

How Are, and Should, Parliamentarians of States Be Involved in Global Governance?

by Chadwick F. Alger, The Ohio State University, with Kent J. Kille, College of Wooster¹

Inter-State organizations of parliamentarians are operating in the international system in significant numbers and are increasingly involved in the United Nations (UN) system. This research paper bolsters our ability to understand how the parliamentarians are involved in global governance through reviewing and categorizing these actors. Some are global, some are regional, and some are interregional. Some have a broad agenda, and some focus on specific issues, including small arms and light weapons, nuclear proliferation and disarmament, drug control, corruption, and democracy. There are also organizations of secretaries general, presidents, and speakers of State parliaments. In addition, as global governance becomes more extensive, there is increasing concern about how this global governance may be made more democratic. Those expressing this concern should become more aware and consider the implications of this involvement of inter-State organizations of parliamentarians. Further research is needed that considers the impact this experience has on participating parliamentarians and how it affects the influence they have on both the parliament of their State and the inter-State parliament in which they participate.

Introduction

Participation in the UN system has been accelerating in recent years, moving beyond primarily representatives of member States and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).² For instance, in 1999 UN Secretary General Kofi Annan proposed the Global Compact to involve business corporations in meeting standards in UN declarations and covenants on human rights, labor, and environment. There are now over ten thousand business participants in this UN Global Compact. In addition, a broader understanding of useful UN–Civil Society connections to address relevant issues was emphasized by the 2004 Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations–Civil Society Relations (Cardoso Report).

Such developments motivated research on the involvement in global governance of both local governments and parliamentarians (Alger 2010, 2011). The effort to acquire an overview of the involvement of parliamentarians of States in the UN system led to the awareness of the existence of at least sixty-seven inter-State organizations of parliamentarians of States and revealed the previously unrealized extensive efforts that these parliamentarians have made to become directly involved with parliamentarians of other States,

1. JIOS received a submission from Chadwick Alger just weeks before he passed earlier this year, and before he had a chance to undertake suggested revisions. With the permission of Alger's family, Kent Kille, a former PhD student (and editor of an *International Journal of Peace Studies* special issue on his peace tools work) and a member of the JIOS Editorial Board, has edited the piece, while carefully ensuring that Alger's voice and ideas are retained. As such, this article represents a last think piece from Alger that is a fitting endnote to his research and writing legacy. For further information about Alger's work, see the three-volume compendium *Chadwick F. Alger: Pioneer in the Study of the Political Process and on NGO Participation in the United Nations, The UN System and Cities in Global Governance, and Peace Research and Peacebuilding*, published by Springer in 2014.

2. Throughout this paper the term "State" is intentionally capitalized to refer to those government units recognized as sovereign by other States. This avoids confusing the use of this term where the sub-units of the State are referred to as "states" (such as those within the United States of America), which is intentionally lowercased.

instead of permitting the executive branches to dominate the foreign relations of their State. International parliamentary institutions are part of the growing networked global society and show signs of continuing to evolve as an important part of the shifting international structure (Cutler 2001).

Parliamentarian involvement in the UN system has linked these dimensions of global governance. This includes parliamentarians in attendance at sessions of the UN General Assembly. The Inter-Parliamentarian Union (IPU), which was founded well before the existence of the UN (or even the League of Nations) in 1889, has established and maintained important connections to the UN. This has recently included a special session held at the General Assembly Hall in celebration of the UN's fiftieth anniversary in 1995 and an agreement of cooperation with the UN was signed the following year (Johnsson 2003). The UN Millennium Summit reinforced the importance of cooperation between the UN and IPU and subsequent meetings, reports, and resolutions have assisted in maintaining the organizational partnership across different parts of the UN system, and the General Assembly has extended special observer status to the IPU.

The consideration of parliamentarians of States relates to a broader exploration of the democratic implications for and the possibilities of widening participation in global governance (Alger 2007, 2011). The potential role of parliamentarians harkens to Robert Dahl and Edward Tufte's (1973) treatise on *Size and Democracy*. After observing that democracy is most compatible with small political units, they noted the challenge to democracy presented by problems that transcend political boundaries:

The central theoretical problem is no longer to find suitable rules, like the majority principle, to apply within a sovereign unit, but to find suitable rules to apply among a variety of units, none of which is sovereign. . . . At the same time that transnational units will increase the capacity of the system to handle critical problems . . . transnational units will also increase the ineffectuality and powerlessness of the individual citizen. . . .

