Five questions

1. **What?**
   - Ideals v. institutions

2. **Where?**
   - Supra-national
     - e.g. regional, global
   - Sub-national
     - e.g. workplace

3. **Who?**
   - Those that should **not** share in rule, but **do**
   - Those that **should** share, but do **not**

4. **Why?**
   - Instrumental v. non-instrumental

5. **How?**
   - Direct v. indirect
   - Aggregative v. non-aggregative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aggregative (Majority Rule)</th>
<th>Extra-aggregative (Deliberative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Representative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

1. Representation
   a) In general
   b) Descriptive representation in particular

2. Aggregation
   a) Majority rule

3. Summing-up
What is representation?

Representation = “make present again” (Pitkin)

A is represented by B through C to D

Four components:

a) A (the entity represented) ...

b) … is “represented” by B (the representative) ...

c) … through C (the object/activity of representation) ...

d) … to D (an audience)
Pitkin’s four types of representation

1. **Formalistic** representation
   - How the rep. is selected (authorization) and punished (accountability) by the rep’ed (e.g. elections)

2. **Substantive** representation
   - What the rep. does to represent others (e.g. legislative proposals)

3. **Symbolic** representation
   - How rep. “stands for” the represented (e.g. sovereign; flag)

4. **Descriptive** representation
   - How rep. resembles the represented (e.g. member of same social group)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of Female Representatives</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representation of women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of seats in both Houses held by women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globally</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td><strong>28.19%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (including Nordic countries)</td>
<td><strong>27.19%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (excluding Nordic countries)</td>
<td><strong>26.09%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td><strong>23.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td><strong>19.49%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td><strong>17.49%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td><strong>17.49%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-white MPs elected at UK General Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Lib Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Politics of presence

“We have become sufficiently attuned to the politics of presence to distrust the notion that anyone can “stand in” for anyone else’

Modes of descriptive representation

- Institutional mechanisms for ensuring ‘presence’:
  1. **Quotas**, esp. re. gender
  2. **Redistricting**, esp. around Black-majority constituencies in USA
  3. **Consociational democracy**, esp. in Europe
  4. “**Enabling devices**”
     - e.g. schools, caps on campaign expenses, public funding for campaigns, etc.
Arguments for descriptive representation

1. **Rectify** historic injustice
2. Improve **recognition** of groups
3. Increase (quality of) **dialogue** between groups
4. Increase **legitimacy** of regime
5. Increase **range** of policy **proposals**
6. Improve **advocacy** of policy **proposals**
Arguments against descriptive representation

1. Individuality
2. Essentialism
3. Community
4. “Balkanization”
5. Accountability
'For these writers, representing is not acting with authority, or acting before being held to account, or any kind of acting at all. Rather, it depends on the representative’s characteristics, on what he is or is like, on being something rather than doing something. The representative does not act for others; he “stands for” them, by virtue of … a resemblance or reflection. In political terms, what seems important is less what the legislature does than how it is composed.'

– Pitkin, Concept of Representation, p. 61
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Ideal or institution?

Democracy as an ideal

Rule of the many
(not the few)

Equal opportunity for each to influence collective decisions

Democracy as an institutional arrangement

One person, one vote

Voting, periodically and via secret ballot, for representatives of a plurality of parties in a plurality of geographically-bounded constituencies to form a legislature for fixed terms governed by majority rule and limited by constitutional constraints
Group decision-making

1. **Democracy**
   - “The people” should have influence over group decisions

2. **Political equality**
   - Each individual should have equal influence over group decisions

3. **Majority rule**
   - Most votes should determine group decision
Voting

1. **Plurality** (winner-takes-all)
   - Most votes wins
   - e.g. 50.1% of votes = 100% of representation
   - Plurality in single-member constituencies

2. **Proportionality** (winner-takes-some)
   - Outcomes selected in proportion to their share of vote
   - e.g. 50.1% of votes = 50.1% of representation
   - PR in multi-member districts
Majority rule

- In the absence of unanimity, should the **majority rule**?

1. **For** majority rule
   - If majority *don’t* rule, then not treating majority as equals
   - Equivalent to saying 49.9% > 50.1%

2. **Against** majority rule
   - If majority *do* rule, then not treating minority as equals
   - Equivalent to saying 49.9% = 0%
‘in an equal democracy ... the majority of the people ... will prevail over the minority ... But does it follow that the minority should have no representatives at all? ... [M]ust the majority have all the votes, the minority none? Nothing but habit can reconcile any reasonable being to the needless injustice. In a really equal democracy, every section would be represented proportionately. A majority of the electors would always have a majority of the representatives, but a minority of the electors would always have a minority of the representatives. [Otherwise] there is not equal government, but a government of inequality and privilege: one part of the people rule over the rest’

– Mill, Considerations on Representative Government, ch. 7
Constituency

1. ** Territory**
   a) Extraterritorial issues
      ➢ Migration, trade, environment, etc.
   b) Nonterritorial
      ➢ Class, gender, race, religion, etc.

2. ** Individual injustice**
   ➢ Multiple districts paradox: most votes in most constituencies, but not most overall

3. ** Historic injustice**
   ➢ Perpetuates group-based disadvantage
60% blue, 40% red

3 blue districts, 2 red districts
BLUE WINS

5 blue districts, 0 red districts
BLUE WINS

2 blue districts, 3 red districts
RED WINS
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Summing-up

Representative democracy
- What is it? Formal v. descriptive
- Should we embrace it? Accountability v. elitism

Aggregative democracy
- What is it? Counting votes
- Should we embrace majority rule?