

A Recursive Measure of Voting Power that Satisfies Reasonable Postulates

A. Abizadeh*

A. Vetta†

May 10, 2021

Abstract

We design a recursive measure of voting power based upon partial voting efficacy as well as full voting efficacy. In contrast, classical indices and measures of voting power incorporate only partial voting efficacy. We motivate our design by representing voting games using a division lattice and via the notion of random walks in stochastic processes, and show the viability of our recursive measure by proving it satisfies a plethora of postulates that any reasonable voting measure should satisfy. These include the iso-invariance, dummy, dominance, donation, bloc, quarrel, and added blocker postulates.

1 Introduction

A fundamental question in the empirical study and institutional design of decision-making bodies – from committees or legislatures to international, transnational, and supranational bodies such as those of the EU – is how much decision-making power each actor has in virtue of their standing to vote. This question has led to numerous attempts to specify an adequate measure of voting power. There have been two approaches to justifying proposed measures. The first is the *axiomatic* approach, which seeks to identify a set of reasonable axioms that uniquely pick out a single measure of voting power. To date this justificatory approach has proved a failure: while many have succeeded in providing axiomatic characterizations of various measures, that is, in providing the set of axioms uniquely satisfied by a given measure, no one has succeeded in doing so for a set of axioms all of which are independently justified. In other words, no one has succeeded in showing why it would be reasonable to expect a measure of voting power to satisfy the entire set of axioms that uniquely pick out a proposed measure. For example, Dubey (1975) and Dubey and Shapley (1979) have characterized the classic Shapely-Shubik index (*SS*) and Penrose-Banzhaf measure (*PB*) as uniquely satisfying a distinct set of axioms, respectively, but, as critics have noted, several of

*Department of Political Science, McGill University: arash.abizadeh@mcgill.ca

†Department of Mathematics & Statistics and School of Computer Science, McGill University: adrian.vetta@mcgill.ca

the axioms lack proper justification.¹ In particular, the *additivity* (or *transfer*) postulate used to characterize both is unmotivated, and the postulates distinguishing the two (namely, *efficiency* for *SS* and *total power* for *PB*) are either unnecessary or ad hoc (Straffin 1982: 292-296; Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 194-195; Laruelle and Valenciano 2001).

The second, *two-pronged* approach is more modest and involves combining two prongs of justification. The first prong is to motivate a proposed measure on conceptual grounds, showing the sense in which it captures the intuitive meaning of what voting power is. With this conceptual justification in place, the second prong of justification then requires showing that the measure satisfies a set of reasonable postulates, that is, a set of postulates we should expect any reasonable measure of voting power to satisfy. For the more modest approach, both prongs of justification are necessary: on the one hand, because more than one measure may satisfy the set of reasonable axioms, we must turn to conceptual justification to adjudicate between competing proposals; on the other hand, any violations of reasonable postulates count against a measure regardless of how intuitive an interpretation can be provided for its meaning. Thus, for this two-pronged approach, the satisfaction of reasonable postulates serves, not to pick out a uniquely reasonable measure, but to rule out unreasonable measures.

The first prong of justification has been typically carried out in *probabilistic* terms. For example, the *a priori* Penrose-Banzhaf measure equates a player's voting power, in a given voting structure, with the proportion of logically possible *divisions* or complete vote configurations (an ordered partition of the set of players) in which the player is (fully) *decisive* for the division outcome, i.e., in which the player has an alternative voting strategy such that, if it were to choose that alternative instead, the outcome would be different (holding all other players' votes constant). The standard interpretation is that the *a priori PB* measure represents the probability a player will be decisive under the assumptions of *equiprobable voting* (the probability a player votes for an alternative is equal to the probability it votes for any other) and *voting independence* (votes are not correlated),² which together imply *equiprobable divisions* (the probability of each division is equal) (Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 37-38). The classic *a priori PB* measure is a special case of a generalized measure that weights a player's decisiveness in each division by a probability for that division; the generalized measure therefore represents the probability a player will be decisive given some probability distribution for the divisions. If the probability of each division is set to its actual ex ante probability – that is, given the actual distribution of players' preferences and the potential effects of strategic considerations on voting behaviour – then the generalized measure yields a measure of so-called *a posteriori* voting power.³

Thus the first prong of justification for the classic *PB*, in both *a priori* and generalized forms, has been to show the intuitive plausibility of equating voting power with the probability of decisiveness,

¹For the introduction of these measures, see Shapley and Shubik (1954) for *SS* and Penrose (1946) and Banzhaf (1965, 1966) for *PB*. For recent discussion, see Felsenthal and Machover (1998, 2004) and Laruelle and Valenciano (2008).

²That is: the unconditional probability any player *i* votes for an alternative equals the probability *i* does so conditional on a particular vote configuration of all other players; and the unconditional probability of any given vote configuration of all other players equals its probability condition on *i* voting for a given alternative.

³On the distinction between *a priori* and *a posteriori* voting power, see Felsenthal and Machover (2003, 2004).

by arguing in favour of equating the notion of having efficaciously exercised power to effect an outcome with that of being decisive for it. Similarly, *SS* has been interpreted in probabilistic terms as the probability a player will be decisive if players share a common standard by which they judge the desirability of alternatives, which can be formalized as the probability of decisiveness given a probability distribution of divisions resulting from “homogeneous” voting behaviour, that is, if the probability any player votes for some arbitrary alternative is the same for all players and selected from a uniform distribution on $[0,1]$ (Owen 1975; Straffin 1977; Leech 1990; Laruelle and Valenciano 2005b). On this probabilistic interpretation, *SS* is therefore not a measure of a priori voting power, but of a posteriori voting power under such a homogeneous probability distribution assumption.⁴

However, measures of voting power based exclusively on the ex ante probability of decisiveness – including *PB* in both a priori and generalized forms – suffer from a crucial conceptual flaw. The motivation for basing a measure of voting power on this notion is that decisiveness is supposed to formalize the idea of a player *making a difference* to the outcome. To equate a player’s voting power with the player’s ex ante probability of being decisive is to assume that if any particular division were hypothetically to occur, then the player would have efficaciously exercised power to help produce the outcome ex post if and only if that player would have been decisive or necessary for the outcome. Yet this assumption is false: sometimes an actor has efficaciously exercised its power to effect an outcome ex post, and, through the exercise of that power, made a causal contribution to the outcome, even though the actor’s contribution was not decisive to it.⁵

This is the case, for example, for *causally overdetermined* outcomes. Consider a three-player vote under majority rule. In a unanimous 3-0 YES-vote, no single individual player is (fully) decisive for the outcome: for any single player, even if that player had voted NO, the YES-outcome would have remained intact. Yet it would be a mistake to conclude that, because no single player has “made a difference” to the outcome, in the sense of being decisive, none has, by exercising its voting power, helped to cause it. The notion of exercising power to effect an outcome is, in other words, broader than the notion of making a difference (and hence of being decisive). More specifically, reducing voting power to the ex ante probability of being decisive fails to take into account players’ *partial* causal efficacy in producing outcomes ex post. This failure is why *PB* interprets each individual player, in the unanimous 3-0 division, as not having efficaciously exercised any voting power ex post at all – even though in fact each player causally contributes and hence is partially efficacious in realizing it. Decisiveness measures of voting power, in other words, falter on the first prong of justification concerning their conceptual foundations.⁶

⁴As an a priori index, by contrast, *SS* has been interpreted as an index of the relative *value* of a player’s a priori voting power, and therefore as, for example, a bribe index (Morriss 2002), or the player’s expected payoff assuming a cooperative game with transferable utility (Felsenthal and Machover 1998).

⁵We here presuppose a notion of active power to effect outcomes as a conditional-dispositional property along the lines defended by Morriss (2002).

⁶For more extensive defence of this point, see Abizadeh (working paper). On partial causation, see also Wright (1985, 1988), McDermott (1995), Ramachandran (1997), Hitchcock (2001), Halpern and Pearl (2005), Hall (2007), and Braham and van Hees (2009). It might be objected that overdetermined outcomes may be caused by the mereological sum of individuals, rather than by any of the individuals in particular (Lewis 1986; Barry 2002: 181-82). But as Schaffer (2003) has argued, it is wholly implausible to attribute emergent causal properties to a collective none of whose individual members plays a causal role.

In this paper, we design a *Recursive Measure (RM)* of voting power that remedies this shortcoming, by taking into account partial efficacy or degrees of causal efficacy. To ask whether a player would have been decisive or *fully efficacious* if various divisions were to have occurred is obviously to ask a set of hypothetical questions about what would counterfactually be the case if a given vote configuration were to arise. Similarly, to ask whether a player would have been *partially efficacious* within a particular division, we pose a further series of *nested* hypothetical questions counterfactualizing about that division itself. In particular, for any division whose outcome is causally overdetermined, we ask: Would the player have been decisive if a division with the same outcome had occurred that was identical to the overdetermined division except that one player who voted in favour of the outcome were to vote against it? And in what proportion of such doubly counterfactualized, outcome-preserving divisions would the player be decisive? For example, in the unanimous 3-0 division under majority rule, there are three such doubly counterfactualized divisions, each of which preserves the YES outcome by 2-1. And each YES-voter in the 3-0 division would be decisive in two of these three hypothetical divisions. This yields a measure of the player’s partial efficacy in the unanimous division (namely, $\frac{2}{3}$). And if the doubly counterfactualized divisions are themselves causally overdetermined, then we must of course recursively iterate the calculation for them.