Theory, then, needs to do what democratic theory has never done well: to offer useful guidance about the appropriate relations among units. (Dahl and Tufte, 1973, 135)

Since Dahl and Tufte's assertion, many more problems are now transcending the boundaries of States. As a result, there has been an increasing focus on the challenges that this presents for achieving global democracy. The role that parliamentarians of States might play in such global democracy should be a focus in these considerations.

Indeed, it has been recognized that international parliamentary institutions could play a role in building more democratic global governance (Sabic 2008; see also Sabic 2010). Proposals in the Cardoso Report for addressing the democracy deficit in global governance points to the need for "enhanced United Nations–parliamentarian relations." This includes a "four-pronged strategy" to:

Take United Nations issues to national parliaments more systematically; ensure that parliamentarians coming to United Nations events have more strategic roles at those events; link parliaments themselves with the international deliberative process; and provide an institutional home at the United Nations for engaging parliamentarians. (1994, 46)

The fact that there are now at least sixty-seven inter-State organizations of parliamentarians, and expanding involvement in the UN system by parliamentarians, is certainly providing a significant challenge to democratic theory. How to best address this challenge cannot be resolved until scholars, government officials, and citizens of democracies become more aware of the growing direct involvement of parliamentarians of their State in global governance. Due to the relatively limited knowledge that people have in this area, this paper provides a helpful descriptive overview based on reviewing and undertaking a classification exercise of the organizations. The hope is that this will then motivate others to build upon this material to undertake research that will extend knowledge about their impact on efforts to make global governance more democratic. Further, following the overview and clas-

sification of inter-State organizations of parliamentarians, the conclusion indicates related research questions that this activity raises.

Inter-State Organizations of Parliamentarians of States

The titles of the sixty-seven organizations of parliamentarians of States identified reveal that they have a diversity of formats. These titles include not only parliament, but also parliamentary assembly, parliamentary council, parliamentary conference, parliamentary committees, parliamentary dimension, parliamentary union, parliamentary forum, parliamentary network, conference of speakers of parliaments, conference of presidents of parliaments, conference of parliamentarians, interparliamentary assembly, international council of parliamentarians, and assembly.

Such diversity is recognized by Lluís Maria de Puig (2008) in *International Parliaments*. De Puig has been a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Assembly of the Western European Union, and the Assembly of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and notes:

These are various forums, committees or conferences which meet occasionally or periodically, sometimes even frequently, which satisfy the criterion of meetings or gatherings of groups of parliamentarians but do not have either the structure or the status of what could be regarded as a *permanent supranational assembly*. (25–26)

De Puig then provides “those assemblies which I believe satisfy the basic conditions for being considered as true international parliamentary assemblies.” When these organizations appear in the organizations listed in the tables below, an asterisk is placed before their name to indicate the overlap with de Puig. Of course, all forms of parliamentarians deserve attention. We are now challenged to differentiate the impact that various kinds of inter-State parliamentary organizations are having on global governance.

For this research exercise, the organizations have been usefully classified with respect to their geographic scope and also the scope of their agenda. The organizations have been placed into five categories: 1) global/broad agenda, 2) global/specific issue, 3) regional/broad agenda, 4) regional/specific issue, and 5) interregional. These categories were previously established from what was then a review of forty-seven parliamentary organizations but only an initial group of those with a global reach was addressed (Alger 2010). The effort here revisits, updates, and greatly expands the review and categorization exercise.

There are sixteen global organizations, forty regional (thirteen in Europe), and eleven interregional. The fifteen organizations that are focused on specific issues reach across a wide range of issues. The issues addressed include development, corruption, democracy, environmental concerns, security, drug control, education, nuclear proliferation and disarmament, and small arms. The diversity of participants in these organizations includes members of parliaments of States, speakers and presidents of parliaments of States, members of regional legislative assemblies, and Jewish parliamentarians.

Global/Broad Agenda

There are nine global—broad agenda organizations. Five are included in what de Puig identifies as “true international parliamentary assemblies” (marked by an asterisk from this point forward).

One global organization of parliamentarians has a language focus: the Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF). The APF is an association of the parliaments of francophone States. The organization was established in Luxembourg in 1967 and was then known as the Association Internationale des Parlementaires de Langue Française. APF has members from eighty-one parliaments across four continents, and the organization’s goals are to promote democracy, human rights, and the international diffusion of French-language culture and diversity (www.apf.francophonie.org).

