and India would fill 138 seats, or 17.3 percent. For most governments, there would be little incentive to establish such a body in which only two countries provide 37.2 percent of the membership regardless of the autonomy of the individual delegates.

A poll on democracy conducted across 15 countries on behalf of the BBC in August 2007 included the question: "How likely would you be to support a Global Parliament, where votes are based on country population sizes and the global parliament is able to make binding policies?" In only three countries — Dubai, India, and South Africa — did a majority of those surveyed respond "very likely, it is a good idea." Even when the results for those who responded with "very likely" and "quite likely, but with reservations" are combined, support crosses the majority threshold in only eight countries (see table 1). The overall picture shows that popular support for this approach is insufficient. In six countries, among them the United States, those surveyed responded with strong refusal. Though the reasons for the refusal are not known for certain, it stands to reason that the vast discrepancy in countries' population and the resulting proportional representation is a major cause for concern.

In his reflections on the creation of a world parliament, L. Quidde (1922: 16) already pointed out that a "reasonable graduation between big and small" states will have to be found. On the one hand, the right of the population of all countries to be represented, derived from the principle of federalism and sovereignty, has to be considered. On the other hand, the principle of democracy prescribes that political legitimacy is derived from individuals whose vote should have an equal weight.³⁴ As the examples of the European Parliament and PACE emphasize, both aspects need to be balanced in any solution for the apportionment of seats in a UNPA. This can be achieved by degressive proportionality. "Governments of very populous countries may have to concede that only a sliding-scale formula could result in a fully global Assembly still of workable size," Erskine Childers and Brian Urquhart (1994: 179) noted.

In order to meet the requirement of equality, a minimum representation needs to be considered. In 1960, Edith Wynner stressed that each nation, however small, shall be allotted more than one delegate in a "world legislature" in order to allow differences of opinions within nations to be reflected

³⁴ Cf. Höffe (2002: 311).

Table 1. *International poll: “How likely would you be to support a Global Parliament, where votes are based on country population sizes and the global parliament is able to make binding policies?”*

Country	Answers					Positive attitude: (1) and (2) added	Negative attitude: (3) and (4) added	Positive minus negative attitude
	(1) Very likely, a good idea	(2) Quite likely, but with reservations	(3) Quite unlikely, but it might work	(4) Very unlikely, it is a bad idea	(5) Neither likely nor unlikely			
India	36.3	27.5	2.1	3.2	15.5	63.8	5.3	58.5
Dubai	29.5	28.5	7.6	10.8	12.4	58.0	18.4	39.6
Germany	23.2	25.7	20.1	9.4	15.0	48.9	29.5	19.4
Poland	15.7	30.6	14.3	13.1	18.5	46.3	27.4	18.9
South Korea	5.4	33.6	12.0	12.5	28.9	39.0	24.5	14.5
South Africa	28.5	18.2	10.9	25.3	9.9	46.7	36.2	10.5
Singapore	12.2	21.9	11.3	15.5	25.5	34.1	26.8	7.3
France	10.0	35.8	18.6	20.0	15.6	45.8	38.6	7.2
Russia	14.0	11.8	25.7	13.1	20.2	25.8	38.8	-13.0
Norway	5.3	20.9	15.6	25.5	19.6	26.2	41.1	-14.9
UK	9.4	21.4	16.8	29.1	23.4	30.8	45.9	-15.1
Italy	9.0	19.2	17.0	29.5	13.0	28.2	46.5	-18.3
Australia	5.8	21.4	16.7	34.8	15.0	27.2	51.5	-24.3
USA	6.2	17.7	17.1	34.1	24.9	23.9	51.2	-27.3
Denmark	5.2	9.6	15.2	37.7	16.5	14.8	52.9	-38.1

In percentage of respondents. Poll conducted on behalf of BBC. Source: Synovate (2007).

across national boundaries.³⁵ Admittedly, there were no microstates in the UN when Wynner wrote. But if we consider that nation states are the main

³⁵ Abstract in Newcombe (1971a: 70).

building block of the world order, the point remains valid. In any case, if a UNPA is to reflect the political plurality of the population of the UN member states in this sense, there should be a minimum of two delegates allocated to every country — one to be selected by the legislative majority and the other by the minority or opposition party in parliament.³⁶ Only in this way can it be guaranteed that the majority and minority from each national parliament are represented.

(A): Proportional Distribution

The first model (A) that shall be illustrated is based on a directly proportional distribution of seats with a minimum representation of two seats per country as just discussed. It is assumed that all UN member states participate and the total number of delegates is fixed at 800. This means that 384 seats would be distributed according to the principle of equality, two for each country. The remaining 416 seats are distributed among all countries according to their share in the world population, with figures rounded up or down to the nearest integer. Due to rounding, the resulting total number of seats in this model is 794. Among these seats, 21 graduations for the distribution of the seats emerge.

While there are still 146 countries, or 76 percent, that would have three or two seats, the larger countries would have many fewer seats compared with the directly proportional approach with no minimum representation as discussed above. China, for example, which is the world's most populous state and accounts for 19.9 percent of the world's population, would be allocated 85 seats or 10.7 percent of the total number. This is one seat per 15.74 million Chinese citizens. India would have one seat per 15.75 million citizens, the United States one per 14.62 million. In this model, China and India would be allocated the largest number of seats.

The five countries with the largest shares of seats would be China, India, USA, Indonesia and Brazil. Together they would hold 26.39 percent of all seats.

Key figures for this and the following models are shown in table 2, with more detailed descriptions of the allocation of seats for each country included in the annex.

³⁶ Also stressed in Sohn (1970: 59).

Table 2. Shares of selected units in world population, world GDP and in the seats of a UNPA in models (A) to (D)

Unit	% of world population	% of world GDP	Models							
			(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
			Seats	%	Seats	%	Seats	%	Seats	%
World	100	100	794	100	809	100	800	100	675	100
States with 2 seats			101	52.6	89	46.4	104	54.2	42	21.9
States with 3 seats			45	23.4	34	17.7	45	23.4	121	63.0
10 most populous states	59.3	47.9	268	33.8	179	22.1	235	29.4	125	18.5
100 least populous states	3.9	6.4	202	25.4	214	26.5	216	27.0	262	38.8
United States	4.6	24.8	21	2.6	18	2.2	57	7.1	29	4.3
China	19.9	6.4	85	10.7	37	4.6	48	6.0	24	3.6
India	17.3	2.1	74	9.3	34	4.2	39	4.9	20	3.0
G-8	13.0	57.7	71	8.9	80	9.9	186	23.3	98	14.5
G-20 (19) ^a	62.2	77.6	299	37.7	231	28.6	361	53.5	181	26.8
European Union (27)	7.3	31.2	85	10.7	100	12.4	149	18.6	109	16.1
ASEAN (10)	8.8	2.4	56	7.1	66	8.2	42	5.3	34	5.0
African Union (49) ^b	13.8	2.3	154	19.4	186	23.0	129	16.1	146	21.6
AOSIS (37) ^c	0.8	0.6	77	9.7	77	9.5	76	9.5	83	12.3

a. Without EU (but including G-20 members France, Germany, Italy and United Kingdom that are also EU member states).

b. Without Mauritania, Guinea, Madagascar because membership suspended, Western Sahara not UN member.

c. Alliance of Small Island States.

Own calculation. Figures for population numbers CIA (2009a), for GDP average from CIA (2009b), IMF (2008) and World Bank (2008).

