

was toppled, Yugoslavia (since named Serbia and Montenegro) did reapply, and it was readmitted in 2000.

Withdrawal suspension or expulsion is another membership issue. Nationalist China (Taiwan) was, in effect, ejected from the UN when the "China seat" was transferred to the mainland. In a move close to expulsion. The General Assembly refused between 1974 and 1991 to accept the credentials of South Africa's delegate because that country's apartheid policies violated the UN charter. The refusal to recognize Yugoslavia in 1992 as a successor state was, in effect, an expulsion of that country based on its bloody repression of Bosnians, Croats, and others.

Basis of Representation Issues

There are important issues that relate to the structure of representative bodies of IGOs. Most have a plenary representative body that includes all members. The theoretical basis for plenary bodies is the mutual responsibility of all members for the organization and its policies. The UN General Assembly (UNGA) is the UN's plenary organ, but in other IGOs it may be termed a council conference; a commission, or even a parliament.

These plenary bodies normally have the authority to involve themselves in virtually all aspects of their organization. Thus, in theory, they are the most powerful elements of their organization. In practice, however, the plenary organization may be secondary to the administrative structure or some other part of the organization.

A second type of representative body is a limited membership council. It is based on the theory that some members have a greater concern or capacity in a particular area. For example, the UN Security Council (UNSC) has 15 members. Ten are chosen by the UNGA for limited terms. But five are permanent members. These five (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) were the leading victorious powers at the end of World War II and were thought to have a special peacekeeping role to play. They have served continuously since 1945 as permanent members on the Security Council; more than half of the other 186 members have never served on the council.

The special status enjoyed by the five permanent members of the UNSC is a simmering issue in the UN. Some charge that it is an

inaccurate reflection of power realities. As the German mission to the UN puts it, "The Security Council as it stands does not reflect today's world which has changed dramatically since 1945" Given current realities, Germany, India, Japan, and some other powerful countries have begun to press for permanent seat for themselves.

Geographic and demographic imbalance is another issue. Geographically, Europe and North America have four of five permanent seats, and those four permanent members are also countries of predominantly Eurowhite and Christian heritage. Many countries in Africa and elsewhere agree with the view expressed by the president of Zambia that the council "can no longer be maintained like the sanctuary of the Holy with only the original members acting as high priests, deciding on issues for the rest of the world who cannot be admitted.

What some critics charge is an inequitable vein is a third issue. Speaking in the General Assembly a Venezuelan diplomat described the veto as "an anti-democratic practice not in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of states.

Whatever may be just, however, change will be hard to achieve.

One difficulty is that any Charter revision must be recommended by a two-thirds vote of the UNSC (in which each of the five permanent members has a veto), adopted by a two-thirds vote of the UNGA, and ratified by two-thirds of the members according to their respective constitutional processes. The permanent UNJSC members are opposed to surrendering their special status. It will also be difficult to arrive at a new formula that satisfies the sensitivities of other countries and regions. For example, the thought of India having a permanent seat alarms Pakistan, whose UN representative has characterized those seeking permanent status as motivated by "an undisguised grab for power and privilege".

Therefore, the prospects for reform remain dim. Speaking in late 2003, Secretary-General Kofi Annan noted that many of the "structures of the United Nations reflect an earlier age", that "this is most clearly the case in the Security Council", and that there is "widespread agreement that the council should be enlarged". Yet he had to concede, "There is no consensus on the details.

Voting Issues

One of the difficult issues that any international organization faces is its formula for allocating votes. Three major alternatives as they exist today are majority voting, weighted voting, and unanimity voting. The implications of voting formulas are evident.

Majority voting is the most common formula used in IGOs. This system has two main components: (1) each member casts one equal vote, and (2) the issue is carried by either a simple majority (50% plus one vote) or, in some cases, a supermajority (commonly two-thirds). The theory of majoritarianism springs from the concept of sovereign equality and the democratic notion that the will of the majority should prevail. The UNGA and most other UN bodies operate on this principle.

The problem with the idea of equality among states is that it does not reflect some standards of reality. Should Costa Rica, with no army, cast an equal vote with the powerful United States? Should San Marino, with a population of thousands, cast the same vote as China, with its more than 1 billion people? It might be noted, for example, that in the UNGA, some 127 states, whose combined populations are less 15% of the world's population, account for two-thirds of membership and, thus, the available votes. By contrast, the 10 countries, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, and the United States), which combined have 60% of the world's population, have just 5% of the available votes in the General Assembly.

Weighted voting, or a system that allocated unequal voting power on the basis of a formula, is second voting scheme. Two possible criteria are population and wealth. As noted earlier, the European Parliament provides as example of an international representative body based in part on population. A number of international monetary organizations base voting on financial contributions. Voting in the World Bank and the international Monetary Fund is based on member contributions. The United States alone commands about 17% of the votes in the IMF, and it and France, Germany, Great Britain, and Japan together can cast almost 40% of the votes in that IGO, yet combined have only 10% of the world population by contrast china and India which combined 38% of the world's population, together have 4.9% of the IMF votes. This