Table 1. Global/Broad Agenda (9)

*Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF)
*Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA)
*Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (IAO)
*Inter-Parliamentarian Union (IPU)
*Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA)
Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP)
African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP)–European Union (EU) Joint Parliamentary Assembly
International Council of Jewish Parliamentarians (ICJP)
Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (PUIC)

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), an organization of British origin, was founded as the Empire Parliamentary Association in 1911. The association's primary goals are good governance, democracy, and human rights. Branches exist across a range of areas, including Africa, Asia, Australia, the British Islands and Mediterranean, Canada, Caribbean, Americas and Atlantic, India, and Pacific and Southeast Asia (www.cpahq.org).

The Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (IAO) draws parliamentarians from a range of European States along with Russia and the Ukraine. Also participating are groups of parliamentarians from Australia, Asia, Africa, and the United States. Because of this level of engagement, the organization has been placed in the global category, although the agenda has been focused on Europe. IAO advocates a widening of the use of orthodoxy in responding to challenges and expanding knowledge of how orthodoxy may contribute to the building and establishment of peace and justice. The effort to create global involvement is explained as recognition that European problems are now problems encountered in the entire world, and the body's name was intentionally changed from European Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy to the broader Interparliamentary Assembly on Orthodoxy (www.eiao.org).

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), which was referenced in the introduction of this paper, was founded in 1889 in Paris (and has been based in Geneva since 1921) and focused on promoting the ideas of peace and international arbitration and encouraging multilateral cooperation. Started as an association of individual parliamentarians, the IPU transformed into an organization of the parliaments of States and now has members from 164 State parliaments in conjunction with ten associate members. The IPU's main areas of activity are representative democracy, international peace and security, sustainable development, human rights and humanitarian law, women in politics, and education, science, and culture (www.ipu.org).

Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA) was set up in Washington, D.C., in 1978–79 and is currently headquartered in New York City. The founding ideal was to draw together parliamentarians from across different countries in order to better address global issues through joint action. The PGA links together approximately eleven hundred individual legislators from 139 parliaments. The three central programs of PGA are international law and human rights, peace and democracy, and gender, equality, and population, with the organization working with a range of bodies in the UN System as well as NGOs and related research institutions (www.pgaction.org).

The Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP) aims to facilitate personal connections between parliamentary assembly secretaries general. ASGP studies the different laws and practices across parliaments and can propose means of improving these

practices and encouraging cooperation between the parliaments. The association functions on the basis of its own rules and working methods, but is a consultative organ that assists the IPU (www.asgp.co; <http://www.ipu.org/asgp-e/rules.htm>).

The African, Caribbean, and Pacific Group of States (ACP)–European Union (EU) Joint Parliamentary Assembly is placed in the global group, because the assembly involves over one hundred States across four regions. The ACP–EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly seeks to promote human rights and democratic processes through dialogue and consultation, to facilitate greater understanding between the peoples of the contributing States, and to raise public awareness and promote north–south interdependence on development issues. Work is carried out in several main committees: political affairs, economic development, finance and trade, and social affairs and environment (www.acpsec.org; www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/acp).

The International Council of Jewish Parliamentarians (ICJP), which has its headquarters in Jerusalem, brings together Jewish members of parliaments of States and the European Parliament, as well as cabinet or deputy ministers of States. The ICJP’s mission statement explains the purpose of the council as:

To promote an ongoing dialogue and a sense of fraternity among Jewish legislators and ministers; To uphold the principles of democracy, further the cause of human rights and promote the rule of law; To combat racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, terrorism and Holocaust denial by all means available to parliamentarians and ministers; To support Israel, conduct dialogue on political issues between Jewish parliamentarians and the political leadership in Israel, and contribute toward the creation of enduring peace in the Middle East; To ensure the welfare, both material and spiritual, of Jews and Jewish communities worldwide. To create international cooperation on projects relevant to ICJP members. (www.icjp.net/about)

Another global organization of parliamentarians, the Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (PUIC), instead has an Islamic focus. PUIC membership ranges across Eastern Europe, Caucasias, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia (www.puic.org).

Finally, in addition to these organizations, there is a global e-Parliament designed to inform, connect, and build coalitions among parliamentarians to undertake needed policy improvements on important global issues (www.e-parl.net). The e-Parliament’s initial emphasis was on two issue areas, climate change and the spread of democracy. The e-Parliament is now focusing on promoting renewable energy and addressing climate change via its Climate Parliament subsidiary (www.climateparl.net).

Global/Specific Issue

The seven global organizations of parliamentarians working on a specific issue are focused on corruption, democracy, drug control, nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament, small arms and light weapons, sustainable urban development, and international financial institutions. Five are referred to by de Puig as “true international parliamentary assemblies.”