(B): The Square Root Formula

The next model (B) is based on a method devised by Lionel Penrose. Penrose (1946) suggested that “the voting power of each nation in a world assembly should be proportional to the square root of the number of people in millions on each nation’s voting list.”³⁷ The underlying mathematical formula can just as well be used to calculate the number of seats per country in a UNPA.

For the model we are looking at here it is again assumed that all UN member states participate. The mathematical formula to calculate the number of seats per country is the square root of a country’s population size divided by one million. The resulting number of seats would always be rounded up or down to the nearest integer number.

If the formula is applied without further provisions, the assembly would have a total of 732 seats. 21 countries, all with a population of less than 200,000 people, would have no representation at all and 35 countries, all those with a population of less than 2.25 million and more than 200,000, would have only one seat. In order to achieve the minimum representation of two seats, these countries would be allocated the missing number of one or two seats. In this way, a total of 77 additional seats would be established without altering the actual formula. The final number of seats in this model thus would be 809 and it results in 17 graduations. Table 2 again shows some key figures. More details are listed in the annex.

The suggestion to employ a square root formula is derived from statistical rules that Penrose identified, according to which it is possible to measure the probability that an individual vote or a bloc of votes changes the outcome of a decision that is made by majority rule.³⁸ A basic observation is, according to John F. Banzhaf (1966), that “the number of votes each participant may cast is not always an accurate indication of voting strength.”³⁹

Eventually Penrose and Banzhaf concluded that a voter’s ability to affect the outcome of an election decreases as the inverse of the square root of the population of a given district. Thus, if the number of representatives is proportional to the population, more populous districts “are given more representatives than are necessary to compensate for the decrease in the individual citizen-voter’s voting effectiveness.”⁴⁰ Penrose claimed that from a statistical perspective equality of all voters in a world assembly therefore could only be established by applying the square root formula. Proponents of a “second assembly” readily embraced this result in the 1980s. It was promoted by the

³⁷ Penrose (1946: 57).

³⁸ Recently discussed by Gelman et al. (2002) and Grofman and Feld (2005).

³⁹ Banzhaf (1966: 1314f.).

⁴⁰ Banzhaf (1966: 1323f.).

International Network for a UN Second Assembly (INFUSA, 1987) which at the same time conceded, however, that other possible methods of allocation of seats should be considered as well. In any case, Jeffrey Segall (1990: 277), one of INFUSA's coordinators, held the opinion that

the problem of democratically representing as individuals the peoples of sovereign member-states was solved in statistical terms by adopting the Penrose method. Statistically, this method would give everyone an equal influence on the decision-making of a UN Second Assembly.

Recent studies suggest that the statistical rules established by Penrose and Banzhaf cannot be confirmed empirically. According to Andrew Gelman et. al. (2004), the square-root rule “overestimates the probability of close elections in larger jurisdictions.” In electoral systems and voting patterns in the United States and Europe analyzed by Gelman et. al., it could not be verified that there are more swing votes in larger jurisdictions than in smaller ones. It was concluded that:

In designing a constitution and setting up a voting system, it would be inappropriate to assign weights based on the assumption that vote margins are inversely proportional to the square root of the number of voters, when empirically no such pattern appears.⁴¹

Thus, since its empirical relevance is disputed, the square root model can no longer be regarded as the scientifically perfect solution through which it is possible to achieve degressive proportionality and to uphold the democratic equality of all citizens at the same time. This, however, does not diminish the method's value. As we have seen before, degressive proportionality is justified anyway, even though it leads to a degree of unequal representation. The scientific debate can be left aside for our purposes. As Carol Barrett and Hanna Newcombe (1968: 8f.) have pointed out, the practical reason for using the square root model is to diminish the “overwhelming importance” which the larger nations might otherwise have, if straight proportionality was used.

In model (B) 123 or 64.1 percent of all countries would have three or two seats. Compared with the other models, the member states of the African Union and of ASEAN are allocated the highest percentage of seats here, 23 or 8.2 percent respectively. The five countries with the largest shares of seats are the same here as in model (A): China, India, USA, Indonesia and Brazil. However, their combined share of the total seats would be significantly lower, 14.7 percent.

⁴¹ Gelman et. al. (2004: 672f.).

(C): Population, UN Dues and Sovereignty I

The third model is based on a method developed and promoted by Joseph Schwartzberg (2004). The method is supposed to be used to calculate possible voting powers in a reformed UN General Assembly.⁴² The resulting percentages per country, however, could also be translated into the number of seats in a UNPA.

According to the original proposal by Schwartzberg, the percentage of votes for each country would be the outcome of three equal factors that embody demographic, economic, and legal aspects: A country's population size, its contribution to the UN budget, and its unit share in the UN membership (which is currently one out of 192).

Mathematically, the share of seats of a given country in the total number of seats in a UNPA thus would be the average of first, P (its percentage share of the total population of all UN member states); second, C (its percentage share of the total UN budget); and third, M (its share of the total UN membership: 1/192 or 0.521 percent). Once a percentage for each country is calculated this way, it is possible to calculate the number of seats per country from a fixed total number of seats, T. A minimum representation of two seats per country can be achieved, for example, by including factor M two times. The formula for the altered model thus would be the following:

$$\textit{Share of seats} = T x ((P + C + 2 x M)/4) / 100$$

The single results finally would have to be rounded up or down to the nearest integer. If T is set at 800, the total number we are aiming at, rounding effects will lead to a total number of 784 seats. In order to adjust the rounding effects and to obtain the actual total number of 800, T would have to be inserted in the mathematical formula with the value 820.

In this model, the resulting 800 seats would occur in 17 graduations. 149 countries, or 77.6 percent, would have three or two seats. In this model, the United States and the members of the G-8, G-20 and the European Union would be allocated the highest combined number of seats compared with the other formulas. The members of the G-20 who account for 77.6 percent of the world's combined GDP and 62.2 percent of world population (counting only France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom from the European Union), would be allocated 53.5 percent of seats. The number of seats allocated to the G-8 countries would be 23.3 percent.

⁴² For a "world parliamentary assembly", Schwartzberg (2003) suggests a different proposal, namely, a variation of proportional representation according to population size.

The five countries with the largest share of seats would be the USA, China, Japan, India and Germany. Together their delegates would hold 25.76 percent of all seats.

If one of the goals of a UNPA is to reflect the actual distribution of geopolitical power in the world, it would be useful to consider a country's economic weight. This can be done by taking into account the shares in the UN budget and this model gives an example of how this could be done. This way it could be guaranteed that those who finance the organisation and its operations feel duly represented (shareholder principle).

Taking into account the real power structure of the world, measured economically, is probably a necessary prerequisite to any significant expansion in the powers and authority of a future UNPA and of the UN itself. Newcombe (1971b: 93) rightfully noted that equal representation for each individual in the world is "a final state to aim at, in a future world in which differences in wealth and poverty will be more or less smoothed out all over the world."⁴³ However, we are not yet at that point.

(D): Population, UN Dues and Sovereignty II

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace (CSOP) (1970: 59) suggested a model that includes a minimum representation, a ceiling of seats per country and the criterions of population size and share of the UN budget. Forty years ago, at the time when CSOP published its suggestion, the UN had 127 member states. Today, its membership has grown by 65 additional members, 24 of which are small and micro-states with less than 500,000 inhabitants. This has, of course, an impact on the resulting apportionment of seats. The model is presented here anyway in order to illustrate further the variety of possible solutions.