This is how *RM* is constructed, which is why we call it the Recursive Measure. A full conceptual justification for the measure – i.e., the first prong of justification on the more modest approach – is given in Abizadeh (working paper). The key to this justification lies in the fact that *RM* does not reduce the efficacious exercise of voting power to being decisive; the measure is grounded, rather, in the broader notion of causal efficacy. *RM* represents, not the *probability* a player will be decisive for the division outcome (the probability the player will be *fully causally efficacious* in bringing it about) but, rather, the player’s *expected efficacy*, that is, the probability the player will make a causal contribution to the outcome weighted by the degree of causal efficacy. Whereas decisiveness measures such as *PB* solely track full efficacy, *RM* tracks partial efficacy as well.

Yet no matter how intuitively plausible, and no matter how strong the justification of its conceptual foundations, *RM* would not be a viable measure of voting power unless it also satisfied a number of postulates that arguably any reasonable measure ought to satisfy. As we have argued, the more modest approach requires supplementing the first, conceptual prong of justification with the second, postulate-satisfaction prong. Our task in this paper is to furnish this second prong of justification. In particular, we take it that any reasonable measure of a priori voting power should satisfy, for simple voting games, the *iso-invariance*, *dummy*, *dominance*, *donation*, *bloc*, *quarrel*, and *added blocker* postulates. We here explain the intuitive justification for each of these voting-power postulates, and then prove that *RM* satisfies them for a priori power in simple voting games. Moreover, we prove these postulates by introducing a new way of representing voting games using a division lattice, and show that previous formulations of some of these postulates require revision.

2 The Voting Model

In this section we present voting games and, in particular, the class of simple voting games that are ubiquitous in the literature. We then explain how voting games can be represented by the division lattice. This lattice representation will subsequently be used in Section 3 to design a recursive measure of voting power that incorporates partial causal efficacy.

2.1 Simple Voting Games

Let $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a nonempty, finite set of players with two strategies, voting YES or voting NO, and let $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{YES}, \text{NO}\}$ be the set of alternative outcomes. A division $\mathbb{S} = (S, \bar{S})$ of the set $[n]$ is an ordered partition of players where the first element in the ordered pair is the set of YES-voters and the second element is the set of NO-voters in \mathbb{S} . Thus, for $\mathbb{S} = (S, \bar{S})$, the subset $S \subseteq [n]$ comprises the set of YES-voters and the subset $\bar{S} = [n] \setminus S$ comprises the set of NO-voters. Note that we shall frequently use the convention of representing a bipartitioned division by its first element in blackboard bold.

Let \mathcal{D} be the set of all logically possible divisions \mathbb{S} of $[n]$. A *binary voting game*, in which each player has two possible strategies, is a function $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{S})$ mapping the set of all possible divisions \mathcal{D} to two outcomes in \mathcal{O} . A *monotonic* binary voting game is one satisfying the condition:

- (i) **Monotonicity.** If $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{S}) = \text{YES}$ and $S \subseteq T$, then $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}) = \text{YES}$.

Monotonicity states that if a division outcome is YES, then the outcome of any division in which at least the same players vote YES will also be YES. Hence, monotonicity states that if a set of players could ensure a YES-outcome by each voting YES, then any superset of those players could do so as well.

A *simple voting game* is a monotonic binary voting game that satisfies the additional condition:

- (ii) **Non-Triviality.** $\exists \mathbb{S} \mid \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{S}) = \text{YES}$ and $\exists \mathbb{T} \mid \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}) = \text{NO}$.

Non-Triviality states that not all divisions yield the same outcome, that is, there is at least one division whose outcome is YES and at least one whose outcome is NO. Observe that together monotonicity and non-triviality ensure that simple voting games also have the desirable property of unanimity, which states that if everyone votes NO, the outcome is NO, and if everyone votes YES, the outcome is YES.

- (iii) **Unanimity.** $\mathcal{G}((\emptyset, [n])) = \text{NO}$ and $\mathcal{G}([n], \emptyset) = \text{YES}$.

We remark that *unanimity* immediately implies non-triviality. Thus conditions (i) and (iii) also characterize the class of simple voting games.

Call any player whose vote corresponds to the division outcome a *successful* player. Let \mathcal{W} be the collection of all sets of players S such that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{S}) = \text{YES}$ (that is, if each member of S were to vote YES, they would be successful YES-voters). We call this the collection of *YES-successful subsets* of $[n]$, also commonly called *winning coalitions*. We can now alternatively characterize conditions (i) and (iii) as:

- (i) **Monotonicity.** If $S \in \mathcal{W}$ and $S \subseteq T$ then $T \in \mathcal{W}$.
- (iii) **Unanimity.** $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{W}$ and $[n] \in \mathcal{W}$.

In the discussion and proofs that follow, it should be understood that, as is standard in the voting-

power literature, we are discussing simple voting games so defined.

2.2 The Division Lattice

The divisions of a voting game can be plotted on a lattice, called the *division lattice* $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{D}, \succeq)$. There is an element \mathbb{S} in the lattice for each ordered division $\mathbb{S} = (S, \bar{S})$. The elements of the lattice are ordered by comparing the sets of players who vote YES in each division. Specifically, for $\mathbb{T} = (T, \bar{T})$, we have $\mathbb{S} \succeq \mathbb{T}$ if and only if $T \subset S$; that is, the YES-voters in \mathbb{T} are a strict subset of those in \mathbb{S} . This implies that the supremum (top element) of the lattice is the division $[n] = ([n], \emptyset)$ where every player votes YES. Similarly, the infimum (bottom element) of the lattice is the division $(\emptyset, [n])$ where every player votes NO. The elements of the lattice are coloured grey if the division is a YES-outcome and coloured white if the division is a NO-outcome.

For example, consider the weighted voting game $\mathcal{G} = \{8; 5, 4, 3, 2\}$, which we shall use as a running example. A *weighted voting game* is a voting game in which each player's vote has a fixed weight; not all voting games are weighted voting games (Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 31-32). The number prior to the semicolon is the quota required for a YES-outcome; and the numbers after the semi-colon are the weights of each player's vote. The division lattice for this weighted game is shown in Figure 1 where each logically possible division \mathbb{S} is labelled by its YES-voters S .




Figure 1: The Division Lattice \mathcal{L} and its YES-outcomes and NO-outcomes.

Call a division \mathbb{S} *winning* if its outcome is YES and *losing* if its outcome is NO. Thus, the division lattice \mathcal{L} induces two posets, one consisting of the winning YES-divisions and another consisting of the losing NO-divisions. These are illustrated in Figure 2 for the voting game $\{8; 5, 4, 3, 2\}$.

It is useful to invert the poset of losing divisions so that it has a supremum $(\emptyset, [n])$. Thus we obtain two posets with supremums, called the YES-poset and the NO-poset, respectively. See Figure 3.

In the YES-poset, we say that \mathbb{T} is a *loyal child* of \mathbb{S} (and \mathbb{S} is a *loyal parent* of \mathbb{T}) if and only if $S = T \cup \{j\}$. That is, \mathbb{T} is identical to \mathbb{S} except that exactly one less player votes YES in \mathbb{T} than in \mathbb{S} . The nomenclature *loyal* refers to the fact that \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{T} have the same outcome. Symmetrically,




Figure 2: Two Induced Posets.




Figure 3: The YES-poset and the NO-poset.

in the NO-poset, we say that \mathbb{T} is a *loyal child* of \mathbb{S} (and \mathbb{S} is a *loyal parent* of \mathbb{T}) if and only if $S = T \setminus \{j\}$. That is, \mathbb{T} is identical to \mathbb{S} except that exactly one less player votes NO in \mathbb{T} than in \mathbb{S} . Moreover, we call a division's *loyal descendants* those divisions that are its loyal children, their loyal children, and so on.

We maintain the same terminology when describing the entire division lattice \mathcal{L} , denoting by $LC(\mathbb{S})$ the set of loyal children of \mathbb{S} in \mathcal{L} . Notice that this implies that if \mathbb{S} is a winning YES-division then its loyal children, if it has any, lie immediately *beneath* it in \mathcal{L} . By contrast, since the NO-poset was inverted, if \mathbb{S} is a losing NO-division then its loyal children, if it has any, lie immediately *above* it in the division lattice \mathcal{L} .

3 The Recursive Measure of Voting Power

Our goal is to construct a measure of voting power that incorporates partial causal efficacy, which, we suggested, requires a recursive measure. How exactly should such a measure be defined? Our formulation, presented in Section 3.1, is motivated by the division lattice representation of voting games, in particular, via the loyal children concept proffered by the YES-poset and NO-poset. We provide an example illustrating how the measure is calculated using a weighted voting game in Section 3.2 and an interpretation of the measure, in terms of random walks on the YES-poset and NO-poset, in Section 3.3.

The strength of our proposed measure will be demonstrated in Sections 4 to 9 where we show it satisfies a series of reasonable voting postulates, namely, the iso-invariance, dummy, dominance, donation, bloc, quarrel, and added blocker postulates.

3.1 A Recursive Formulation

We define a *measure of voting power* for simple voting games as a function π that assigns to each player i a nonnegative real number $\pi_i \geq 0$ and that satisfies two sets of basic adequacy postulates: the *iso-invariance* postulate, according to which the a priori voting power of any player remains the same between two isomorphic games; and the *dummy* postulates, according to which a player has zero a priori voting power if and only if it is a dummy (i.e., not decisive in any division), and the addition of a dummy to a voting structure leaves other players' a priori voting power unchanged (Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 236; see section 4 below). We define an *efficacy measure* of voting power (of which decisiveness measures such as PB are a species) as a measure based strictly on the causal efficacy of the player in each of the voting games divisions (the player's division *efficacy score*), weighted by the significance of each division (the division's *probability*).

An efficacy measure of voting power π therefore assigns to each player i a value

$$\pi_i = \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})$$

where $\alpha_i(\mathbb{S})$ is the division efficacy score of player i in division \mathbb{S} and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})$ is the ex ante probability (weight) of \mathbb{S} , for any division $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}$. The focus in this paper will be on *a priori* measures. Thus, we assume equiprobable divisions and set $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$. In particular, for binary voting games, $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} = \frac{1}{2^n}$.

