How important is the Role of Small States Security in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security?

Alex Henderson

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Arts in the University of Malta for the degree of Master in Contemporary Diplomacy

August 2016

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is my own original work. Wherever contributions of others are involved, every effort is made to indicate this clearly, with due reference to the literature.

Alex Henderson

19 August 2016, Victoria, Seychelles

<u>Abstract</u>

The game of International Peace and Security has for a long time been one played only by the great powers, leading to the singling out of small states in its deliberations. These states would create their own rules and be their own referees, whilst the existing small states would conduct themselves as mere spectators. However, following the effects of the end of the two World Wars, the creation of the UN and decolonization, the role of small states in the maintenance of international peace and security has gathered new responsibilities and in consequence it has made them important agents and messengers of peace. As a result of this their relevance to international peace and security has had many positive effects on international law and norms that aims to safeguard and promote the ideals of sovereignty, global stability and the common good. This dissertation seeks to provide an understanding of this evolution and key characteristics of small states security in the post-Cold War international system. It will also attempt to explain how and why small states are essential to the global security landscape and what are the factors that restrict them from having greater influence on international peace and security.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

- African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP)
- Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)
- African Standby Force (ASF)
- Arms Trade Treaty (ATT)
- Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)
- Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ)
- European Union (EU)
- Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)
- Foreign direct investment (FDI)
- Forum of Smaller States (FOSS)
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
- Gross National Product (GNP)
- International Criminal Court (ICC)
- International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- International Relations (IR)
- LGBTI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex)
- Multi-National Corporation (MNC)
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
- Permanent member states of the United Nations Security Council (P5)
- Responsibility to Protect (R2P)
- Small Island Developing States (SIDS)
- United Kingdom (UK)
- United Nations (UN)
- UN Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC)
- United States of America (USA)
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR)
- Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

Introduction

"How many soldiers does Switzerland have?" Goering asked.
"One million, Sir," replied the Swiss soldier.
"What if Germany sends two million soldiers to invade
Switzerland?"
"Then each Swiss soldier will shoot twice, Sir."

Swiss anecdote dating from World War II (Wei, 2005)

The concept of small state politics and its role within global politics is becoming a growing field

in the further comprehension of contemporary international relations. Its understanding in terms

of its influence on global politics has been a gradual one that begun to gain prominence at the

end of the Cold War. While some scholars refer to them as 'small powers' particularly when

denoting their military capabilities, the term 'small states' is the preferred use when describing or

making reference to such group of states (Kassimeris, 2009). In its study, it has been observed

that;

"The available case studies in International Relations (IR) heavily concentrate on great powers, and thus look at only one particular sample of states…Small states started life as a residual category and under a different name. Until well into the twentieth century, in all European languages states were routinely referred to as 'powers' (French *puissance*, German *Macht*, Russian *derzhava*, Spanish/Portuguese *poder*, etc.). While this noun is still used for a different category of states, namely 'great powers' (and, more rarely, also for 'middle powers'), 'small powers' are nowadays simply referred to as 'small states'. This usage certainly further underlines their presumed lack of power in a quantitative sense. Following the Napoleonic Wars, 'the powers' met at the Congress of Vienna. Those powers that made up the winning quadruple alliance – Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and the Habsburg Empire – were soon convinced by the spokesman of vanquished France, Talleyrand, that questions of importance would have to be

settled between these five powers. In today's parlance, we would say that they were to be settled 'at five'. However, some of the questions that were to be settled would directly concern powers that were deemed too important to be left out entirely. These powers were given access to certain meetings that were held 'at six' or 'at seven'. As the century wore on, these powers sometimes came to be known, through processes that still await their researcher, as 'middle powers'. Those powers that were deemed too inconsequential to be so included came to be known as 'small states'" (Neumann and Gstöll, 2004, p. 2-3).

Historical sources thus point out that the appeal of small states was of less importance to the international decision making process and their contributions was of the same. However the study of small states and their role in foreign matters grew in significance in the 1960s and 1970s during the time when many of them were in the process of de-colonization as they became sovereign states. The cessation of the superpower politics gave way to the emergence of small states literature and more importantly their growing roles in world affairs. Understandably the concept of global politics and security in the context of small state security is still not as profound as that of the larger states as the impacts have been many but still not to the major impacts that originate from these large states.