First of all, CSOP suggested a minimum representation of each national parliament of three members. In addition, according to this model, the parliament of any nation having a population of more than one per cent of the total world population would be entitled to select one extra member for each full one percent of that nation's share in the population of the world. Furthermore the parliament of any nation that contributes more than one per cent of the total contributions to the UN budget would be allowed to select one extra member for each full one percent of that nation's contribution. Finally,

⁴³ Nolan and Lenski (2006: 352) as well stress the need to narrow the economic gap between societies in order to facilitate a gradual strengthening of the UN.

CSOP's model includes a ceiling of 25 members "to prevent a too large discrepancy between the number of delegates from large and small nations and to provide equality between the superpowers." Under today's circumstances, however, the ceiling would only apply to the United States, which would get 29 seats according to the formula. In order to adapt the model, it is suggested to abandon the ceiling and to allocate two instead of three seats to all states with a population of less than one million inhabitants.

The total number of seats in the altered model is 675. The calculation results in 11 graduations. In this model, China and India as well as the members of ASEAN would have the lowest number of seats compared with the number allocated to them under the other formulas. The 37 member states of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) that together account for 0.8 percent of the world's population, would be allocated the highest percentage of seats in this model, 12.3 percent. The five countries with the largest share would be as in the previous model USA, China, Japan, India and Germany. Together they would hold 14.64 percent.

4

The Democratic Character of the Assembly

Now that we have four theoretical models for the apportionment of seats in a UNPA at hand, it is possible to assess the democratic character of the assembly in the various designs more closely. As was previously noted, there is a widespread fear that a UNPA would, to a large extent, be composed of “pseudo-parliamentarians” that are selected by and take instructions from democratically illegitimate governments. In order to assess the impact of such delegates on the UNPA it is necessary to quantify the problem. How many delegates in the UNPA exactly might be controlled by authoritarian governments? In particular, would they be able to form a majority in the assembly?

In an attempt to answer these questions, it is possible to use country ratings available from widely accepted global surveys of freedom and democracy. For this, there are three major sources: The annual ratings of Freedom House (2010), the Economist Index of Democracy (EIU, 2008), and the “polity scores” of the Polity IV Project (Marshall et al., 2009). Of course any evaluation based on these data can only give a rough answer since these surveys reduce complex societies to one classification or index number. As Rodrigo de Almeida (2009) stated recently, the attempt to come up with a consistent country-by-country cross-assessment is in itself difficult. In addition, the Economist rightfully points out that there is no consensus on how to measure democracy and that definitions are contested (EIU, 2008: 14).

The most complete data are provided by Freedom House. In its latest assessment, *Freedom in the World 2010*, Freedom House (2010) classifies 115 of the 192 UN member states, or 59.9 percent of them, as electoral democracies. The qualifying criteria include in particular that a competitive multiparty political system must be in place:

- (1) A competitive, multiparty political system;

- (2) Universal adult suffrage for all citizens (with exceptions for restrictions that states may legitimately place on citizens as sanctions for criminal offenses);
- (3) Regularly contested elections conducted in conditions of ballot secrecy, reasonable ballot security, and in the absence of massive voter fraud, and that yield results that are representative of the public will;
- (4) Significant public access of major political parties to the electorate through the media and through generally open political campaigning.

Furthermore, a categorization as “electoral democracy” requires that the last presidential elections and/or the last elections for the national legislature have been “free and fair”.

Table 3 shows how the seats would be distributed in the four models according to the categorization of their country of origin by Freedom House. In each of the four models for the apportionment of seats in a UNPA discussed above, a majority of the delegates would come from electoral democracies. In model C, it even is two thirds, 66 percent.

In addition, Freedom House rates 88 of the 192 UN member states (45.8 percent) as “free”, 57 (29.7 percent) as “partly free” and 47 (24.5 percent) as “not free”. The 47 countries rated as “not free” are those in which political liberties are least developed. In these cases it can be expected that the government tries to take significant influence on the selection and conduct of delegates. The percentage is highest in model A with 29.8 percent of all seats allocated to such countries and lowest in model C.

From the three sources mentioned above, only Freedom House includes all UN member states in its assessment. The insights based on the Freedom House data are therefore the most conclusive.

The Economist Index of Democracy excludes 27 micro-states and Somalia, the Polity IV Project excludes 31 micro-states. In consequence, it is not possible to categorize around 57 or respectively 62 seats.⁴⁴ This would mean that, depending on the index and the model under observation, between 7.0 and 9.2 percent of all seats would be uncategorized. However, it is possible to simply omit these seats and to make an approximate assessment based on the incomplete data available. According to the Economist Index of Democracy, following approximated numbers of seats then would be allocated to

⁴⁴ In all models the micro states concerned have the minimum number of two seats. Somalia has three seats in models A, B and D, and two in model C.

Table 3. *The distribution of seats in models (A) to (D) according to Freedom House categories*

Category	People		GDP		Models							
	in million	%	in billion	%	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
					Seats	%	Seats	%	Seats	%	Seats	%
All	6742	100	56464	100	794	100	809	100	800	100	675	100
Electoral Democracy	3498	51.9	47320	83.8	443	55.8	449	55.5	528	66.0	420	62.2
Not elect. democracy	3243	48.1	9110	16.1	351	44.2	360	44.5	272	34.0	255	37.8
Free	3053	45.3	46088	81.6	362	45.6	356	44.0	459	57.4	339	50.2
Partly Free	1363	20.2	2985	5.3	195	24.6	231	28.6	162	20.3	172	25.5
Free & partly free	4417	65.5	49073	86.9	557	70.2	587	72.6	621	77.6	511	75.7
Not free	2325	34.5	7390	13.1	237	29.8	222	27.4	179	22.4	164	24.3

Own calculation. Figures for categorization from Freedom House (2010), for population numbers CIA (2009a), for GDP average from CIA (2009b), IMF (2008) and World Bank (2008).

democratic countries:⁴⁵ 48.2 percent in model A, 47.5 percent in model B, 59.8 percent in model C and 48.6 percent in model D. An analysis of the Polity IV scores leads to following approximated numbers of seats allocated to democracies:⁴⁶ 54.0 percent in model A, 55.0 percent in model B, 65.3 percent in model C and 61.2 percent in model D. Under the Freedom House assessment, all except four of the micro-states not included in the Economist Index of Democracy and Polity IV respectively qualify as “free” and are thus considered “electoral democracies.” This indicates that the mentioned approximated values in actual fact would be higher. In particular all would be above 50 percent.

⁴⁵ The Economist Index of Democracy places countries into four types of regimes: Democracies (scores 8 to 10), flawed democracies (scores 6 to 7.9), hybrid regimes (scores 4 to 5.9) and authoritarian regimes (scores below 4).

⁴⁶ The Polity IV Project includes three regime categories: Autocracies (scores -10 to -6), anocracies (scores -5 to +5) and democracies (scores +6 to +10).

It is possible to conclude that a majority of seats in a UNPA could be held by delegates from democracies. The view that most delegates in a UNPA would be controlled by authoritarian governments cannot be confirmed from the available data.

In this analysis, we attempted to quantify the number of delegates who come from democratic countries according to global indices. To get a more precise picture, however, a specifically adjusted country-by-country assessment would be necessary. For instance, there are countries classified as non-electoral democracy by Freedom House that nevertheless have multi-party systems with opposition forces in parliament. Zimbabwe, for example, rightfully ranks among the least democratic states of the world. Still, Zimbabwe has a strong opposition party that is represented in parliament, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). Even though MDC is part of the country's "Government of National Unity" since February 2009, it would be inaccurate to attribute MDC delegates in a UNPA to the category "controlled by an authoritarian regime". But this is exactly the case when using the above global indices. This means that the number of government-independent delegates would actually be higher than the above figures suggest.