The key characteristic of a given efficacy measure is therefore its specification of the division efficacy score. For example, the classic PB measure defines the division efficacy score *non-recursively* as

$$\alpha_i^{PB}(\mathbb{S}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ is decisive in } \mathbb{S} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A player i is *YES-decisive* in division \mathbb{S} if and only if $i \in S \in \mathcal{W}$ but $S \setminus \{i\} \notin \mathcal{W}$; is *NO-decisive* if and only if $i \notin S \notin \mathcal{W}$ but $S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{W}$; and is *decisive* if and only if it is either YES-decisive or NO-decisive.

Given the conceptual shortcomings inherent to a measure based only on full causal efficacy, we incorporate partial causal efficacy via a recursive definition of the division efficacy score. Specifically, the *Recursive Measure of Voting Power (RM)* is defined as

$$RM_i = \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha_i(\mathbb{S})$, the division efficacy score of player i in division \mathbb{S} , is defined recursively as

$$\alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ is decisive in } \mathbb{S} \\ 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is not successful in } \mathbb{S} \\ \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S})|} \cdot \sum_{\hat{\mathbb{S}} \in LC(\mathbb{S})} \alpha_i(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $LC(\mathbb{S})$ is the set of loyal children of \mathbb{S} in the division lattice.

To compute the efficacy score α for a player we distinguish between its YES-*efficacy score* α^+ and its NO-*efficacy score* α^- . For RM these are defined recursively as:

$$\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ is YES-decisive in } \mathbb{S} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbb{S} \text{ is losing or if } i \notin S \\ \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S})|} \cdot \sum_{\hat{\mathbb{S}} \in LC(\mathbb{S})} \alpha_i^+(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ is NO-decisive in } \mathbb{S} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbb{S} \text{ is winning or if } i \in S \\ \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S})|} \cdot \sum_{\hat{\mathbb{S}} \in LC(\mathbb{S})} \alpha_i^-(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The efficacy score is then the sum of the YES-*efficacy* and NO-*efficacy* scores, $\alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S})$. Correspondingly, RM can be written as the sum of a *Recursive Measure of YES-Voting Power* RM^+ and a *Recursive Measure of NO-Voting Power* RM^- :

$$\begin{aligned} RM_i &= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} (\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S})) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\ &= RM_i^+ + RM_i^- \end{aligned}$$

Note that decisiveness measures of a priori voting power such as PB can be computed using a shortcut. Precisely because such measures only consider full decisiveness, their measure of a priori YES- and NO-voting power will be equal. This is because, by definition of decisiveness, for each winning division in which a voter is YES-decisive, there is exactly one corresponding losing division in which the voter is NO-decisive. It follows that $PB^+ = PB^-$ and that PB is therefore equal to

$$PB_i = \frac{\sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^{+PB}(\mathbb{S})}{2^{n-1}}$$

This symmetry between a priori YES- and NO-voting power does not hold, however, for efficacy measures in general. In a division in which a voter is only partially YES-*efficacious*, in the corresponding division in which all other votes are held constant but in which the player votes NO, the voter will be zero NO-*efficacious* because the player will now be unsuccessful. This is why we cannot calculate RM using a shortcut formula analogous to the one typically used for PB , but must do so on the basis of both RM^+ and RM^- .

3.2 Calculating Efficacy Scores via the Yes-Poset and No-Poset

We can calculate the efficacy scores of player i via the YES-Poset and NO-Poset. Again we illustrate this using the posets of Figure 3 for the weighted game $\{8; 5, 4, 3, 2\}$.

Using these two posets we recursively find the efficacy scores of each player at each node. For example, let's calculate the efficacy scores for player 2. In the YES-poset, the divisions \mathbb{S} where player 2 is YES-decisive in Figure 4 are striped downwards (from left to right) and its YES-efficacy score is $\alpha_2^+(\mathbb{S}) = 1$. For any winning division where player 2 votes NO, its YES-efficacy score is $\alpha_2^+(\mathbb{S}) = 0$. (Note that the YES-efficacy score of each player, including player 2, is zero for every node in the NO-poset, since they are all losing divisions.) The values of the remaining nodes for player 2 in the YES-poset are then calculated recursively; see Figure 4.

Similarly, in the NO-poset, the nodes where player 2 is NO-decisive are striped upwards and its NO-efficacy score is $\alpha_2^-(\mathbb{S}) = 1$. For any losing division where player 2 votes YES, its NO-efficacy score is $\alpha_2^-(\mathbb{S}) = 0$. (Note that the NO-efficacy score of each player, including player 2, is zero for every node in the YES-poset, since they are all winning divisions.) The values of the remaining nodes for player 2 in the NO-poset are then calculated recursively; again, see Figure 4.




Figure 4: Calculating the Efficacy Scores Recursively.

These values can be shown on a single picture using the division lattice \mathcal{L} as in Figure 5.




Figure 5: The Efficacy Scores

Given the efficacy scores we may compute the a priori RM voting power of the second player. Reading from Figure 4, we see that $RM_2^+ = \frac{1}{16}(\frac{5}{8} + \frac{1}{2} + 1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 0) = \frac{33}{128}$ and $RM_2^- = \frac{1}{16}(1 + 0 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 0 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{13}{24}) = \frac{113}{384}$. Hence $RM_2 = RM_2^+ + RM_2^- = \frac{33}{128} + \frac{113}{384} = \frac{212}{384} = \frac{53}{96}$.

3.3 Random Walks

There is a natural interpretation of the *RM* efficacy scores via the concept of random walks in stochastic processes. Specifically, if \mathbb{S} yields a YES-outcome, the YES-efficacy score of player i is the probability that a uniform random walk starting at \mathbb{S} in the YES-poset ever reaches a node where i is YES-decisive. Here a uniform random walk means that from the initial node the walk travels next to any loyal child with equal probability, and then to any loyal child of those nodes with equal probability, and so on. The random walk terminates when it reaches a node with no loyal children. For example, in Figure 4, at the node represented by $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$ player 2 has a YES-efficacy score equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ because a random walk starting there has two loyal children, and moves to each with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, and in each case then terminates because neither of these loyal children have any loyal children themselves. The second player is YES-decisive in the loyal child represented by $S = \{2, 3\}$ but not in the one represented by $S = \{1, 3\}$. Thus half the random walks starting from the node represented by $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$ pass through a node in which player 2 is YES-decisive; consequently $\alpha_2^+(\mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Symmetrically, if \mathbb{S} yields a NO-outcome, the NO-efficacy score of player i is the probability that a uniform random walk starting at \mathbb{S} in the NO-poset ever reaches a node where i is NO-decisive. Here a uniform random walk means that from the initial node the walk travels next to any loyal child with equal probability, etc., and terminates when it reaches a node with no loyal children. For example, in Figure 4, at the node $\mathbb{S} = \emptyset$, the second player has a NO-efficacy score equal to $\frac{13}{24}$. The reader may verify that a random walk starting from $\mathbb{S} = (\emptyset, [n])$ hits a node where i is NO-decisive with probability $\frac{13}{24}$.

This combinatorial view applies because such random walks naturally encode the recursive formula's defining efficacy scores. This viewpoint, whilst not required in the proofs that follow, provides additional insight into the proofs' motivation.

4 Minimal Adequacy Postulates

In the rest of the paper, we assess the strength of *RM* by testing it against a set of voting postulates.⁷ We begin with two sets of basic *adequacy postulates*, namely the *iso-invariance postulate* and *dummy postulates*, which any reasonable measure of a priori voting power ought to satisfy (Felsenthal and Machover 1998), and whose satisfaction we embedded in the definition of a measure of voting power. We shall now prove that *RM* satisfies these postulates.

4.1 The Iso-Invariance Postulate

Two voting games \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ are *isomorphic* if each division in the one maps in a one-to-one correspondence onto an identical division with the **same** outcome in the other. In particular, the YES-successful sets \mathcal{W} and $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$ are identical after relabelling the players' names. The iso-invariance postulate requires that any player's a priori voting power in two isomorphic simple voting games

⁷For a comprehensive treatment of the postulates most typically deemed to be reasonable to expect measures of voting power to satisfy, see Felsenthal and Machover (1988) and Laruelle and Valenciano (2005a).

be identical. Specifically, a measure of voting power π satisfies the *iso-invariance postulate* if, given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$:

(ISO) For iso-invariant voting games \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, we have $\pi_i = \hat{\pi}_i$ for any player i .

Evidently, a violation of the iso-invariance postulate would be a critical defect in a voting measure: iso-invariance merely expresses the requirement that a priori voting power depend on nothing but the structure of the game itself and the position of each player in that structure.

Theorem 4.1. *RM satisfies the iso-invariance postulate.*

Proof. This follows immediately by the recursive definition of *RM*, since the YES-posets and NO-posets for player i are identical in \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. \square

4.2 The Dummy Postulates

We say that a player d is a *dummy voter* if it is never decisive in any logically possible division. That is, a division $(S \cup \{d\}, \bar{S} \setminus \{d\})$ yields a YES-outcome *if and only if* the division (S, \bar{S}) yields a YES-outcome. (Again adopting the convention of representing a bipartitioned division by its first element in blackboard bold, we shall represent the former division as $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbb{d}$ and the latter as \mathbb{S} .)