Regardless, their growing roles in world affairs have caught the attention of a number of scholars and also to the key players on the international scenery. This is primarily because their roles in global politics and security are directly related to the fact that most small states often reflect the picture of peace enablers. Their increased engagement in specific activities related to mediation, peace building, peacekeeping, promotion and enforcement of international rule of law has made them vital agents and messengers of peace for the safety of world politics. These roles are deeply rooted in the fact that small states feel insecure for a variety of historical and geopolitical reasons, because it is this type of states that are more vulnerable in facing credible external threats that emerge from old and new security threats (Goetschel, 2013). Moreover, in a world that continues

to witness the evolution of globalization and the emergence of new security threats, the safety concerns of small states is becoming more evident and alarming.

In seeking to provide a better understanding as to how and why small states have developed such a focus, the first half of this dissertation will present an analysis of the evolving concept of small state security, introduce the concept of the guns or better dilemma and also examine the relevance of small state security in multilateralism. Emphasis on the importance of the United Nations for small state security will also be made, as the United Nations gives small states the ideal venue and tools to which they can pursue and promote their security concerns and interests through their engagement with other states and other relevant non-actors.

In the context of the impacts of globalization on small state security, the dissertation will attempt to explain the different approaches of small states towards international security issues and the new security challenges that they face in an increasingly interdependent and globalized world. The other half of the dissertation will then outline the important contributions of small states towards global security. It will also set out to indicate the key challenges that they face in their quest to become more efficient agents in the maintenance of international peace and security which ultimately limits their overall influence on the issue.

Chapter 1 – Evolving concept of a small state and security in the context of small states

'When elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers'

African Kikuyu proverb

1.1 Background: Definition of a small state

What is a small state? The definition of a small state can be explained in both quantitative and qualitative terms. The quantitative definition addresses this question on the basis of geographical or demographic factors. The qualitative definition, on the other hand, focuses on the product of these relationships. Within this qualitative understanding, the majority of states are middle powers, whose interpretation of smallness is essentially circumstantial and subjective.

The geographical size of a state has normally been the simplest way to distinguish between small and larger states. However, other quantitative attempts in defining small states have also turned to population as another measure of size. According to the World Bank and the Commonwealth, countries with a population below 1.5 million people are considered to be small states. Current European Union (EU) politics deems that if a member state has a population of less than 40 million then it is considered as a small state. Thus based on such a criteria Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Greece, Czech Republic, Portugal, Hungary, Sweden, Austria and other EU member states with lesser populations are all seen by the EU as small states (Kassimeris, 2009). Member states which are part of the Forum of Smaller States (FOSS), a voluntary and informal grouping

at the United Nations (UN), defines small states as countries with populations fewer than 10 million people. Another grouping in the understanding of small states concentrates on the exceptional challenges that are faced by 'microstates'. Microstates are defined as very small states with populations of less than 500,000 people. Microstates would include Small Island Developing States (SIDS) such as Seychelles, Tuvalu, Maldives, Bahamas and Cabo Verde amongst others.

The relative approach, on the other hand, utilizes a qualitative method in defining the concept of small states upon the idea of perception. As a result it considers a much larger number of states as falling under the small state category. This interpretation indicates that we look at the behaviour or ability of such states to operate in the international arena in order to determine which states should be classified as a small state. In other words, this approach involves a qualitative evaluation of a state's relationship to its wider environment. Further to this approach, Asgrimsson (2003) states that "it is an old adage, for example, that size is relative. Assessment of size is dependent on criteria and viewpoint. This is particularly true when we take the measure of the various different countries of the world. Microstates, small states, smaller states, larger states, world powers and superpowers are vague concepts". In support of this assertion, the following examples can be considered as viable explanations.