5 Further Aspects

Political Groups as Electoral Colleges

One of the major features of a UNPA that was discussed above is that the delegates of the UNPA could be elected from among the party groupings, if such exist, in national legislatures. The determination of the number of seats that may be occupied by delegates from a given country is thus only the first of two steps in the arithmetic procedure:

- (1) The first step is to determine the number of seats per country.
- (2) In a second step, the resulting number of seats per country eventually needs to be broken down to the political groups in the respective parliament according to their share in the total number of seats in the national assembly.

In the United States, for example, the Democratic Party holds 59 percent of the seats. This means that whatever total number of seats the United States as country would be allocated, 59 percent of the delegates could be elected by the House Democratic caucus. In model A the United States would be allocated a total number of 21 seats. This would translate into 12 seats for the House Democratic caucus and 9 seats for the Republican caucus.

In Brazil, to mention another example, the 14 total seats in model A would be allocated to ten different groups in the Chamber of Deputies. In smaller countries with lower total numbers of seats the provision is relevant that at least one seat would have to be allocated to the majority and one to the minority in parliament.

The annex contains a table that illustrates how many delegates the political groups in the parliaments of Bangladesh, Brazil, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Phillipines, Russia, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States would be able to elect under the four models for the apportionment of seats discussed above.

Representation of Regional Assemblies

This analysis has so far assumed that the delegates of a UNPA initially would be selected at the national level by the political groups in national parliaments, in so far such exist. In addition, however, it is conceivable that regional parliaments and parliamentary assemblies as well could dispatch delegates. CEUNPA (2007b), for example, stated that “the Campaign also advocates the participation of regional parliamentary assemblies in a UNPA, such as the European Parliament and the Pan-African Parliament.” In October 2009, this approach was also promoted in a resolution adopted by PACE (2009). In para. 7, the resolution suggests:

As to institutional reform, the Assembly reiterates its conviction that the role and the authority of the United Nations General Assembly ... should be restored. This role could be further strengthened by the introduction, or the reinforcement, of a parliamentary element in the structure of the UN General Assembly, composed either by representatives of international regional parliamentary assemblies or directly elected representatives.

Since not all countries are taking part in such assemblies at this time and since the stage of development of such assemblies is very different in the various world regions, a hybrid structure suggests itself, combining some delegates selected at the national level as outlined above, and others dispatched by international regional assemblies. The UNPA Statutes could include a provision that allows groups of countries to cede a certain number of seats allocated to them in the first arithmetical step to international regional parliamentary assemblies or parliaments. In principle, this procedure would allow political groups in national parliaments and regional assemblies at the same time to be represented and to participate in a UNPA.

Merely to illustrate the approach, let us construct a concrete example based on the apportionment in model (A). The combined number of seats allocated to the 27 EU member states comes to 85. In this example, they agree to cede 16 of these seats to the European Parliament. This number of seats for the EP consequently would have to be deducted proportionally from the number of seats attributed to the single EU member states. This is shown in table 4. In a next step, these 16 seats then would have to be distributed among the political groups in the EP. In this example, at first one seat is automatically allocated to each of the eight groups. The remaining eight seats are then allocated proportionally to the share of the group’s membership in the total number of MEPs. This is illustrated in table 5.

Table 4. *Proportional deduction of seats from EU member states in the example for the allocation of seats to the European Parliament under model (A)*

EU member state	Model (A)	Model (A) with allocation of 16 seats to EP		Seats in EP ^a
	No. of seats per national parliament	No. of seats per national parliament	No. of seats allocated to EP	
All	85	69	16	736
Germany	7	5	2	99
France	6	5	1	72
United Kingdom	6	5	1	72
Italy	6	5	1	72
Spain	5	4	1	50
Poland	4	3	1	50
Romania	3	2	1	33
Netherlands	3	2	1	25
Greece	3	2	1	22
Portugal	3	2	1	22
Belgium	3	2	1	22
Czech Republic	3	2	1	22
Hungary	3	2	1	22
Sweden	3	2	1	18
Austria	3	2	1	17
Bulgaria	2	2	0	17
Denmark	2	2	0	13
Slovakia	2	2	0	13
Finland	2	2	0	13
Ireland	2	2	0	12
Lithuania	2	2	0	12
Latvia	2	2	0	8
Slovenia	2	2	0	7
Estonia	2	2	0	6
Cyprus	2	2	0	6
Luxembourg	2	2	0	6
Malta	2	2	0	5

a. 7th parliamentary term, 2009-2014.

Depending on the number of seats that is to be allocated, rounding effects would have to be adjusted and more questions might come up like how to deal with the effect that national parliaments are allocated less than two seats

Table 5. Allocation of seats to groups in the European Parliament in the example under model (A)

Group in European Parliament	No. of MEPs	Percentage of total no. of MEPs	Allocation of UNPA seats
European People's Party (Christian Democrats)	264	36	4
Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats	184	25	3
Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe	84	11	2
Greens/European Free Alliance	55	7	2
European Conservatives and Reformists Group	54	7	2
Confederal Group of the European United Left	35	5	1
Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group	31	4	1
Non attached members	28	4	1
Total	735	100	16

because they are allocated to a regional parliament. A solution could be that it is then provided that the according regional parliament itself has to select at least an according number of delegates (one or two) from that country. Otherwise the principle would be violated that at least two delegates from each country are to be represented in a global parliamentary assembly.

More detailed reflections on this approach will be required. In any case, in principle it shows how regional parliaments and parliamentary assemblies could be represented in a UNPA without affecting the balanced overall arithmetic of the apportionment of seats in the UNPA.

Weighted Voting

One complementary approach that could be considered would be to apply weighted voting mechanisms in such a way that individual delegates have differing voting strengths in the UNPA.

These methods are sometimes utilized in inter-governmental organizations. For example, the International Monetary Fund apportions voting strength per country according to weighted quotas that are intended to correspond to the size of country GDP. Representatives from wealthy countries with large economies carry more voting power than do delegates from smaller countries.

A UNPA that allocated voting strength to delegates in different proportions, according to agreed criteria, is at least theoretically possible. However,

there are few examples of parliaments that function along these lines. Most of the well-known parliamentary assemblies assume an equal voting strength of each delegate, basically, one delegate, one vote. Any system which departs from that principle will inevitably be more complex. As Monbiot (2004: 86) noted, “complexity undermines legitimacy.” The more complicated the assembly becomes, the less ordinary citizen will understand it and the less it will be accepted.

One advantage of using weighted voting strengths is that it would introduce greater flexibility in the overall calculation of UNPA composition. In particular, it could be used to reduce the voting strengths of delegates from micro-states and at the same time allow these countries to have a minimum representation of two seats. Employing weighted voting might also make more practicable the simultaneous participation in a UNPA of regional as well as national parliamentarians.

6 Final Remarks

There are many more models and almost unlimited variations conceivable for the apportionment of seats in a UNPA than those discussed in this paper. The principles and the four models presented in this analysis serve the purpose of fueling the debate. And they underpin three important insights:

First, it is possible to find solutions for the apportionment of seats, if the political will exists. It is not justified to describe the task as “hardly surmountable”.⁴⁷ Secondly, single countries, however large, would not necessarily be able to dominate the assembly, not least because the seats would not be occupied by states but rather by individual delegates who would group themselves in multiple forms. Thirdly, there are many models that could guarantee that the assembly would be composed of delegates a majority of whom would be from democratic countries.