The dummy postulates require, in a simple voting game, that *all* dummies have zero a priori voting power, that *only* dummies have zero a priori voting power, and that adding a dummy to a game has no effect on other players' a priori voting power. The first dummy postulate is reasonable because a dummy is effectively a non-player; the second is reasonable because, by definition, non-dummies are decisive in at least one possible division; and the third is reasonable because, just as changes in the population of (literal) non-players outside of $[n]$ have no impact on players' a priori voting power, so too should changes in the population of dummies who are members of $[n]$ have no impact.⁸

More formally, let $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ be the game formed by the addition of a dummy voter d to \mathcal{G} . A measure of voting power π , according to which π_i and $\hat{\pi}_i$ are player i 's voting power in \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, respectively, satisfies the *dummy postulates* if, given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$:⁹

(DUM-1) If i is a dummy voter, then $\pi_i = 0$.

(DUM-2) $\pi_i = 0$ only if i is a dummy voter.

(DUM-3) $\pi_i = \hat{\pi}_i$ for all $i \neq d$.

We will now prove that *RM* satisfies the three dummy postulates.

⁸Note that while it would be reasonable to expect all dummies to have zero voting power in general, by contrast, it would be unreasonable to expect only dummies to have zero voting power in general, because if only divisions in which the player is unsuccessful have positive probability, then even a non-dummy player might have zero a posteriori voting power; and it would be unreasonable to expect adding dummies to have no impact on others' voting power in general because a player's a posteriori power might change if its votes are correlated with the added dummy.

⁹(DUM-1) is called the *dummy property* and (DUM-3) the *strong dummy property* in Felsenthal et al. (1998: 87). See also Felsenthal and Machover (1998: 222), where (DUM-1) and (DUM-2) are together called *vanishing just for dummies* and (DUM-3) is called *ignoring dummies*.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\hat{\alpha}$ be the players' efficacy scores in the new game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ formed by the addition of a dummy voter d to \mathcal{G} . Then, for any subset of players S , $d \notin S$, the RM efficacy scores of any player i satisfy:*

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^-(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}_i^-(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = \alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S}) \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \quad (\text{A3})$$

Proof. Take any player i and division \mathbb{S} with YES-efficacy score $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$ in the game \mathcal{G} . Suppose a dummy d is added to create a new game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$.

First, we want to show that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$. The key fact is that i is YES-decisive at \mathbb{S} in \mathcal{G} if and only if it is YES-decisive at both \mathbb{S} and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. It follows immediately that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$, since the loyal descendants of \mathbb{S} in the YES-poset of the modified game form a subposet identical to the corresponding subposet, formed by \mathbb{S} 's loyal descendants, in the YES-poset of the original game. The properties of the corresponding random walks are then identical and so

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \quad (2)$$

Now we must show that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$. We proceed by induction on the cardinality of S . For the base case, $S = \emptyset$. Now, by unanimity, $\mathbb{S} = (\emptyset, [\hat{n}])$ is losing. Since d is a dummy it follows that the division \mathfrak{d} is also losing. Thus $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = 0 = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$.

For the induction step, if $i \notin S$ or $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}$ is losing, then $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) = 0 = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$. So assume $i \in S$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}$ is a winning division. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}) &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \sum_{\hat{\mathbb{S}} \in \hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{k} \in S \cup \{d\}} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{k} \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{k} \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{k} \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d})|} \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{k} \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) \end{aligned}$$

We remark that the second equality holds because $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d} \setminus \mathfrak{k}) = 0$ for any non-loyal child of $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathfrak{d}$. The fourth equality follows from (2). The fifth equality follows by the induction hypothesis.

Now $|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})| = |\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S})| + 1$ because d is a dummy voter. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d}) &= \frac{1}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S})|}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|} \cdot \frac{1}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathbb{S}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \frac{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S})|}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{|\widehat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d})|}\right) \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (A1) holds. A symmetric argument applies to show $\hat{\alpha}^-(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}^-(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d}) = \alpha^-(\mathbb{S})$ and thus (A2). Summing (A1) and (A2), we then obtain $\hat{\alpha}(\mathbb{S}) = \hat{\alpha}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{d}) = \alpha(\mathbb{S})$. So (A3) holds. \square

Theorem 4.3. *RM satisfies the dummy postulates.*

Proof. Take any winning division \mathbb{S} where $d \in S$. Since d is a dummy, it follows that $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{d}$ is also a winning division. Thus, d is never decisive and recursively we have that $\alpha_d^+(\mathbb{S}) = 0$. Similarly, $\alpha_d^-(\mathbb{S}) = 0$. Hence, $\alpha_d(\mathbb{S}) = \alpha_d^+(\mathbb{S}) + \alpha_d^-(\mathbb{S}) = 0$ and so a dummy voter's efficacy score is zero at any division \mathbb{S} . Property (DUM-1) then holds since

$$RM_d = \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_d(\mathbb{S}) = 0$$

On the other hand, assume that player i is not a dummy. Then there exists a division \mathbb{T} at which i is YES-decisive. So, by definition, we have $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{T}) = 1$. Property (DUM-2) then holds since

$$RM_i = \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{T}) = \frac{1}{2^n} > 0$$

Now consider property (DUM-3). Then, for any voting-independent probability distribution \mathbb{P} , when a dummy voter d is added to the game we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
R\hat{M}_i &= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{S}) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \notin S} \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \in S} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{d}) \cdot \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{S}) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \notin S} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \in S} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(d \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{d}) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}: d \notin S} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(d \text{ votes no}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(d \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(d \text{ votes no}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= RM_i
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second equality holds by Lemma 4.2. The third equality follows from voting independence in \mathbb{P} . Thus RM satisfies (DUM-3) for any voting-independent probability distribution.

As stated, our interest lies in the equiprobable division distribution $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} = \frac{1}{2^n}$. We remark that an equiprobable division distribution could violate voting independence, but in such cases the probability distribution of divisions is identical to an equiprobable distribution that does satisfy voting independence (and equiprobable voting). Therefore, the proof still applies and (DUM-3) is also satisfied for any a priori RM. \square

5 The Dominance Postulate

Here we consider the dominance postulate. For any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \notin S$, we say that player j *weakly dominates* player i if for any winning division $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$, the division $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ is winning. A player *strictly dominates* another if the former weakly dominates the latter but not vice versa.

A measure of voting power π satisfies the *dominance postulate* if, given equiprobable divisions

$$\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}:$$

(DOM-1) $\pi_j \geq \pi_i$ whenever j weakly dominates i , and

(DOM-2) $\pi_j > \pi_i$ whenever j strictly dominates i .

Thus the dominance postulate holds that a player who is able to replace another player in any successful subset of players without compromising the subset's success, and who sometimes can replace that player in an unsuccessful subset and render it successful, ought to have greater a priori voting power than the latter (and that if two players can each replace the other in any successful subset without affecting the outcome, they ought to have equal voting power). This is reasonable to expect of any measure of a priori voting power because a (strictly) dominant player is just as effective as the dominated player (and then some).¹⁰

We will now prove RM satisfies the dominance postulate.

Lemma 5.1. *For any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \notin S$, we have $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$ and $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$ whenever j weakly dominates i .*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the cardinality of S . For the base case, $S = \emptyset$ and $|S| = 0$. Now, by the unanimity condition, $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{W}$, so \mathbb{S} is losing. If $\mathbf{i} = (\{i\}, [n] \setminus \{i\})$ is losing then $\alpha_i^+(\mathbf{i}) = 0 \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbf{j})$. If \mathbf{i} is winning then, by dominance, \mathbf{j} is also winning. But then i is YES-decisive at \mathbf{i} and j is YES-decisive at \mathbf{j} . Hence $\alpha_i^+(\mathbf{i}) = 1 = \alpha_j^+(\mathbf{j})$. Thus in both cases $\alpha_i^+(\mathbf{i}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbf{j})$ as required.

Next, if $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ is losing then $\alpha_i^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) = 0 = \alpha_j^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$. So we may assume that $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ is winning. We have two cases to consider. First, if \mathbf{i} is losing then j is YES-decisive at $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ and $\alpha_j^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) = 1 \geq \alpha_i^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$. Second, if \mathbf{i} is winning then, by dominance, \mathbf{j} is also winning. Thus \mathbf{i}

¹⁰(DOM-2) corresponds to Felsenthal and Machover's (1998: 244) formulation. Our formulation is stronger, because (DOM-1) effectively requires that the voting power of two players who weakly dominate each other be equal. Laruelle and Valenciano's (2005a) formulation is even weaker than Felsenthal and Machover's, because they merely require that, if j strictly dominates i , then the voting power of the former not be less than the latter. It therefore allows two players, one of whom strictly dominates another, to have equal voting power.

and \mathbf{j} are both loyal children of $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$. It immediately follows that $\alpha_i^+(\mathbf{i}) = 1 = \alpha_j^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$ and that $\alpha_i^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) = \frac{1}{2} = \alpha_j^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$. Thus, $\alpha_i^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$ as required.

For the induction step, let's begin by showing that $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$ for any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \notin S$. First, assume the \mathbb{S} is a losing division. If $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ is losing then $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) = 0 \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$. If $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ is winning then $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ is also winning since player j dominates player i . Thus i and j are YES-decisive in $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$, respectively, and so, by definition, $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) = 1 = \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$.

Second, assume \mathbb{S} is a winning division. Then by monotonicity $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ are winning; but neither i or j are YES-decisive. Thus recursively we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S \cup \{\mathbf{j}\}} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now let $k \in S_1 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ both win. Let $k \in S_2 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses. Let $k \in S_3 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ both lose. Observe that, by dominance, there does not exist $k \in S$ such that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins. Thus $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in S_2} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in S_2} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in S_2} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Here the inequality follows from the induction hypothesis. Now for $k \in S_2$ we have that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses. By monotonicity this implies that $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ also loses. But since $k \in S_2$, we have that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins. Thus j is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$. In particular, $\alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) = 1$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) &\geq \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\ &\geq \min \left[\frac{1}{|S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right), \frac{1}{|S_2|} \cdot |S_2| \right] \\ &= \min \left[\frac{1}{|S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right), 1 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \tag{3} \end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality follows from the mathematical fact that $\frac{A+B}{C+D} \geq \min\left(\frac{A}{C}, \frac{B}{D}\right)$ for positive numbers A, B, C, D . On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^+(S \cup \{i\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_1| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Together, (3) and (4) imply that

$$\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \tag{5}$$

as desired.