Table II. Global/Specific Issue (7)
*Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC)
*Global Parliamentarians on Habitat (GPH)
*Parliamentary Forum on Small Arms and Light Weapons
*Parliamentary Network on the World Bank and International Monetary Fund
*Transatlantic Interparliamentary Drug Control Conference
International Movement of Parliamentarians for Democracy (IMPD)
Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND)

The Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC) was created in October 2002 at a conference in Ottawa, Canada, with 170 parliamentarians from over fifty States participating. Built upon the core values of integrity, accountability, collaboration, and diversity, GOPAC's vision is to "achieve accountability and transparency through effective anti-corruption mechanisms and inclusive participation and cooperation between parliamentarians, government and civil society" (www.gopacnetwork.org/overview). As part of the operating structure, GOPAC includes regional and national chapters.

Global Parliamentarians on Habitat (GPH), founded in 1987 in Yokohama, Japan, in the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, has maintained close cooperation with UN-HABITAT, which notes: "UN-HABITAT believes that partnership with parliamentarians is vital to build support for its mission and the implementation of HABITAT Agenda and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Because parliamentarians act as the bridge between the people and their government, they are instrumental in advocating for the rights and needs of the people" (www.unhabitat.org). GPH has held five Global Forums of Parliamentarians that usually attract over two hundred parliamentarians and about three hundred other participants from over fifty States around the world. In April 2009, GPH met and passed a resolution in support of UN-HABITAT's main theme, promoting affordable housing finance systems in an urbanizing world challenged by a global financial crisis. The meeting also established the African Parliamentarians chapter of GPH, and African parliamentarians were elected to its board of directors.

The Parliamentary Forum on Small Arms and Light Weapons was established in 1999 at the instigation of parliamentarians from Europe and Central America but now brings together a network of parliamentarians who are focused on addressing this issue area from across much of Latin America, Europe, and Africa. The forum is designed "to support parliamentarians in their small arms related work, contributing to the advancement of the small arms agenda, and providing a space for parliamentarians to meet and join forces with other stakeholders and actors, such as civil society organizations" (www.parliamentaryforum.org/theorganization).

Another global/specific issue organization of parliamentarians involved with a particular organization in the UN system is the Parliamentary Network on the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (the Parliamentary Network). Drawing parliamentarians from over 140 States, the Parliamentary Network is focused on providing "a platform for parliamentarians around the globe to advocate for increased accountability and transparency in International Financial Institutions and multilateral development financing," and activities are guided by the principles of "dialogue, advocacy, networking, partnership, and increased accountability" (www.pnowb.org/about/mission). Membership is open to elected parliamentarians from World Bank member States who are willing to represent their own views and their constituents, not act as country representatives, and the work is carried out in conjunction with a wide group of related partners. In a very different issue area, the Transatlantic Interparliamentary Drug Control Conference has been organized in conjunction with the UN International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP). For example, in 2002 the conference was held Tokyo with the Federation of Japanese Parliamentarians to Fight against Abuse of Narcotics and Amphetamine-Type Stimulants (www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/en/pressrels/2002/socnar841.html).

The International Movement of Parliamentarians for Democracy (IMPD) was founded in 2003 and formalized at the second meeting in 2004 as part of the third assembly of the World Movement for Democracy, with the listed purpose "to strengthen, re-invigorate, reform, and bolster democracy worldwide, and to defend democratically elected parliamentarians who are denied their seats or who face harassment" (www.wmd.org/assemblies/third-assembly/workshops/international-democracy-assistance-and-solidarity/international-). Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND) is a global network of over seven hundred parliamentarians from seventy-five countries working as "a non-partisan forum for parliamentarians nationally and internationally to share resources and information, develop cooperative strategies and engage in nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament issues, initia-

tives, and arenas” and links as well with nongovernmental experts (www.pnnd.org/about-us). A program of the Global Security Institute (www.gsinsitute.org), PNND provides information on related issues, meetings, resolutions, and legislation along with encouraging the building of contacts and the development of joint strategies.

European Regional

Moving to regional organizations, we begin with Europe, because it has the most extensive array of parliamentary organizations. A broad descriptive overview of the region’s twelve parliamentary organizations is provided because of the great diversity of regional organizations, the overlap of the regions, and their reach beyond Europe. Eight of the twelve parliamentary organizations in Europe are included in de Puig’s “true interparliamentary assemblies.” The European Parliament is a directly elected parliament of the EU that has twenty-eight member States. It has been described as one of the most powerful international legislatures in the world and serves as a model for those who are advocating the creation of a directly elected UN Assembly. It is important to mention that, as the EU developed, the role of the Western European Union (WEU) declined, and it ceased to exist in June 2011. The assembly of the WEU held its last session in May 2011.