Finally it shall be brought to mind that the world is subject to continuous economic and demographical change. Whatever model will eventually prevail for the apportionment of seats in a UNPA, it needs to be taken into account that the calculations will have to be adapted to these changes in regular intervals.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ This was the opinion of a Study Commission of the German parliament on globalization seven years ago, see Deutscher Bundestag (2002: 430).

⁴⁸ For population projections see UN (2009).

— Annex —

The population numbers in the annex are taken from CIA (2009a). GDP figures are an average from CIA (2009b), IMF (2008) and World Bank (2008).

Table 1. Largest shares of seats per country in model (A)

Country	Position	% of world population	% of world GDP	Seats	% of seats	Million per seat
China	1	19.86	6.4	85	10.63	15.74
India	2	17.30	2.1	74	9.25	15.75
USA	3	4.56	24.8	21	2.63	14.62
Indonesia	4	3.56	0.8	17	2.13	14.13
Brazil	5	2.95	2.5	14	1.75	14.19
Pakistan	6	2.61	0.2	13	1.63	13.55
Bangladesh	7	2.31	0.1	12	1.50	13.00
Nigeria	8	2.21	0.3	11	1.38	13.56
Russian Federation	8	2.08	2.5	11	1.38	12.73
Japan	9	1.89	8.0	10	1.25	12.70
Mexico	10	1.65	1.8	9	1.13	12.35
Philippines	11	1.45	0.3	8	1.00	12.24
Viet Nam	12	1.29	0.1	7	0.88	12.42
Ethiopia	12	1.26	0.0	7	0.88	12.17
Egypt	12	1.23	0.2	7	0.88	11.86
Germany	12	1.22	6.1	7	0.88	11.76
Turkey	12	1.14	1.2	7	0.88	10.97
Congo (Kinshasa)	13	1.02	0.0	6	0.75	11.44
Iran	13	0.99	0.5	6	0.75	11.07
Thailand	13	0.98	0.4	6	0.75	10.98
France	13	0.95	4.8	6	0.75	10.67
United Kingdom	13	0.91	4.9	6	0.75	10.18
Italy	13	0.86	3.9	6	0.75	9.68

23 countries. All other countries have five or less seats.

Table 2. Largest shares of seats per country in model (B)

Country	Position	% of world population	% of world GDP	Seats	% of seats	Million per seat
China	1	19.86	6.4	37	4.57	36.17
India	2	17.30	2.1	34	4.20	34.29
USA	3	4.56	24.8	18	2.22	17.06
Indonesia	4	3.56	0.8	16	1.98	15.01
Brazil	5	2.95	2.5	14	1.73	14.19
Pakistan	6	2.61	0.2	13	1.61	13.55
Bangladesh	7	2.31	0.1	12	1.48	13.00
Nigeria	7	2.21	0.3	12	1.48	12.43
Russian Federation	7	2.08	2.5	12	1.48	11.67
Japan	8	1.89	8.0	11	1.36	11.55
Mexico	8	1.65	1.8	11	1.36	10.11
Philippines	9	1.45	0.3	10	1.24	9.79
Viet Nam	10	1.29	0.1	9	1.11	9.66
Ethiopia	10	1.26	0.0	9	1.11	9.47
Egypt	10	1.23	0.2	9	1.11	9.23
Germany	10	1.22	6.1	9	1.11	9.14
Turkey	10	1.14	1.2	9	1.11	8.53
Congo (Kinshasa)	11	1.02	0.0	8	0.99	8.58
Iran	11	0.99	0.5	8	0.99	8.30
Thailand	11	0.98	0.4	8	0.99	8.23
France	11	0.95	4.8	8	0.99	8.00
United Kingdom	11	0.91	4.9	8	0.99	7.63
Italy	11	0.86	3.9	8	0.99	7.26

23 countries. All other countries have seven or less seats.

Table 3. Largest shares of seats per country in model (C)

Country	Position	% of world population	% of world GDP	Seats	% of seats	Million per seat
USA	1	4.56	24.8	57	7.13	5.38
China	2	19.86	6.4	48	6.00	27.88
Japan	3	1.89	8.0	40	5.00	3.17
India	4	17.3	2.1	39	4.88	29.89
Germany	5	1.22	6.1	22	2.75	3.74
United Kingdom	6	0.91	4.9	18	2.25	3.39
France	7	0.95	4.8	17	2.13	3.76
Italy	8	0.86	3.9	14	1.75	4.15

Country	Position	% of world population	% of world GDP	Seats	% of seats	Million per seat
Indonesia	9	3.56	0.8	10	1.25	24.02
Brazil	9	2.95	2.5	10	1.25	19.87
Mexico	9	1.65	1.8	10	1.25	11.12
Russian Federation	10	2.08	2.5	9	1.13	15.56
Spain	10	0.60	2.6	9	1.13	4.50
Canada	10	0.50	2.5	9	1.13	3.72
Pakistan	11	2.61	0.2	8	1.00	22.03
Korea (South)	11	0.72	1.6	8	1.00	6.06
Bangladesh	12	2.31	0.1	7	0.88	22.29
Nigeria	12	2.21	0.3	7	0.88	21.31
Australia	13	0.32	1.6	6	0.75	3.54
Netherlands	13	0.25	1.4	6	0.75	2.78

20 countries. All other countries have five or less seats.

Table 4. Largest shares of seats per country in model (D)

Country	Position	% of world population	% of world GDP	Seats	% of seats	Million per seat
USA	1	4.56	24.8	29	4.04	10.59
China	2	19.86	6.4	24	3.35	55.77
Japan	3	1.89	8.0	20	2.79	6.35
India	3	17.3	2.1	20	2.79	58.3
Germany	4	1.22	6.1	12	1.67	6.86
United Kingdom	5	0.91	4.9	9	1.26	6.79
France	5	0.95	4.8	9	1.26	7.11
Italy	6	0.86	3.9	8	1.12	7.26
Indonesia	7	3.56	0.8	6	0.84	40.04
Mexico	7	1.65	1.8	6	0.84	18.53
Russian Federation	7	2.08	2.5	6	0.84	23.34
Brazil	8	2.95	2.5	5	0.7	39.74
Spain	8	0.60	2.6	5	0.7	8.1
Canada	8	0.50	2.5	5	0.7	6.69
Pakistan	8	2.61	0.2	5	0.7	35.24
Korea (South)	8	0.72	1.6	5	0.7	9.7
Bangladesh	8	2.31	0.1	5	0.7	31.21
Nigeria	8	2.21	0.3	5	0.7	29.84

18 countries. All other countries have four or less seats.