Next let's show that $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^+(S \cup \{i, j\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S \cup \{i, j\}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + 0 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S \cup \{i, j\}} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) \\
&= \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality follows from (5). The second inequality follows from the induction hypothesis. The equalities follow by definition of the YES-efficacy score α^+ . Thus $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$ as desired. \square

Lemma 5.2. *For any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \in S$, we have $\alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{i}) \leq \alpha_j^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{j})$ and $\alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_j^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$ whenever j weakly dominates i .*

Proof. Apply a symmetric argument to that in the proof of Lemma 5.1. \square

Theorem 5.3. *RM satisfies the dominance postulate.*

Proof. Assume that player j weakly dominates player i . We claim that $RM_i^+ \leq RM_j^+$.

$$\begin{aligned}
RM_i^+(\mathcal{G}) &= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} \left(\alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} \left(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= RM_j^+(\mathcal{G})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the inequality holds by Lemma 5.1. A similar argument applying Lemma 5.2 shows that $RM_i^- \leq RM_j^-$. Summing, we obtain that $RM_i \leq RM_j$. Thus (DOM-1) holds.

Next assume player j strictly dominates player i . Then there exists a subset S such that the division $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ is losing whilst $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ is winning. Since $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ is losing we have, by definition, $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) = 0$. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ is winning it follows that $\alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) > 0$. Ergo, $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) < \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$. Repeating the above argument for weak domination, the inequality now becomes strict. Hence, $RM_i < RM_j$ and (DOM-2) holds. \square

6 The Donation Postulate

Next we study the donation postulate. Consider a modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ in which j transfers its vote to player i . A measure of voting power π then satisfies the *donation postulate* if the a priori voting power of player i in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ is at least equal to the a priori voting powers of player i and of player j in \mathcal{G} , that is, if, given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$:

$$(DON-1) \quad \hat{\pi}_i \geq \max(\pi_i, \pi_j)$$

What does it mean for player j to transfer its vote to i ? In a weighted voting game, it simply means i transfers the weight of its vote to i 's. For example, in the weighted voting game $\{8 : 5, 4, 3, 2\}$, the fourth player could transfer its vote's weight of 2 to the third player whose vote is then weighted 5. However, since not all voting games are weighted voting games, players' votes may not have a weight that could be transferred. So for simple voting games in general we define the YES-successful sets $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$ in a modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as follows. Player j *donates* (or transfers its vote)

to player i if, for all S containing neither i nor j ,

$$\begin{aligned} S \cup \{i, j\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \cup \{i\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \cup \{j\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \in \mathcal{W} \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, this construction implies that in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ player i has the voting influence of i and j together in \mathcal{G} , whereas player j has the zero voting influence in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Indeed player j is a dummy voter in the new game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$.

It is reasonable to expect a measure of a priori voting power to satisfy the donation postulate because the player to whom a vote is transferred remains at least as effective as it was prior to the transfer (the player has not lost anything) and becomes at least as effective as the player who transfers its vote (the beneficiary gains the entirety of the donor's vote).

Before proving that RM satisfies the donation postulate (which is equivalent to the *transfer postulate* of Felsenthal and Machover (1998)), we first show that the modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ retains monotonicity.

Lemma 6.1. *The modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ is monotonic.*

Proof. Assume a violation of monotonicity is caused by division $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ winning in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but losing in \mathcal{G} . By definition of $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$ this implies that $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in \mathcal{G} . Let the violation arise because $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k}\}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Now $k \neq j$, since $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ given that it wins in \mathcal{G} . But $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k}\}$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$ does in \mathcal{G} . However, given that $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in \mathcal{G} , then by monotonicity so too does $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$. Thus, by definition, $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{k}\}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, a contradiction.

On the other hand assume a violation of monotonicity is caused by $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ losing in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but winning in \mathcal{G} . Let the violation arise because $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus $k \neq j$. Since $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ this means \mathbb{S} loses in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. But $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ does in \mathcal{G} . But, by monotonicity, $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in \mathcal{G} . Thus, by definition, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, a contradiction. \square

We will now show that RM satisfies the donation postulate. The main tool required is the following technical lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Let player j donate to player i . Then, for any $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \notin S$, the efficacy scores of player i satisfy:*

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \geq \max\left(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})\right) \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \geq \max\left(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})\right) \quad (\text{C2})$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on the cardinality of S . For the base case, consider $S = \emptyset$. For (C1) observe that if either \mathbf{i} or \mathbf{j} wins in \mathcal{G} then, by monotonicity, so does $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$. Then, by definition, \mathbf{i} wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. But then i is YES-decisive at \mathbf{i} in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and so (C1) holds. Next, if i is YES-decisive at $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then (C2) trivially holds. We may hence assume that $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. But \mathbf{j} has the

same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as $(\emptyset, [n])$ does in \mathcal{G} , that is, it loses. This means i is YES-decisive at $\{i, j\}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and so $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) = 1$ and (C2) holds.

Next consider the induction step. First we must show (C1) $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) \geq \max(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j))$. Recall that $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ wins in \mathcal{G} . Thus if $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ is losing in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ is losing in \mathcal{G} . Therefore, by monotonicity both $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ are losing in \mathcal{G} . Thus $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) = 0 = \max(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j))$. So we may assume that $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ is winning in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Furthermore, we may assume that \mathbb{S} is a winning division in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, otherwise i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ and the result holds trivially. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup i)|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup i)|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) + 0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Let $k \in S_1 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k$ both win in the modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Let $k \in S_2 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ wins and $\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Let $k \in S_3 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k$ both lose in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Recall $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ does in \mathcal{G} . Further, by monotonicity, $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ wins in \mathcal{G} if either $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ or $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ does. Thus there does not exist $k \in S$ such that $\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k$ wins and $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ loses in the modified game. Consequently $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup i)|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) + \sum_{k \in S_2} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup i)|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) + |S_2| \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup i)|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k) + |S_2| \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k) + |S_2| \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k) + |S_2| + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

To see the second equality, recall that for $k \in S_2$, $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ wins and $\mathbb{S} \cup j \setminus k$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus, by monotonicity, $\mathbb{S} \setminus k$ also loses. Hence i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \setminus k) = 1$, for each $k \in S_2$. The first inequality holds by the induction hypothesis. The last equality holds since

$\alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) = 0$ given $j \notin S$. From (6) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) &\geq \min \left(\frac{|S_2|}{|S_2|}, \frac{1}{|S_1| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right) \\
&= \min \left(1, \frac{1}{\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right) \\
&\geq \min \left(1, \frac{1}{LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here the first inequality again follows from the mathematical fact that $\frac{A+B}{C+D} \geq \min\left(\frac{A}{C}, \frac{B}{D}\right)$ for positive numbers A, B, C, D . The second inequality holds because $LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \geq \hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j})$. This follows from the fact $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as \mathbb{S} does in \mathcal{G} ; so if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ is winning in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then it must also win in \mathcal{G} .

It remains to show that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \geq \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})$. To do this, let $k \in T_1 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins both in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and in \mathcal{G} . Let $k \in T_2 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but loses in \mathcal{G} . Let $k \in T_3 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses both in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and in \mathcal{G} . Again, by definition of \hat{W} and monotonicity, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ if either $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ or $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ wins \mathcal{G} . Thus there does not exist $k \in S$ such that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but wins in \mathcal{G} . So $S = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in T_2} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|T_1| + |T_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in T_2} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now for $k \in T_2$, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in \mathcal{G} . By monotonicity, $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ also loses in the original game. Then, given $i, j \notin S$, by definition $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and \mathcal{G} . Thus $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Because $k \in T_2$, moreover, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in the modified game and so i is

YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$. It follows that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) = 1$ for any $k \in T_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) &= \frac{1}{|T_1| + |T_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |T_2| + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|T_1| + |T_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |T_2| + 0 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|T_1| + |T_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |T_2| + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|T_1| + |T_2| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |T_2| + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Here the inequality follows by the induction hypothesis. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) &\geq \min \left(\frac{|T_2|}{|T_2|}, \frac{1}{|T_1| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right) \\
&= \min \left(1, \frac{1}{LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in T_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})
\end{aligned}$$

By (7) and (8) we have $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \geq \max \left(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{j\}) \right)$. Ergo (C1) is satisfied.