Table III. European/Broad Agenda (12)
*European Parliament
*Baltic Assembly
*Baltic Sea Parliamentary Conference
*Benelux Parliament
*Euro–Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly
*Nordic Council
*Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)
*Parliamentary Dimension of the Central European Initiative
British–Irish Parliamentary Assembly
Conference of European Regional Legislative Assemblies (CALREC)
Conference of Speakers of European Union Parliaments
European Conference of Presidents of Parliaments

On a much smaller scale among the “true parliamentary assemblies” are the Baltic Assembly, which encompasses Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (www.baltasam.org); the Benelux Parliament for Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg (www.benelux-parlement.eu); and the Nordic Council, drawing members from Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the Faroe Islands, Greenland, and Åland (www.norden.org/en/nordic-council). Unlike the narrow Baltic Assembly, the Baltic Sea Parliamentary Conference draws together participants from across the entire region to allow for dialogue between parliamentarians operating at the national, regional, and parliamentary organization level (www.bspc.net).

The Euro–Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly (EMPA) includes representatives from the national parliaments of EU member States, the European Parliament, and national parliaments of partner States in the European Mediterranean and the Mediterranean Sea from Turkey to Tunisia and allows for consultation and recommendations related to the region (www.europarl.europa.eu/intcoop/empa/content_en.html). The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), which consists of over three hundred individuals from parliaments of the

forty-seven member States, is designed to “uphold the shared values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law that are the ‘common heritage’ of the peoples of Europe” (www.website-pace.net/en_GB/web/apce/in-brief). Finally, there is the Parliamentary Dimension of the Central European Initiative, which operates as one of three pillars of the overarching organization along with the governmental and business dimensions (www.cei.int/content/parliamentary-dimension).

Out of the four not specified by de Puig as “true interparliamentary assemblies,” one is rather unusual in the diversity of the participants. The Conference of European Regional Legislative Assemblies (CALREC), which “unites seventy-four presidents of European regional legislative assemblies: the parliaments of the Spanish communities, Italian regional councils, the federated states of Germany and Austria, the Portuguese regions of l’ Açores and Madeira, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom, Åland Islands in Finland, and Belgium community and regional chambers” (www.calre.net.eu/index.php/what-is-calre/history). The British Irish Parliamentary Assembly encompasses quite a small grouping (www.britishterish.org). The final two involve specific offices of parliaments: the Conference of Speakers of EU Parliaments (www.europarl.europa.eu/webnp/cms/pid/8) and European Conference of Presidents of Parliaments (www.website-pace.net/en_GB/web/apce/conferences).

Table IV. European/Specific Issue (1)

Conference of Community and European Affairs Committees of Parliaments of the EU (COSAC)
--

There is only one European organization that focuses on a specific issue: the Conference of Community and European Affairs Committees of Parliaments of the EU (COSAC). COSAC was created in 1989, when members of the parliaments of the EU member States agreed to strengthen the role of the State parliaments in relation to community matters by bringing together their committees on European Affairs (www.cosac.eu).

Regional Outside Europe/Broad Agenda

The twenty regional parliamentary organizations with broad agendas that are outside of Europe cover regions around the world: Arctic (1), Africa (4) America (3), Latin America (7), Arab (2), Asia (1), Pacific (1), and former USSR (1). Available space only permits a brief comment on each region that illuminates the diversity of parliamentary organizations, and the following sections provide a categorized listing of related organizations for reference.

For the Arctic there is the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (CPAR), with parliamentarians from Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the U.S., the European Parliament, and permanent participants representing indigenous peoples. CPAR works on initiatives to improve Arctic cooperation and serves as a parliamentary forum for issues relevant to the efforts of the Arctic Council. Between conferences, Arctic parliamentary cooperation is carried on by a Standing Committee (www.arcticparl.org).

The four identified African organizations include a Pan-African Parliament (www.pan-africanparliament.org) and two sub-regional organizations in East Africa (www.eala.org) and West Africa (www.parl.ecowas.int). In addition, there is an African Network of Parliamentary Staff (www.asgp.co/node/30132). The three American organizations include the Parliamentary Confederation of the Americas (COPA), which involves State, provincial, and territorial parliamentarians or legislators from across all of the Americas (<http://www.copa.qc.ca/>). Parliamentarians for the Americas (ParlAmericas), which was previously named the Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas (FIPA), brings together delegates to formulate recommendations to take back to the legislatures across the hemisphere (www.parlamericas.org). There is also a different form of representation provided through the Indigenous Parliament of America (www.parlatino.org/es/enlaces/parlamentos-regionales/parlamento-indigena.html).