Table 5. Examples for the number of seats allocated per political group in selected parliaments in models (A) to (D)

Country, election year, parties	National parliament		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Seats	%	Seats			
Total			794	809	800	675
Bangladesh, 2008	299	100	12	12	7	5
Bangladesh Awami League	230	76.9	10	10	5	4
Bangladesh Nationalist Party	29	9.7	1	1	1	1
Jatiya Party	27	9.0	1	1	1	0
Jatiyo Samajtantrik Dal	3	1.0	0	0	0	0
Others	10	3.3	0	0	0	0
Brazil, 2006	513	100	14	14	10	5
Partido do Movimento Democrático	89	17.3	2	2	2	1
Partido dos Trabalhadores	83	16.2	2	2	2	1
Partido da Social-Democracia Brasilei-	65	12.7	2	2	2	1
Partido da Frente Liberal	65	12.7	2	2	2	1
Partido Progressista	42	8.2	1	1	1	1
Partido Socialista Brasileiro	27	5.3	1	1	1	0
Partido Democrático Trabalhista	24	4.7	1	1	0	0
Partido Liberal	23	4.5	1	1	0	0
Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro	22	4.3	1	1	0	0
Partido Popular Socialista	21	4.1	1	1	0	0
Partido Verde	13	2.5	0	0	0	0
Others	39	7.6	0	0	0	0
France, 2007	577	100	6	8	17	9
Union pour un mouvement populaire	320	55.5	4	5	9	5
Socialiste, radical et citoyen	204	35.4	2	3	6	3
Gauche démocratique et Républicaine	24	4.2	0	0	1	1
Nouveau centre	23	4.0	0	0	1	0
Non-inscrit	6	1.0	0	0	0	0
Germany, 2009	622	100	7	9	22	12
CDU/CSU	239	38.4	3	4	9	4
SPD	146	23.5	2	2	5	3
FDP	93	15.0	1	1	3	2

Country, election year, parties	National parliament		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Seats	%	Seats			
Linke	76	12.2	1	1	3	2
Grüne	68	10.9	0	1	2	1
India, 2009	543	100	74	34	39	20
UPA (INC+)	262	48.3	37	17	19	10
NDA (BJP+)	157	28.9	22	10	12	6
Third Front	80	14.7	11	5	6	3
Fourth Front	27	5.0	4	2	2	1
Others	17	3.1	2	0	0	0
Indonesia, 2009	560	100	17	16	10	6
Partai Demokrat, PD	150	26.8	4	4	3	2
Partai Golongan Karya, Golkar	107	19.1	3	3	2	1
Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan	95	17.0	3	3	2	1
Partai Keadilan Sejahtera, PKS	57	10.2	2	2	1	1
Partai Amanat Nasional, PAN	43	7.7	1	1	1	1
Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, PPP	37	6.6	1	1	1	0
Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa, PKB	27	4.8	1	1	0	0
Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya, Gerindra	26	4.6	1	1	0	0
Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat, Hanura	18	3.2	1	0	0	0
Italy, 2008	630	100	6	8	14	8
The People of Freedom	275	43.7	3	4	6	4
Democratic Party	217	34.4	2	3	5	3
Lega Nord	60	9.5	1	1	1	1
Union of the Centre	35	5.6	0	0	1	0
Italy of Values	29	4.6	0	0	1	0
Others	14	2.2	0	0	0	0
Japan, 2009	480	100	10	11	40	20
Democratic Party	308	64.2	7	7	26	13
Liberal Democratic Party	119	24.8	2	3	10	5
Komeito Party	21	4.4	1	1	2	1
Communist Party	9	1.9	0	0	1	1
Social Democratic Party	7	1.5	0	0	1	0
Others	16	3.3	0	0	0	0
Mexico, 2009	500	100	9	11	10	6
Partido Revolucionario Institucional	237	47.4	4	5	5	3
Partido Acción Nacional	143	28.6	3	3	3	2
Partido de la Revolución Democrática	71	14.2	1	2	1	1
Partido Verde Ecologista de México	21	4.2	1	1	1	0
Partido del Trabajo	13	2.6	0	0	0	0
Nueva Alianza	9	1.8	0	0	0	0

Country, election year, parties	National parliament		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Seats	%	Seats			
Convergencia	6	1.2	0	0	0	0
Nigeria, 2007	358	100	11	12	7	5
People's Democratic Party	260	72.6	8	9	5	4
All Nigeria Peoples Party	62	17.3	2	2	1	1
Action Congress	32	8.9	1	1	1	0
Others	4	1.1	0	0	0	0
Pakistan, 2008	351	100	13	13	8	5
Pakistan Peoples Party	130	37.0	5	5	3	2
Pakistan Muslim League (N)	95	27.1	4	4	2	1
Pakistan Muslim League (Q)	55	15.7	2	2	1	1
Muttahida Qaumi Movement	26	7.4	1	1	1	1
Awami National Party	13	3.7	1	1	1	0
Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal Pakistan	6	1.7	0	0	0	0
Others	26	7.4	0	0	0	0
Phillipines, 2007	241	100	8	10	5	4
Lakas-Christian Muslim Democrats	92	38.2	3	4	2	2
Kabalikat ng Malayang Pilipino	49	20.3	2	2	1	1
Nationalist People's Coalition	28	11.6	1	1	1	1
Liberal Party	16	6.6	1	1	1	0
Nacionalista Party	8	3.3	1	1	0	0
United Opposition	7	2.9	0	1	0	0
Others	41	17.0	0	0	0	0
Russia, 2007	450	100	11	12	9	6
United Russia	315	70.0	8	8	6	4
Communist Party	57	12.7	1	2	1	1
Liberal Democratic Party	40	8.9	1	1	1	1
Fair Russia	38	8.4	1	1	1	0
South Africa, 2009	400	100	5	7	4	3
ANC	264	66.0	3	5	3	2
DA	67	16.8	1	1	1	1
COPE	30	7.5	1	1	0	0
IFP	18	4.5	0	0	0	0
ID	4	1.0	0	0	0	0
FF+	4	1.0	0	0	0	0
UDM	4	1.0	0	0	0	0
Others	9	2.3	0	0	0	0
United Kingdom, 2005	646	100	6	8	18	9
Labour Party	356	55.1	3	5	10	5
Conservative Party	198	30.7	2	2	6	3

Country, election year, parties	National parliament		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Seats	%	Seats			
Liberal Democrats	62	9.6	1	1	2	1
Democratic Unionist Party	9	1.4	0	0	0	0
Scottish National Party	6	0.9	0	0	0	0
Others	15	2.3	0	0	0	0
United States, 2008	434	100	21	18	57	29
Democratic Party	256	59.0	12	13	34	17
Republican Party	178	41.0	9	5	23	12

Table 6. Full country list for the distribution of seats in models (A) to (D)