Next consider (C2). That is, we must prove $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \geq \max \left(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) \right)$. If i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then we are done. So we may assume that both $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ win in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. But, by definition, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ and \mathbb{S} have the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus \mathbb{S} also wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) &= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \sum_{k \in S \cup \{i, j\}} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ has the same outcome in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as \mathbb{S} does in \mathcal{G} . Thus we have two cases: either $|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})| = |LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ has the same outcome in both $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and \mathcal{G} , or $|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup$

$|\{i, j\}| = |LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but loses in \mathcal{G} . In the former case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + 0 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + 0 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \max(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i), \alpha_j^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j)) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) \right) \\
&= \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i \cup \{i, j\})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality holds by the induction hypothesis. The second inequality follows from (C1). In the latter case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + 0 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

To see the third equality, note that for this case $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ but loses in \mathcal{G} . But by assumption, \mathbb{S} has the same outcome in both $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, by monotonicity, \mathbb{S} loses in \mathcal{G} . Thus i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) = 1$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + 1 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})| + 1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k) + 1 \right) \\
&\geq \min \left(\frac{\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\} \setminus k)}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})|}, \frac{1}{1} \right) \\
&\geq \min(\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}), 1) \\
&= \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the second equality follows from the induction hypothesis. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let player j make a donation to player i . Then, for any $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \in S$, the efficacy scores of player i satisfies:*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha}_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \{i, j\}) &\geq \max\left(\alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \{i, j\}), \alpha_j^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus \{i, j\})\right) \\ \hat{\alpha}_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus i) &\geq \max\left(\alpha_i^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus i), \alpha_j^-(\mathbb{S} \setminus j)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply a symmetric argument to that in the proof of Lemma 6.2. \square

Theorem 6.4. *RM satisfies the donation postulate.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}RM_i &= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} (\hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + \hat{\alpha}_i(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} (\max\{\alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup i), \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup j)\} + \max\{\alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}), \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})\}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} (\max\{\alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + \alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}), \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup j) + \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\})\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \max\left\{ \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} \alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup i) + \alpha_i(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}), \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}: i, j \notin \mathbb{S}} \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup j) + \alpha_j(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) \right\} \\ &= \max\{RM_i, RM_j\}\end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality holds by Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.3. The second inequality holds because $\max(A_1, B_1) + \max(A_2, B_2) \geq A_1 + A_2$ and $\max(A_1, B_1) + \max(A_2, B_2) \geq B_1 + B_2$. \square

7 The Bloc Postulate

Next we consider the bloc postulate. Here we assume player i and j agree to form an indissoluble *bloc*; equivalently, player i annexes the vote of player j . Again the postulate can be formulated via a modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Because of the annexation, the game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ has one fewer player than the original game \mathcal{G} . Specifically, let $I = \{i, j\}$ denote the bloc player in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Player i annexes the vote of player j if, for all S containing neither i nor j ,

$$\begin{aligned}S \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \cup \{I\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{W}\end{aligned}$$

A measure of voting power π then satisfies the *bloc postulate* if the a priori voting power of bloc player $I = \{i, j\}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ is at least the a priori voting power of both player i and of player j in \mathcal{G} . That is, if, given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$:

$$\text{(BLOC-1)} \quad \hat{\pi}_I \geq \max(\pi_i, \pi_j)$$

Thus the bloc postulate requires that the bloc’s a priori voting power be at least as large as that of its most powerful member. On the one hand, there is no good reason to expect the voting power of a bloc to be equal to the sum of the power of its individual members (Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 226-227). On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect that a measure of a priori voting power respect the bloc postulate, because a bloc can do everything its most powerful member can. The bloc postulate is justified for reasons similar to those justifying the donation postulate.

Theorem 7.1. *RM satisfies the bloc postulate.*

Proof. The annexation of player j by player i can be viewed as a two-step process. First, player j ’s vote is donated to player i to give a game $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$. By Theorem 6.4, $R\bar{M}_i \geq \max(RM_i, RM_j)$. Second, player j is removed from the game to give a game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. The key observation here is that after player j donates to player i , now called I , then player j becomes a dummy voter in $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus, by Theorem 4.3, $R\hat{M}_I \geq R\bar{M}_i$. Combining these two inequalities we obtain $R\hat{M}_I \geq \max(RM_i, RM_j)$. So the bloc postulate is satisfied. \square

We remark that this result is not surprising. As explained by Felsenthal and Machover (1998) a measure that satisfies the donation postulate (or transfer postulate) will satisfy the bloc and dominance postulates.

8 The Quarrel Postulate

It would be paradoxical if ruling out effective cooperation between two players were to somehow increase their individual voting power. A measure of voting power that displays such a “quarrelling paradox” can be said to violate a *quarrel postulate*. It is reasonable to expect a measure of a priori voting power to satisfy such a postulate because, manifestly, one way that players effectively realize outcomes is by joining forces and voting together for the same outcome.

Yet previous attempts, by Felsenthal and Machover (1998: 237) and by Laruelle and Valenciano (2005a: 30), to formulate a reasonable quarrel postulate for a priori voting power come up short. This is because these formulations are not based on a conception of quarrelling that compares voting games both of which respect *monotonicity*. It would be unreasonable to expect a measure of voting power to satisfy a quarrel postulate for voting games that violate monotonicity, because any paradoxical results may stem from the violations of monotonicity rather than the unreasonability of the measure of voting power itself. In addition, Felsenthal and Machover’s conception is asymmetric: it is a conception of quarrelling on the YES side only. While it may be reasonable to expect a measure of YES-voting power to satisfy an asymmetric YES-quarrel postulate, it is unreasonable to expect a measure of a player’s total voting power to do so, for the simple reason that a YES-quarrel may diminish a player’s YES-voting power but increase its NO-voting power.

We therefore propose a quarrel postulate based on a new conception of quarrelling that not only adequately captures the intuitive idea of a quarrel, but also is symmetric and monotonic.¹¹ In

¹¹For a full defence of a quarrel postulate based on this new conception of quarrelling, see Abizadeh and Vetta (working paper).

particular, we say player i has a weak, symmetric quarrel with player j if **both** $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ wins if and only if either $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ or $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ wins **and** \mathbb{S} loses if and only if either $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ or $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ loses. Thus it cannot be the case that $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ both lose and $\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}$ wins; similarly it cannot be the case that $\mathbb{S} \cup i$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup j$ win but \mathbb{S} loses. (Informally this would be i and j effectively cooperating and doing better than they can individually.)

To formulate the postulate, we derive a game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ from \mathcal{G} by inducing a quarrel between i and j in the specified sense. We specify the transformation rule in terms of the YES-successful sets $\hat{\mathcal{W}}$ and \mathcal{W} for $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and \mathcal{G} , respectively. For any S containing neither i nor j ,

$$\begin{aligned} S \cup \{i, j\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{W} \vee S \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{W} \wedge S \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \cup \{i\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{W} \\ S \cup \{j\} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}} &\iff S \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{W} \end{aligned}$$

The first two properties state that if i and j vote on the same side (YES and NO, respectively), then the quarrel implies that a group of players with i and j on their side can be no more successful in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ than that group was with either i or j separately on their side in \mathcal{G} . The last two properties state that the quarrel has no effect if i and j vote on opposite sides.

Lemma 8.1. *The modified game $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ is monotonic.*

The proof is provided in Abizadeh and Vetta (working paper).

Because this transformation rule results in a monotonic game in which i and j quarrel, we have every reason to expect the a priori voting power of i and j not to increase. This intuition is captured in the quarrel postulate. A measure of voting power π satisfies the standard *quarrel postulate* if the a priori voting power of i and j is not greater in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ than in \mathcal{G} , i.e., if, given equiprobable divisions

$$\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}:$$

$$\text{(QUAR-1)} \quad \hat{\pi}_i \leq \pi_i, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{(QUAR-2)} \quad \hat{\pi}_j \leq \pi_j.$$

We will now show that *RM* satisfies the standard quarrel postulate based on this conception of quarrelling.

Lemma 8.2. *For any division \mathbb{S} with $i, j \notin S$, the efficacy scores of player i satisfy:*

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \tag{D1}$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j) \tag{D2}$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) \leq \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup i) \tag{D3}$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) \leq \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{i, j\}) \tag{D4}$$

Proof. Take any S not containing i or j . Since $i \notin S$, we have that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) = 0 = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S})$ and $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j) = 0 = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup j)$. So (D1) and (D2) hold.

We now proceed by induction on $|S|$. The base case is $S = \emptyset$. Now if i wins then $\alpha_i^+(\emptyset \cup \{i\}) = 1 \geq \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\emptyset \cup \{i, j\})$ as required by (D3). If $\{i, j\}$ loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then $\alpha_i^+(\emptyset \cup \{i\}) \geq \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\emptyset \cup \{i, j\}) = 0$.

So we may assume $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and thus also in \mathcal{G} . Furthermore, we may assume \mathbf{j} wins in \mathcal{G} , otherwise i is YES-decisive at $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ in \mathcal{G} and (D4) holds trivially. We then have two possibilities: \mathbf{i} either wins in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ or loses in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. In either case the sub-lattices below $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ are identical for \mathcal{D} and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and thus $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$. Hence (D4) also holds for the base case.

For the induction step, let's begin with showing (D3). Now $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$; otherwise $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) = 0$ and we are trivially done. Thus $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ also wins in \mathcal{G} ; this implies, by definition of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, that \mathbb{S} has the same outcome in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. If \mathbb{S} loses then i is YES-decisive at $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ in both games and $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) = 1 = \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})$. Thus we may assume \mathbb{S} wins and $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})$. Now, $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})$ is defined recursively. For any child $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ of $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$, i but not j is a YES-voter; thus by definition of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, the division outcome is the same in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus the set of loyal children of $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}$ are also identical in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + 0 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + 0 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S}) \right) \\
&= \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here the inequality holds by the induction hypothesis. Thus $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \geq \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i})$ and (D3) holds.

Next consider $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$. Again, we may assume $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and thus also in \mathcal{G} . In addition, we may assume that $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ wins in \mathcal{G} and thus also in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$; otherwise i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$ in \mathcal{G} and we are done.