Table V. Regional Outside Europe—Broad Agenda (20)
<i>Arctic (1)</i>
*Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
<i>Africa (4)</i>
*East African Legislative Assembly
*Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Parliament
*Pan-African Parliament
African Network of Parliamentary Staff
<i>America (3)</i>
*Parliamentary Confederation of the Americas (COPA)
Indigenous Parliament of America
Parliamentarians for the Americas (ParlAmericas)
<i>Latin America (7)</i>
*Amazonian Parliament
*Andean Parliament
*Assembly of Caribbean Community of Parliamentarians (ACCP)
*Central American Parliament (PARLACEN)
*Latin American Parliament (Parlatino)
*Mercosur Parliament
Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America and the Caribbean Basin (FOPREL)
<i>Arab (2)</i>
*Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union
* Consultative Council of the Arab Maghreb Union
<i>Asia (1)</i>
*ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly
Former USSR (1)
*Interparliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States
<i>Pacific (1)</i>
*Association of Pacific Island Legislatures

Located in Caracas, Venezuela, the Amazonian Parliament works “to promote political and parliamentary exchange in the Amazon Basin” (www.insouth.org). The Andean Parliament is an organ of the Andean Community of Nations created in 1979 and adapted in 1997. With representatives chosen from each State, the parliament’s “functions are to participate in the legislative process of putting forward to the bodies of the system draft provisions of common interest. It also promotes the harmonization of member country legislation and the growth of cooperative and coordinated relations with the Parliaments of the Andean countries and of third countries” (www.comunidadandina.org/ingles/sai/estructura_6.html).

The Assembly of Caribbean Community Parliamentarians (ACCP) first met in 1996 and brings together representatives from thirteen member States and one associate member parliaments (www.caricom.org). The main tasks of the Central American Parliament (PARLACEN)

are to provide leadership for representative democracy in Central America and to promote institutional cooperation on issues including integration, sustainable development, and human rights (www.parlacen.int). There is also a Forum of Presidents of the Legislative Bodies of Central America and the Caribbean Basin (FOPREL), which has signed a memorandum of understanding with the Organization of American States (OAS) (www.oas.org/en/media_center/press_release.asp?sCodigo=E-015/07).

The Latin American Parliament (Parlatino) covers an extensive set of members: Argentina, Aruba, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Curacao, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, St. Martin, Suriname, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Parlatino pursues the defense of democracy and Latin American integration along with promoting economic and social development and respect for human rights (www.parlatino.org). Finally, the Mercosur Parliament brings together representatives from the States in this regional organization that promotes a common market in South America (www.parlamentodelmercosur.org).

There are two Arab parliamentary organizations identified. The Arab Parliamentary Union, with parliamentarians from twenty-two States, was established in 1974 (www.arab-ipu.org). The Consultative Council of the Arab Maghreb Union, which includes Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Mauritania, and Tunisia, brings together thirty representatives from each country selected by their respective legislative organs (www.maghrebarabe.org). In Asia, the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) has the goal of contributing “to the attainment of the goals and aspirations of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) through inter-parliamentary cooperation” (www.aipo.org).

In 1992, parliamentarians in States from the former Soviet Union created the Inter-parliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Representatives are from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Ukraine. The Interparliamentary Assembly has the “overarching mission” of “law-making and alignment of national laws” and discusses a range of issues, adopts recommendations and model legislation, and assists with the exchange of information (www.iacis.ru). Finally, the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures (APIL), founded in 1981 and consisting of members from American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Island of Guam, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Republic of Palau, State of Hawaii, Republic of Nauru, Republic of Kiribati, and four States from the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), meets to “consider matters in areas where regional cooperation, coordination, exchange and assistance may help governments achieve their goals through collective action” (www.apilpacific.com).

Regional Outside Europe—Specific Issue

Seven regional parliamentary organizations outside of Europe that focus on specific issues have been established. Four African organizations are involved in development, corruption, forest ecosystems, and education. An Asian organization is concerned with population and development. Two Latin American organizations are focused on environment and democracy.

Interregional

There are eleven organizations identified that are categorized as interregional. Nine are drawn from the “true international parliamentary assemblies” provided by de Puig. It is not surprising that seven of these link Europe with other regions. Most of the connections are mentioned in the titles, but it should be pointed out that the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) includes members from the former Soviet Union and North America. Four link parliaments in other regions: the Black Sea, Islamic States, African and Arab States, and Asia and the Pacific.