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Afghanistan	0.42	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Albania	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Algeria	0.51	4	0.50	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Andorra	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Angola	0.19	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Antigua and Barbuda	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Argentina	0.61	5	0.63	6	0.74	4	0.50	3	0.42
Armenia	0.04	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Australia	0.32	3	0.38	5	0.62	6	0.75	4	0.56
Austria	0.12	3	0.38	3	0.37	4	0.50	3	0.42
Azerbaijan	0.12	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Bahamas	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Bahrain	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Bangladesh	2.31	12	1.50	12	1.48	7	0.88	5	0.70
Barbados	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Belarus	0.14	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Belgium	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	5	0.63	4	0.56
Belize	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Benin	0.13	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Bhutan	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Bolivia	0.14	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Botswana	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Brazil	2.95	14	1.75	14	1.73	10	1.25	5	0.70
Brunei Darussalam	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Bulgaria	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Burkina Faso	0.23	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Burundi	0.13	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Cambodia	0.21	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Cameroon	0.28	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Canada	0.50	4	0.50	6	0.74	9	1.13	5	0.70
Cape Verde	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Central African Rep.	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Chad	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Chile	0.25	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
China	19.86	85	10.63	37	4.57	48	6.00	24	3.35
Colombia	0.68	5	0.63	7	0.87	4	0.50	3	0.42
Comoros	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Congo (Brazzaville)	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Congo (Kinshasa)	1.02	6	0.75	8	0.99	4	0.50	4	0.56
Costa Rica	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Côte d'Ivoire	0.31	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Croatia	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Cuba	0.17	3	0.38	3	0.37	3	0.38	3	0.42
Cyprus	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Czech Republic	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	3	0.38	3	0.42
Denmark	0.08	2	0.25	2	0.25	4	0.50	3	0.42
Djibouti	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Dominica	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Dominican Republic	0.14	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Ecuador	0.22	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Egypt	1.23	7	0.88	9	1.11	5	0.63	4	0.56
El Salvador	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Equatorial Guinea	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Eritrea	0.08	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Estonia	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Ethiopia	1.26	7	0.88	9	1.11	5	0.63	4	0.56
Fiji	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Finland	0.08	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
France	0.95	6	0.75	8	0.99	17	2.13	9	1.26
Gabon	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Gambia	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Georgia	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Germany	1.22	7	0.88	9	1.11	22	2.75	12	1.67
Ghana	0.35	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Greece	0.16	3	0.38	3	0.37	4	0.50	3	0.42
Grenada	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Guatemala	0.20	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Guinea	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Guinea-Bissau	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Guyana	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Haiti	0.13	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Honduras	0.12	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Hungary	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	3	0.38	3	0.42
Iceland	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
India	17.30	74	9.25	34	4.20	39	4.88	20	2.79
Indonesia	3.56	17	2.13	16	1.98	10	1.25	6	0.84
Iran	0.99	6	0.75	8	0.99	5	0.63	3	0.42
Iraq	0.43	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Ireland	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
Israel	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	3	0.38	3	0.42
Italy	0.86	6	0.75	8	0.99	14	1.75	8	1.12
Jamaica	0.04	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Japan	1.89	10	1.25	11	1.36	40	5.00	20	2.79
Jordan	0.09	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Kazakhstan	0.23	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Kenya	0.58	4	0.50	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Kiribati	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Korea (North)	0.34	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Korea (South)	0.72	5	0.63	7	0.87	8	1.00	5	0.70
Kuwait	0.04	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
Kyrgyzstan	0.08	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Lao	0.10	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Latvia	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Lebanon	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Lesotho	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Liberia	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Libya	0.09	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Liechtenstein	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Lithuania	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Luxembourg	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Macedonia	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Madagascar	0.31	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Malawi	0.21	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Malaysia	0.38	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Maldives	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Mali	0.19	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Malta	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Marshall Islands	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Mauritania	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Mauritius	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Mexico	1.65	9	1.13	11	1.36	10	1.25	6	0.84
Micronesia	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Moldova	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Monaco	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Mongolia	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Montenegro	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Morocco	0.52	4	0.50	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Mozambique	0.32	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Myanmar	0.71	5	0.63	7	0.87	4	0.50	3	0.42
Namibia	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Nauru	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Nepal	0.42	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Netherlands	0.25	3	0.38	4	0.49	6	0.75	4	0.56
New Zealand	0.06	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
Nicaragua	0.09	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Niger	0.23	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Nigeria	2.21	11	1.38	12	1.48	7	0.88	5	0.70
Norway	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	4	0.50	3	0.42

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Oman	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Pakistan	2.61	13	1.63	13	1.61	8	1.00	5	0.70
Palau	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Panama	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Papua New Guinea	0.09	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Paraguay	0.10	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Peru	0.44	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Philippines	1.45	8	1.00	10	1.24	5	0.63	4	0.56
Poland	0.57	4	0.50	6	0.74	4	0.50	3	0.42
Portugal	0.16	3	0.38	3	0.37	4	0.50	3	0.42
Qatar	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Romania	0.33	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Russian Federation	2.08	11	1.38	12	1.48	9	1.13	6	0.84
Rwanda	0.16	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Saint Lucia	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Saint Vincent & G.	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Samoa	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
San Marino	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Sao Tome and Principe	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Saudi Arabia	0.43	4	0.50	5	0.62	5	0.63	3	0.42
Senegal	0.20	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Serbia	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Seychelles	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Sierra Leone	0.10	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Singapore	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
Slovakia	0.08	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Slovenia	0.03	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Solomon Islands	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Somalia	0.15	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
South Africa	0.73	5	0.63	7	0.87	4	0.50	3	0.42
Spain	0.60	5	0.63	6	0.74	9	1.13	5	0.70
Sri Lanka	0.32	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Sudan	0.61	5	0.63	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Suriname	0.01	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Swaziland	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Sweden	0.13	3	0.38	3	0.37	5	0.63	4	0.56
Switzerland	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	5	0.63	4	0.56
Syria	0.30	3	0.38	4	0.49	3	0.38	3	0.42
Tajikistan	0.11	2	0.25	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Tanzania	0.61	5	0.63	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Thailand	0.98	6	0.75	8	0.99	5	0.63	3	0.42
Timor-Leste	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Togo	0.09	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Tonga	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Trinidad and Tobago	0.02	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Tunisia	0.16	3	0.38	3	0.37	3	0.38	3	0.42
Turkey	1.14	7	0.88	9	1.11	5	0.63	4	0.56
Turkmenistan	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Tuvalu	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28
Uganda	0.48	4	0.50	6	0.74	3	0.38	3	0.42
Ukraine	0.68	5	0.63	7	0.87	4	0.50	3	0.42
United Arab Emirates	0.07	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.38	3	0.42
United Kingdom	0.91	6	0.75	8	0.99	18	2.25	9	1.26
United States of America	4.56	21	2.63	18	2.22	57	7.13	29	4.04
Uruguay	0.05	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	3	0.42
Uzbekistan	0.41	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Vanuatu	0.00	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.25	2	0.28

Country	% of world population	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)	
		Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats	Seats	% of seats
Venezuela	0.40	4	0.50	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Viet Nam	1.29	7	0.88	9	1.11	5	0.63	4	0.56
Yemen	0.35	3	0.38	5	0.62	3	0.38	3	0.42
Zambia	0.18	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42
Zimbabwe	0.17	3	0.38	3	0.37	2	0.25	3	0.42

References

- Almeida, Rodrigo de. 2009. The inspectors of democracy. *OpenDemocracy* (March 16). <http://www.opendemocracy.net/node/47519/>.
- Banzhaf, John F. 1966. Multi-Member Electoral Districts. Do They Violate the “One Man, One Vote” Principle? *The Yale Law Journal* 75, no. 8 (July): 1309-1338.
- Barrett, Carol, and Hanna Newcombe. 1968. Weighted Voting in International Organizations. *Peace Research Reviews* 2, no. 2 (April).
- Brown, Mark Malloch. 2008. The John W. Holmes Lecture: Can the UN Be Reformed? *Global Governance*, no. 14: 1-12.
- Bummel, Andreas. 2008. The establishment of a UN Parliamentary Assembly and the role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Committee for a Democratic UN, October. <http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/200810ipu-unpa.pdf>.
- . 2010. *Developing International Democracy. For a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations*. 2. ed. Berlin: Committee for a Democratic U.N., February.
- CEUNPA (Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly). 2007a. Appeal for the establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations. April. <http://en.unpacampaign.org/appeal/>.
- . 2007b. Conclusions regarding policies of the Campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly. November. <http://www.unpacampaign.org/documents/en/-POLICY1107.pdf>.
- . 2009. Committee for a World Parliament joins global campaign. 05 May. <http://en.unpacampaign.org/news/374.php>
- Childers, Erskine, and Brian Urquhart. 1994. *Renewing the United Nations System*. Uppsala, Sweden: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Chopin, Thierry, and Jean-François Jamet. 2007. *The Distribution of MEP seats in the European Parliament between Member States: both a democratic and diplomatic issue*. European Issues. Robert Schuman Foundation, September 10.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2009a. The World Factbook - Field Listing: Population. July estimates. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2119.html>. Accessed 23 September.
- . 2009b. The World Factbook - Field Listing: GDP (official exchange rate). 2008 estimates. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2195.html>. Accessed 1 October.