Countries such as Singapore or Luxembourg, are small in terms of their geographical size and population numbers, however, they benefit from having attained a high level of socio-economic development and are well known for having robust economies with strong economic influence in their respective regions. Switzerland and Belgium are also states which if we were to use the

quantitative approach could have been qualified as small states yet they are influential actors in the field of international politics and are the host countries of many important multilateral offices. Equally, a state like Israel which is small in size, has a population below 10 million inhabitants and yet in terms of international security, remains as one of the most prominent actors in the regional security policies of the Middle East and in international security. While these examples may present themselves as being few, they essential indicate the misconception in terms of the influence that small states have in the international arena.

These two approaches have generated many discussions in attempts to reach a conclusion on the correct contemporary definition of a small state. This is because when attempting to understand the concept of a contemporary small state both definitions are still relevant in their own ways. Although they would provide different interpretations, both definitions are in fact complementary rather than opposing understandings. However, the qualitative approach to the definition of a small state will be adopted for this dissertation.

This is because modern international politics reflect many small sized states with lesser populations attaining greater influence and international actions compared to many states of larger natures. Many of these small states have proven that despite their sizes they can punch above their weight and make substantial contributions to the decision making process of global matters. As such, it can be concurred that size and population numbers can no longer be seen as the right indicators when understanding what a contemporary small state is, but rather it is more applicable to consider its influence and impact on international relations and cooperation.

1.2 <u>The evolving concept of small states' security</u>

1.2.1   <u>Small states security prior to the end of the cold war</u>

In understanding how the role of small states is important in the maintenance of international peace and security, it is essential to first understand the evolving concept of small state security. In setting ourselves to analyse a brief timeline of the perception of small states security, Wei, (2005) observes that it is essential to note that "the concept of sovereignty and self-determination for small states has undergone an evolution over the past several decades. Prior to World War I, any country weak and vulnerable was easy prey to an opportunistic large power. Even Imperial China under the Manchus was an easy prey to the colonial powers of the West". Going as far back to the age of empires and monarchs, moving towards the age of colonialism and much further to the Cold War era, history has often reflected that the dominating group of great powers dictated the course of international peace and security, while most of the existent smaller states of that time had no choice but to obey and follow. This of course gave such small states very little possibilities to exert themselves on international security matters.

During such empirical and colonial periods, whether it was through brute force or by instantly waving the white flag, history shows us that during these periods the existent small states had to succumb to the larger powers by becoming part of their sovereign territories or their spheres of influence. As a result, these small states were exploited for means such as their land, natural resources and manpower, whereby people would often either become labourers (for example on farms and plantations) at a very cheap rate with very poor working conditions, or they would be

recruited as soldiers. With very limited defensive resources, these small states would be bringing a knife to a gun fight if they were to stand up to those big states; the repercussions would be frightening for them and their people. In contrast to small states, the big states essentially had all the necessary means to win any battle or conflict such as large armies, better weapons, training, technology and the experience on how to win battles.

1.2.2   Small states security after the cold war

Following the end of the cold war, humankind had witnessed the breaking up of the remaining empires, the creation of the League of Nations and the UN, decolonization and globalization. The world also witnessed an increase in peace building operations which had considerable impacts on the nature and control by states' peace engagements. New types of peace policies came into context which would not have been possible in the cold war era as peace operations preceded into normal practices of international governance in unstable and conflict-ridden states (Goetschel, 2013). Together with other global waves these new global factors helped to create a new mind set, a new set of tools for global governance; it created the concepts of the international community, collective security, the New World Order and a new outlook on the concept of small state security.

The end of the Cold War, along with the principles of the UN offered a historic opportunity for the world to cooperate for the common good whereby it was perceived that the use of military force would now only be used in the quest for peace. The world was witnessing a new phenomenon based on the principles of self-determination (Kassimeris, 2009) as promoted by

the UN, whereby sovereign small states were growing in stature and becoming emerging powers regardless of their size, population or military capabilities, which had previously determined their destinies and roles in global politics and security. It was no longer an affair between a handful of countries wanting to dictate or being the architects of the powers to be. Rather they were faced with a much stronger and dominant multilateral world in the essence of the UN and other non-state actors. Together, small states and UN-sponsored channels of communication would later play a greater role in drafting new international laws that would help to curb the security paradigm of the world.