Table VI. Regional Outside Europe—Specific Issue (7)
<i>Africa (4)</i>
*Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum
African Parliamentarians Network Against Corruption (APNAC) (www.apnacafrica.org)
Network of Parliamentarians for the Sustainable Management of Central African Forest Ecosystems (REPAR) (see http://pfb-cbfp.org/news_en/items/repar-position-REDD-en.html)
Forum of African Parliamentarians for Education (FAPED) (in cooperation with UNESCO, see: https://en.unesco.org/about-us/how-we-work)
<i>Asia (1)</i>
Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD) (www.afppd.org)
<i>Latin America (2)</i>
*Conference of Presidents of Democratic Ibero-American Parliaments
*Latin America Interparliamentary Commission on the Environment

Table VII. Interregional (11)
*Asia–Pacific Parliamentary Forum
*Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA)
*Association of Senates, Shoura and Equivalent Councils in Africa and the Arab World
*Conference of Presidents of Euro–Mediterranean Parliaments
*Interparliamentary Assembly of the Eurasian Economic Community
*Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Parliamentary Assembly
*Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM)
*Parliamentary Association for Euro–Arab Cooperation (PAEAC)
*Parliamentary Union of the Organization of the Islamic Conference
NATO Parliamentary Assembly (www.nato-pa.int)
Parliamentary Assembly for Black Sea Economic Co-operation (PABSEC) (www.pabsec.org)

Conclusion

The involvement of governments of States in global governance has greatly expanded as the global governance agenda has extended. Now it includes not only foreign offices but also many other departments of the governments of States. At the same time, parliamentarians of States are increasingly involved with parliamentarians from a great diversity of other States. Overall, the diversity of these efforts is very impressive. Some parliamentarians maintain a broad emphasis, while others are focused on specific issues, and there are a great range of specific issues encompassed. The parliamentary meetings across State borders can be global, but in other circumstances, they are limited to a regional focus (with a range of examples included across all forms of region) and also include a variety of interregional parliamentary organizations. In a few cases, parliamentarians from a small region are involved. There are organizations that include parliamentarians who are representing the parliament of their State and others in which parlia-

mentarians are only representing themselves. Participants in others are only secretaries general, speakers, and presidents of parliaments.

Given the overview of the diversity of inter-State organizations of parliaments, what conclusions and questions does this exercise raise about their present and potential impact on global governance? For de Puig, writing in the last chapter of *International Parliaments*, titled “History in the Making,” “five final considerations” are reached. First, international parliamentarianism “is a form of parliamentarianism that does not look backwards. . . . There is a dynamic here which makes it inexorable that a forum in which citizens’ representatives discuss and take decisions on all the problems of society and the world will spread to every territorial, sectorial, political, and geo-strategic sphere.” Second, “it is a global phenomenon but one with regional roots. Having started in Europe, it has been spreading everywhere—with a special momentum in Latin America, but also in Africa and Asia.” Third, “it is a factor in the development of democracy in a progressive direction. . . . These assemblies have demonstrated, parliamentarians are less bound by governmental commitments and act with greater freedom” (111). Fourth, “it is an expression of the reality of world economic and political complexity. Bringing states, economies, and territories together and harmonizing legislation in a joint decision-making process, it affords more and better responses.” Fifth, “parliament is society’s proper representative in promoting, criticizing, and, if necessary condemning. Governments are much mistaken if they seek to disregard the parliamentary dimension. The people will not allow them to.” But “the limitations of this form of parliamentarianism, its lack of sovereignty, its inability to set and impose standards, are to be regretted. . . . And the danger exists that the multiplicity of these structures may render them superficial and purely symbolic.” (112)

From the author’s perspective, the developments challenge the long-established practice that only the executive branches of States should represent themselves in interstate organizations. In relation to the UN context, should the present, largely IPU-defined parliamentary relationship with the UN be permitted to evolve? Should a more explicit future vision of an IPU-led parliamentarian–UN relationship be developed? Instead, would the best peacebuilding strategy call for a directly elected UN Parliamentary Assembly? In the European context, the existence of a significant parliamentary organization presence in Europe challenges us to ponder two questions in particular: Are developments in Europe a model that other regions should aspire to follow? And/or are developments in Europe a model that the entire world should follow?

The review of parliamentarian bodies makes it very obvious that those who are interested in the democratic quality of global governance must consider the contributions made by parliamentarians of States. Key questions include: Should parliamentarians of States become involved with parliamentarians of other States in coping with problems that transcend the borders of their State? If they should, how should this be done? How does their personal involvement with parliamentarians of other States impact the nature of their agenda in their home parliament? How does it affect their policy on existing issues? Does it cause them to add new issues to the agenda? How are their policies affected by the regional membership of organizations in which they are involved? In addition, it is useful to know how much influence members of a specific State parliament have when they are participating in interstate parliamentary organizations. Clearly, further research is needed that considers the impact this experience has on participating parliamentarians and how it affects the influence that they have on both the parliament of their State and the inter-State parliament in which they participate.