- Derviş, Kemal, and Ceren Özer. 2005. *A better globalization. Legitimacy, governance, and reform*. Washington D.C.: Center for Global Development.
- Deutscher Bundestag. 2002. *Schlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission „Globalisierung der Weltwirtschaft - Herausforderungen und Antworten“*. June 16. http://www.bundestag.de/gremien/welt/glob_end/glob.pdf.
- EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit). 2008. The Economist Intelligence Unit's Index of Democracy 2008. <http://graphics.eiu.com/PDF/Democracy%20Index%202008.pdf>.
- Freedom House. 2010. *Freedom in the World 2010: The Annual Survey of Political Rights and Civil Liberties*. Freedom House, Rowman & Littlefield, January.
- Gelman, Andrew, Jonathan N. Katz, and Francis Tuerlinckx. 2002. The Mathematics and Statistics of Voting Power. *Statistical Science* 17, no. 4 (November): 420-435.
- Gelman, Andrew, Jonathan N. Katz, and Joseph Bafumi. 2004. Standard Voting Power Indexes Do Not Work: An Empirical Analysis. *British Journal of Political Science* 34, no. 4 (October): 657-674.
- Global Greens Second Congress. 2008. 21 Commitments for the 21st Century. Declaration adopted in Sao Paulo, Brazil, May 4. http://www.global-greens.org/brazil2008/declarations/21_commitments.
- Grofman, Bernard, and Scott L. Feld. 2005. Thinking about the Political Impacts of the Electoral College. *Public Choice* 123, no. 1/2 (April): 1-18.
- Havel, Vaclav. 2000. Address of the President of the Czech Republic at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations September 8, New York. <http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/UNMS-2000-VaclavHavel.pdf>.
- Heinrich, Dieter. 1993. *The Case for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly*. 2. ed. World Federalist Movement / Committee for a Democratic UN, Republished February 2008. <http://www.unpacampaign.org/documents/en-UNPA1993.pdf>.
- Höffe, Otfried. 2002. *Demokratie im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*. 1. revised ed. München: C.H. Beck.
- IMF (International Monetary Fund). 2008. World Economic Outlook Database. October, data of 2007
- INFUSA (International Network for a UN Second Assembly). 1987. Appeal to the United Nations General Assembly to consider the proposal for a UN Second Assembly. <http://earthrights.ejnet.org/archives/gpa/uns.html>.
- Kissling, Claudia. 2006. *Die Interparlamentarische Union im Wandel. Rechtspolitische Ansätze einer repräsentativ-parlamentarischen Gestaltung der Weltpolitik*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Lamy, Pascal. 2005. *Towards World Democracy*. London: policy network.
- Leinen, Jo and Mary Mugenyi. 2009. Joint Statement by the Heads of Delegation to the Copenhagen Climate Conference of the Pan-African Parliament and the European Parliament, December 18. Printed in Bummel (2010: 43).

- Liberal International. 2005. Strengthening citizens representation on international level through an UN Parliamentary Assembly. Resolution adopted by the 53rd Congress in Sofia, Bulgaria, May 14. http://www.liberal-international.org/editorial.asp?ia_id=1089.
- Marshall, Monty G., Keith Jagers, and Ted Robert Gurr. 2009. Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2007. <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm>.
- McIntyre, Elizabeth. 1954. Weighted Voting in International Organizations. *International Organization* 8, no. 4: 484-497.
- McNicoll, Geoffrey. 1999. Population weights in the international order. *Population and Development Review* 25, no. 3: 411-442.
- Monbiot, George. 2004. *The Age of Consent. Manifesto for a New World Order*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Newcombe, Hanna, James Wert, and Alan Newcombe. 1971. Comparison of Weighted Voting Formulas for the United Nations. *World Politics* 23, no. 3: 452-492.
- Newcombe, Hanna. 1971a. Voting System in the United Nations. Selected abstracts. *Security Dialogue*, no. 2: 70-80.
- . 1971b. Weighted Voting Formulas for the United Nations. *Security Dialogue*, no. 2: 92-94.
- Nolan, Patrick, and Gerhard Lenski. 2006. *Human societies: An introduction to macrosociology*. 10. ed. Boulder Colo.: Paradigm Publishers.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2002. Parliament of Dreams. *World Link*, no. March/April: 15-17.
- Onesta, Gérard. 2007. From a European to a World Parliament. In Graham Watson et. al. *The Case for Global Democracy. Advocating a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly*. Somerset: Bagehot Publishing, September. <http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/MEPBROCHURE.pdf>.
- PACE (Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe). 2009. United Nations reform and the Council of Europe member states. Resolution 1688 (2009), October 1. <http://assembly.coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta09/ERES1688.htm>.
- PAP (Pan-African Parliament). 2007. A United Nations Parliamentary Assembly. Resolution adopted at the 8th Ordinary Session, Midrand, South Africa, October 24. http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/PAP_UNPA.pdf.
- Penrose, L. S. 1946. The Elementary Statistics of Majority Voting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 109, no. 1: 53-57.
- Puig, Lluís Maria de. 2008. *International parliaments*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, May.
- Quidde, L. 1922. *Völkerbund und Demokratie*. 2. ed. Berlin: Verlag Neuer Staat.
- Sartorius, Johann Baptist. 1837. *Organon des vollkommenen Friedens*. Zürich: S. Höhr.

- Scholte, Jan Aart. 2007. Political parties and global democracy. In *Global political parties*, ed. Katarina Sehm-Patomäki and Marko Ulvila. London, New York: Zed Books.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E. 2003. Overcoming Practical Difficulties in Creating a WPA. In *A Reader on Second Assembly & Parliamentary Proposals*, ed. Saul H. Mendlovitz and Barbara Walker, 80-92. Wayne, NJ: Center for UN Reform Education, May.
- . 2004. *Revitalizing the United Nations. Reform Through Weighted Voting*. New York, The Hague: World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy.
- . 2009. An incremental approach to a democratic United Nations Parliamentary Assembly. Committee for a Democratic UN, October.
- Segall, Jeffrey J. 1990. Building World Democracy Through the UN. *Medicine and War* 6, no. 4 (October): 275-285.
- Sheppard, Robert. 2000. Towards a UN Parliament: UN Reform for the Progressive Evolution of an Elective and Accountable Democratic and Parliamentary Process in UN Governance in the New Millennium. *Asian & Pacific Law & Policy Journal* 1, no. 4: 1-20.
- Socialist International. 2003. *Governance in a Global Society – The Social Democratic Approach*. Report adopted at the XII. Congress, São Paulo. October 29. <http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/XXII-Socialist-International-2003.pdf>.
- Sohn, Louis B. (ed.). 1970. *The United Nations: The Next Twenty-Five Years. Twentieth Report of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications.
- Synovate. 2007. BBC Poll: Why Democracy. August.
- Strauss, Andrew. 2007. On the First Branch of Global Governance. *Widener Law Review* 13, no. 2. Widener Law School Legal Studies Research Paper No. 08-55: 347-359.
- UN (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). 2009. World Population Prospects. The 2008 Revision. Highlights.
- World Bank. 2008. World Development Indicators database, revised 10 September, data of 2007.