Let $k \in S_1 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Let $k \in S_2 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in \mathcal{G} but loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Let $k \in S_3 \subseteq S$ if $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in both \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. Recall that, by definition of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, if \mathbb{T} loses in \mathcal{G} but wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ then T contains neither i nor j . Thus, there does not exist $k \in S$

such that $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ loses in \mathcal{G} but wins in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + 0 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \sum_{k \in S_2} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now for $k \in S_2$ we have that $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ wins in \mathcal{G} but loses in $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$. But, by definition of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, this implies that both $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ lose in the original game \mathcal{G} . In particular, player i is decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}$ in the original game; consequently, $\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) = 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) &= \frac{1}{|LC(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})|} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 2} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 2} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 2} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_1| + |S_2| + 2} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + |S_2| + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \right) \\
&\geq \min \left(\frac{|S_2|}{|S_2|}, \frac{1}{|S_1| + 2} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \right) \right) \\
&= \min \left(1, \frac{1}{\hat{LC}(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})} \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \setminus \mathbf{k}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{i}) + \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}) \right) \right) \\
&= \hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality holds by (8). The second inequality holds by the induction hypothesis. The fourth equality holds since, as we previously argued, $\mathbb{S} \cup \mathbf{j}$ must be a loyal child. It follows that $\hat{\alpha}_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}) \leq \alpha_i^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\})$, completing the proof of (D4). \square

Lemma 8.3. *Then, for any $S \subseteq [n]$ with $i, j \notin S$, the efficacy scores of player i satisfy:*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha}_i^-(S) &\leq \alpha_i^-(S) \\ \hat{\alpha}_i^-(S \cup i) &\leq \alpha_i^-(S \cup i) \\ \hat{\alpha}_i^-(S \cup j) &= \alpha_i^-(S \cup j) \\ \hat{\alpha}_i^-(S \cup \{i, j\}) &= \alpha_i^-(S \cup \{i, j\})\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply a symmetric argument to that in the proof of Lemma 8.3. □

Theorem 8.4. *RM satisfies the standard quarrel postulate.*

Proof. We have

$$RM_i = \sum_{S \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} \hat{\alpha}_i(S) \cdot \hat{\mathbb{P}}(S) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{\alpha}_i(S) \cdot \mathbb{P}(S) \leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_i(S) \cdot \mathbb{P}(S) = RM_i$$

Here the first inequality holds by Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.3. Similarly $RM_i \geq R\hat{M}_i$. Thus RM satisfies (QUAR-1) and (QUAR-2) for any voting-independent probability distribution. It follows that it satisfies them for equiprobable divisions. □

9 The Added Blocker Postulate

We conclude with the added blocker postulate, which concerns changes to other players' voting power when a blocker is added to a game. We argue that Felsenthal and Machover's (1998) specification of the postulate is not reasonable for a priori voting power in general; we accordingly formulate a new version, and prove that RM satisfies it.

We say that a player i is a *YES-blocker* (or *YES-vetoer*) if for every $S \in \mathcal{W}$ we have $i \in S$. That is, if i votes NO then the outcome is NO. Similarly, a player j is a *NO-blocker* (or *NO-vetoer*) if for every $S \notin \mathcal{W}$ we have $j \in \bar{S}$. That is, if j votes YES then the outcome is YES.

Given a game $\mathcal{G} = ([n], \mathcal{W})$, let $\mathcal{G}^Y = ([n] \cup \{0\}, \mathcal{W}^Y)$ be the game resulting from adding an *added YES-blocker*, i.e., a new player 0 that is a YES-blocker but who otherwise does not affect the original voting structure. Specifically, $\mathcal{W}^Y = \{S \cup \{0\} : \forall S \in \mathcal{W}\}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{G}^N = ([n] \cup \{0\}, \mathcal{W}^N)$ be the game resulting from adding an *added NO-blocker* 0. Specifically, $\mathcal{W}^N = \{S \cup \{0\} : \forall S \in \mathcal{W}\} \cup \{S : \forall S \in \mathcal{W}\}$.

Felsenthal and Machover (1988: 266-275) argue that any reasonable measure of voting power must satisfy the following postulate for a priori voting power. Given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$, for any pair of players i and j ,

$$(ADD-0) \quad \frac{\pi_i(\mathcal{G})}{\pi_j(\mathcal{G})} = \frac{\pi_i(\mathcal{G}^Y)}{\pi_j(\mathcal{G}^Y)}$$

That is, the relative measures of a priori voting power for i and j should be unaffected by an added YES-blocker. They argue “there is nothing at all to imply that the addition of the new” YES-blocker “is of greater relative advantage to some of the voters” of the original game than to others, because there is “no reasonable mechanism that would create a *differential* effect” (Felsenthal and Machover

1998: 267). They then show that PB satisfies this postulate, but SS violates it, and, on this basis, conclude that the latter cannot be considered a valid index of a priori voting power.¹²

We reject their argument for the postulate as they formulate it and, by implication, what they call the *bicameral postulate* (Felsenthal et al. 1998). The problem is that their specification is asymmetric between YES-voting and NO-voting power. Contrary to their assertion, we do have good reasons to expect an added YES-blocker sometimes to have differential relative impact on players' a priori voting power as a whole, depending on the relative importance, to each player's total voting power, of its YES- as opposed to NO-voting power. This is because an added YES-blocker may diminish the relative significance or share of YES-voting power within a player's total voting power.

We should expect this potential asymmetry between YES- and NO-voting power to be neutralized only for measures of voting power that, like PB , rely solely on (full) decisiveness. As we noted in section 3.1, such measures, by ignoring partial efficacy, effectively render a player's YES- and NO-voting power perfectly symmetrical, such that $\pi_i^+ = \pi_i^-$: any player that is YES-decisive in a winning division will also be NO-decisive in the corresponding losing division in which the only difference is that player's vote. By contrast, this symmetry between a player's YES- and NO-voting power will not hold for measures that, like RM , take partial efficacy into account. A player that is only partially efficacious in a winning division will not be efficacious at all in the corresponding division in which all other players' votes are held constant, because, not being (fully) decisive, the player's switch from YES to NO will not change the outcome – which switches the player from successful in one division to unsuccessful in the other. The implication is that, if a player's total voting power relies more heavily on partial efficacy in winning divisions than does that of another player, then an added YES-blocker may have a disproportionately negative impact on the former than on the latter. We therefore have no reason in general to expect an added YES-blocker never relatively to advantage some players.

By contrast, we have every reason to expect that an added YES-blocker will be of no relative advantage to players' a priori YES-voting power and that an added NO-blocker will be of no relative advantage to players' a priori NO-voting power in particular. We therefore reformulate Felsenthal and Machover's proposal, distinguishing between two distinct elements that compose our formulation of the added blocker postulate.

A measure of voting power π satisfies the *added blocker postulate* if, given equiprobable divisions $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$, for any pair of players i and j :

$$(ADD-1) \quad \frac{\pi_i^+(\mathcal{G})}{\pi_j^+(\mathcal{G})} = \frac{\pi_i^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)}{\pi_j^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)}, \text{ and}$$

$$(ADD-2) \quad \frac{\pi_i^-(\mathcal{G})}{\pi_j^-(\mathcal{G})} = \frac{\pi_i^-(\mathcal{G}^N)}{\pi_j^-(\mathcal{G}^N)}$$

(ADD-1) says that the relative measures of a priori YES-voting power are unaffected by an added YES-blocker. We can accordingly call this element of the postulate the *added YES-blocker postulate* for any pair of players i and j . (ADD-2) says the relative measures of a priori NO-voting power

¹²Where voting power is understood as the capacity to influence voting outcomes (Felsenthal and Machover 1998: 267-275).

are unaffected by an added NO-blocker. We can similarly call this element the *added NO-blocker postulate*.

We will now prove that *RM* satisfies (ADD-1) and (ADD-2) for any voting-independent probability distribution $\mathbb{P}()$, and hence for the a priori case $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$.

Lemma 9.1. *For any player i , the RM efficacy scores α^+ and α^- in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}^Y satisfy*

$$\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) = \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \quad \forall S \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+((S, \bar{S} \cup 0)) = 0 \quad \forall S \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^-(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) = \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^-(\mathbb{S}) \quad \forall S \quad (\text{B3})$$

Proof. Consider the games \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}^Y . Recall the winning divisions in \mathcal{G}^Y are of the form $\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}$ where $S \in \mathcal{W}$ in the original voting game. The key facts are then the following. Let $S \subseteq [n]$ contain player i . Then in \mathcal{G}^Y player i is never YES-decisive at $(S, \bar{S} \cup 0)$ because the division is a losing division (given that S does not contain the blocker 0). Furthermore, player i is YES-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}$ in \mathcal{G}^Y if and only if it is originally YES-decisive at \mathbb{S} in \mathcal{G} .

Next take $S \subseteq [n]$ where S does not contain player i . Then in \mathcal{G}^Y player i is never NO-decisive at $(S, \bar{S} \cup 0)$ because $S \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{W}$ (given that it does not contain the blocker 0). Furthermore, player i is NO-decisive at $\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}$ in \mathcal{G}^Y if and only if i is originally NO-decisive at \mathbb{S} in \mathcal{G} .

These key facts imply that the YES-poset for \mathcal{G}^Y is identical to the YES-poset in \mathcal{G} , except that for each YES-outcome the set of YES-voters now also contains the blocker 0 (equivalently, the set of NO-voters in their corresponding divisions are identical). An illustration of this fact is given in Figure 6, where the YES-poset for \mathcal{G}^Y derived from $\mathcal{G} = \{8; 5, 4, 3, 2\}$ is shown. Observe that it is indeed identical to the YES-poset for \mathcal{G}^Y in Figure 4, except for the added YES-blocker 0.




Figure 6: Adding an added YES-blocker to the YES-poset.

Because the YES-poset in \mathcal{G}^Y reproduces the original YES-poset, the corresponding YES-efficacy scores α^+ are identical. That is, $\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) = \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S})$ and (B1) holds.

Furthermore, given that 0 is a YES-blocker, any $S \subseteq [n]$ is a losing division. Thus $\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+((S, \bar{S} \cup 0)) = 0$ as and (B2) holds.

To prove (B3), consider the NO-poset for \mathcal{G}^Y . This NO-poset consist of two parts: the losing divisions in which the blocker 0 votes YES (LHS) and the losing divisions in which the blocker 0 votes NO (RHS). For the game \mathcal{G}^Y derived from $\mathcal{G} = \{8; 5, 4, 3, 2\}$, the NO-poset and its two parts are illustrated in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Adding an added NO-blocker to the NO-poset.