Certainly those engaged in the activities described are engaged in “experiments” that are responsive to the “democratic theory” needs identified by Dahl and Tufte in the introduction to this paper. What are the implications of this growth in the array of actors in world politics? Why are civil society, business, local authorities, and parliamentarians now extending their activities into global governance? Obviously, it is because the boundaries of all significant public policy issues now reach across the entire globe. Nevertheless, each of these public

policy issues has a diversity of local dimensions. Thus, efforts at global governance confront the need for simultaneously coping with issues on a global scale and in the context of governance for a diversity of more local boundaries. This is, indeed, a difficult challenge. Although individual actors have not explained their behavior in these terms, the totality of their efforts implies this hypothesis: *In a world of escalating interdependence, local democracy is not feasible without global democracy, and global democracy is not feasible without local democracy.* But these practitioners have no theory to guide them.

REFERENCES

- Alger, Chadwick F. (2011): "Searching for Democratic Potential in Emerging Global Governance: What Are the Implications of Regional and Global Involvements of Local governments?" *International Journal of Peace Studies* 16 (2): 1–24.
- Alger, Chadwick F. (2010): "Expanding Governmental Diversity in Global Governance: Parliamentarians of States and Local Governments," *Global Governance* 16(1): 59–80.
- Alger, Chadwick F. (2007): "Widening Participation," in Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of the United Nations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Alger, Chadwick F. (2003): "Searching for Democratic Potential in Emerging Global Governance," in Bruce Morrison (ed.): *Transnational Democracy in Critical and Comparative Perspective*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Cardoso Report, Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations–Civil Society Relations [A/58/817 and A/58/817/Corr.1].
- Childers, Erskine and Brian Urquhart (1994): *Renewing the United Nations System*. Uppsala, Sweden: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Commission on Global Governance (1995): *Our Global Neighborhood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cutler, Robert M. (2001): "The Emergence of International Parliamentary Institutions: New Networks of Influence in World Society," in Gordon Smith and Daniel Wolfish (eds.): *Who Is Afraid of the State? Canada in a World of Multiple Centres of Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. and Edward R. Tufte (1973): *Size and Democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- de Puig, Lluís Maria (2008) *International Parliaments*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Hoffmann-Contreras, Carlos (2007) "Interparliamentary Organizations in the World: Objectives, Functions and Areas of Interest," Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP), available at <http://www.asgp.co/node/29908>.
- Johnsson, Anders B. (2003): "A Parliamentary Dimension to International Cooperation," in Saul Mendlovitz and Barbara Walker (eds.): *A Reader on Second Assembly and Parliamentary Proposals*. Wayne, NJ: Center for UN Reform Education.
- Karns, David A. (1977): "The Effect of Interparliamentary Meetings on the Foreign Policy Attitudes of United States Congressmen," *International Organization* 31(3): 497–513.
- Katz, Richard S. and Bernhard Wessels (eds.) (1999): *The European Parliament, the National Parliaments, and European Integration*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Brien, Mitchell, Rick Stapenhurst, and Niall Johnston (eds.) (2008): *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-Affected Countries*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Roche, Douglas (2003): "The Case for a UN Parliamentary Assembly," in Saul H. Mendlovitz and Barbara Walker (eds.): *A Reader on Secondary Assembly and Parliamentary Proposals*. Wayne, NJ: Center for UN Reform Education.

Sabic, Zlatko (2010): “Parliamentarians as International Actors: Members of the U.S. Congress and International Parliamentary Institutions,” Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 17–20.

Sabic, Zlatko (2008): “Building Democratic and Responsible Global Governance: The Role of International Parliamentary Institutions,” *Parliamentary Affairs* 61(2): 235–71.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER READING³

Cofelice, Andrea and Stelios Stavridis (2014): “The European Parliament as an International Parliamentary Institution (IPI).” *European Foreign Affairs Review* 19(2): 145–78.

Costa, Oliver, Clarissa Dri, and Stelios Stavridis (2013): *Parliamentary Dimensions of Regionalization and Globalization: The Role of Inter-Parliamentary Institutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malamud, Andrés and Stelios Stavridis (2011): “Parliaments and Parliamentarians as International Actors,” in Bob Reinalda (ed.): *The Ashgate Research Companion to Non-State Actors*. Farnham: Ashgate.

3. Our thanks to Zlatko Sabic for providing these references.