Our key facts now imply that the sub-poset induced by the losing divisions in which the blocker 0 votes NO is identical to the NO-poset for \mathcal{G} (except for the added NO-blocker). In particular, the set of YES-voters in their corresponding divisions are identical. For example, the RHS of of the NO-poset for G in Figure 7 is the same as in the NO-poset for \mathcal{G} in Figure 4 (other than the presence of the added YES-blocker).

But the divisions on the RHS cannot have children on the LHS because 0 is a YES-voter in the RHS divisions and a NO-voter in the LHS divisions, whereas, by definition, the child of a losing division is identical to it except that one YES-voter in the parent is a NO-voter in the child. This means each original player's NO-efficacy scores on the RHS of the NO-poset in \mathcal{G}^Y must be exactly the same as each player's original NO-efficacy scores in the corresponding divisions in \mathcal{G} . Consequently, $\alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^-(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) = \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^-(\mathbb{S})$ and (B3) holds. \square

Theorem 9.2. *RM satisfies (ADD-1) for any voting-independent probability distribution.*

Proof. For any player i in the original game

$$\begin{aligned}
RM_i^+(\mathcal{G}^Y) &= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}^Y} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}^Y(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+((S, \bar{S} \cup 0)) \cdot \mathbb{P}^Y((S, \bar{S} \cup 0)) + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) \cdot \mathbb{P}^Y(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) \\
&= 0 + \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^Y}^+(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) \cdot \mathbb{P}^Y(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}^Y(\mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(0 \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(0 \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})
\end{aligned}$$

Here the third and fourth equalities hold by Lemma 9.1. The fifth equality holds given that \mathbb{P} is voting independent. Similarly, for any player j in the original game

$$RM_j^+(\mathcal{G}^Y) = \mathbb{P}(0 \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{j,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{RM_i^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)}{RM_j^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)} &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(0 \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})}{\mathbb{P}(0 \text{ votes yes}) \cdot \sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{j,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})}{\sum_{\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_{j,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S})} \\ &= \frac{RM_i^+(\mathcal{G})}{RM_j^+(\mathcal{G})} \end{aligned}$$

Ergo, the added YES-blocker postulate (ADD-2) is satisfied. \square

Lemma 9.3. *For any player i in the original game, the efficacy scores α^+ and α^- in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}^N satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^N}^+((S, \bar{S} \cup \{0\})) &= \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^+(\mathbb{S}) && \forall S \\ \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^N}^-((S, \bar{S} \cup \{0\})) &= 0 && \forall S \\ \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}^N}^-((S, \bar{S} \cup \{0\})) &= \alpha_{i,\mathcal{G}}^-(\mathbb{S}) && \forall S \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Apply a symmetric argument to that used in the proof of Lemma 9.1. \square

Theorem 9.4. *RM satisfies(ADD-2) for any voting-independent probability distribution.*

Proof. Apply a symmetric argument to that used in the proof of Theorem 9.2. \square

Corollary 9.5. *RM satisfies the added blocker postulate.*

Proof. Equiprobable divisions arise if the voting independence and equiprobable voting assumptions hold. The result then follows by Theorems 9.2 and 9.4. \square

We remark that because of the inherent symmetry of SS , if SS were considered (as we suggested it should not) as a measure of a priori voting power, then Felsenthal and Machover's (1998) negative result would apply here as well. To see that SS violates our added blocker postulate, we must first define SS^+ and SS^- . This is easily done. First, we define a *pivot* as a voter who, when an ordered sequence of voters all vote in favour of a given outcome, is the first voter whose vote secures the outcome. The value of SS is equal to the proportion of such permutations (ordered sequences) in which a voter is the pivot. Second, we define a player's SS^+ score as equal to the proportion of vote permutations in which the player is a pivot for a YES-outcome, and SS^- as equal to the proportion of vote permutations in which the player is a pivot for a NO-outcome. Note that SS itself is typically defined as we have defined SS^+ , i.e., with respect to YES-outcomes, and that

in all cases, as can be easily verified, $SS^+ = SS^-$. With these definitions to hand, it can be shown that every instance in which Felsenthal and Machover show that SS violates their own specification of the postulate is also an instance in which SS^+ violates (ADD-1) and SS^- violates (ADD-2) and therefore in which SS violates our specification of the added blocker postulate. For example, let $\mathcal{G} = \{3; 2, 1, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{G}^Y = \{8; 2, 1, 1, 5\}$. Then $SS_1^+(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{2}{3}$ and $SS_2^+(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{6}$, whereas $SS_1^+(\mathcal{G}^Y) = \frac{5}{12}$ and $SS_2^+(\mathcal{G}^Y) = \frac{1}{12}$, such that $\frac{SS_1^+(\mathcal{G})}{SS_2^+(\mathcal{G})} = 4 < \frac{SS_1^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)}{SS_2^+(\mathcal{G}^Y)} = 5$, in violation of (ADD-1) and hence our postulate. We take this to confirm the verdict that SS cannot be reasonably taken to represent a measure of a priori voting power.

10 Conclusion

This completes our analysis. We have motivated our particular construction of a recursive measure of voting power with partial efficacy RM via the lattice representation of voting games and the concept of random walks in stochastic processes, and proven that RM satisfies reasonable postulates.

References

- [1] Abizadeh, A. (Working paper). A Recursive Measure of Voting Power with Partial Decisiveness or Efficacy.
- [2] Abizadeh, A., & Vetta, A. (Working paper). A General Framework for a Class of Quarrels: The Quarrelling Paradox Revisited.
- [3] Banzhaf, J.F. (1965). Weighted Voting Doesn't Work: A Mathematical Analysis. *Rutgers Law Review*, 19, 317-343.
- [4] Banzhaf, J.F. (1966). Multi-Member Electoral Districts: Do They Violate the "One Man, One Vote" Principle. *The Yale Law Journal*, 75(8), 1309-1338.
- [5] Barry, B. (2002). Capitalists Rule Ok? Some Puzzles About Power. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 1(2), 155-184.
- [6] Braham, M., & van Hees, M. (2009). Degrees of Causation. *Erkenntnis*, 71(3), 323-344.
- [7] Dubey, P. (1975). On the Uniqueness of the Shapley Value. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4(3), 131-139.
- [8] Dubey, P., & Shapley, L.S. (1979). Mathematical Properties of the Banzhaf Power Index. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(2), 99-131.
- [9] Felsenthal, D.S., & Machover, M. (1998). *The Measurement of Voting Power: Theory and Practice, Problems and Paradoxes*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- [10] Felsenthal, D.S., & Machover, M. (2003). The Voting Power Approach: Response to a Philosophical Reproach. *European Union Politics*, 4(4), 473-479.
- [11] Felsenthal, D.S., & Machover, M. (2004). A Priori Voting Power: What is it All about? *Political Studies Review*, 2(1), 1-23.
- [12] Felsenthal, D.S., Machover, M., & Zwicker, W. (1998). The Bicameral Postulates and Indices of a Priori Voting Power. *Theory and Decision*, 44(1), 83-116.
- [13] Hall, N. (2007). Structural Equations and Causation. *Philosophical Studies*, 132(1), 109-136.
- [14] Halpern, J.Y., and J. Pearl. (2005). Causes and Explanations: A Structural-Model Approach. Part I: Causes. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 56(4), 843-887.
- [15] Hitchcock, C. (2001). The Intransitivity of Causation Revealed in Equations and Graphs. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 98(6), 273-299.
- [16] Laruelle, A., & Valenciano, F. (2001). Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf Indices Revisited. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 26(1), 89-104.
- [17] Laruelle, A., & Valenciano, F. (2005a). A Critical Reappraisal of Some Voting Power Paradoxes. *Public Choice*, 125(1), 17-41.
- [18] Laruelle, A., & Valenciano, F. (2005b). Assessing Success and Decisiveness in Voting Situations. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 24(1), 171-197.
- [19] Laruelle, A., & Valenciano, F. (2008). *Voting and Collective Decision-Making: Bargaining and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Leech, D. (1990). Power Indices and Probabilistic Voting Assumptions. *Public Choice*, 66(3), 293-299.
- [21] Lewis, D. (1986). *Philosophical Papers: Volume II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] McDermott, M. (1995). Redundant Causation. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 46(4), 523-544.
- [23] Morriss, P. (2002). *Power: A Philosophical Analysis* (2nd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- [24] Owen, G. (1975). Multilinear Extensions and the Banzhaf Value. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 22(4), 741-750.
- [25] Penrose, L.S. (1946). The Elementary Statistics of Majority Voting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 109(1), 53-57.
- [26] Ramachandran, M. (1997). A Counterfactual Analysis of Causation. *Mind*, 106(422), 263-277.
- [27] Schaffer, J. (2003). Overdetermining Causes. *Philosophical Studies*, 114(1), 23-45,

- [28] Shapley, L.S., & Shubik, M. (1954). A Method for Evaluating the Distribution of Power in a Committee System. *The American Political Science Review*, 48(3), 787-792.
- [29] Straffin, P.D. (1977). Homogeneity, Independence, and Power Indices. *Public Choice*, 30(1), 107-118.
- [30] Straffin, P.D. (1982). Power Indices in Politics. In S. J. Brams, W. F. Lucas, & P. D. Straffin (Eds.), *Political and Related Models* (pp. 256-321). New York: Springer.
- [31] Wright, R.W. (1985). Causation in Tort Law. *California Law Review*, 73, 1735-1828.
- [32] Wright, R.W. (1988). Causation, Responsibility, Risk, Probability, Naked Statistics, and Proof: Pruning the Bramble Bush by Clarifying the Concepts. *Iowa Law Review*, 73, 1001-77.