1.2.3   <u>Small states security and the United Nations</u>

The predecessor of the UN, the League of Nations, had failed at its mandate to maintain global peace after the First World War. This failure was stemmed with its low level of membership, absence of major powers as members, and its relatively lack of military and economic clout keep to its economic sanctions, or provide armed forces for peace missions when needed. Altogether these factors reduced its ability to enforce its decisions. Thus it was no surprise that Mussolini said that 'the League is very well when sparrows shout, but no good at all when eagles fall out', which essentially translated to its lack of authority and influence in the maintenance of peace and security.

But regardless of its failures to prevent many global conflicts, it must not be disregarded that it was the creation of the League that paved the way for peaceful multilateral diplomacy. Also the League did manage to deal with most of the territory disputes that it was tasked to mediate over

such as between Greece and Bulgaria. Moreover it played successful roles to reduce sexual slavery, trade in opium, helping refugees and also in setting up a health organisation which worked towards the eradication of diseases (GCSE History, n.d). Moreover, its original objectives, which were to implement a free-for-all and idealist principle in the essence of new collective efforts to address worldwide problems that went beyond the capacity of individual countries to solve, would later become the key pillars of the UN that we know of today.

In comparison to the League of Nations, the UN was a huge improvement and was much more effective in terms of achieving its objectives of attempting to create a safer and unified world. For small states in particular, in their pursuit for equality and a common order governed by international rule of law, the UN signified a big step forward in placing them at the same discussion and decision tables along with the big powers and other states of the world. Amongst other factors, the shift in global governance that the UN helped to bring along meant that the political voices of the small states were finally at the same pitch as their big brothers who had once been singing all the tones. Small states were now able to represent themselves and voice out their sovereign concerns. The rule of 'one country, one vote' meant that at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) both small and large states had equal power. However, such principles are not applicable to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) which holds the real power of the UN.

While the great powers of 1945 still dominate the UNSC (often referred to as the high table of international relations), it is imperative to note that in the UNGA all 193 states are equal. In the UNGA the vote of Benin, Mongolia or Mauritius carries the same weight as that of France,

Brazil or Canada. Even if it is the only the UNSC that can make binding decisions on peace and security matters, the UNGA is still the UN's primary body for debating and making recommendations on matters ranging from peace and security to development and human rights. While it is also necessary to highlight the moral weight which the UNGA non-binding resolutions have, it must not be disregarded that it is the UNGA that elects the non-permanent members of the UNSC and the members of other important bodies of the UN, thus showing that the UNGA does have an important role to play also.

In line with this, it must be noted that elected member states of the UNSC are only permitted to serve on the council as non-permanent members for two years and do not hold the veto power compared to the five permanent member states of the UNSC (P5) - China, United States of America (USA), United Kingdom (UK), France, Russia. However, this does not mean that the elected non-permanent members are powerless ornaments at the all-powerful horse shoe table. For example the ten non-permanent members of the UNSC can influence the work of the Security Council by a number of ways such as during the passing of Council resolutions. Council resolutions need nine votes to pass, so the support of the non-permanent members is as necessary as that belonging to the P5. One recent example that demonstrated the importance of this nine-vote requirement was demonstrated in 2003 when the UNSC was considering the draft UK-US-Spanish resolution on Iraq which had to be withdrawn because it was clear that it would not pass because it lacked the necessary nine votes.

As we further reflect on the correlation between the work of the UN and the growing understanding of small state security, it is important to consider the positive outcomes which the

work of the UNSC has had on the security of small states. The UNSC - which can legitimate the use of force when international peace and security is in danger - has over many years developed into a safety umbrella for many small states against multiple security threats. For example when conflict broke out in Lebanon (2006) and in Gaza (2008), the Council played an instrumental role in bringing the parties to the table to broker a deal. The Council also played crucial roles in the achievement of independence in Namibia (1990) and attaining peace and stability in El Salvador (1991-1995). Moreover, in redeeming its previous inaction in both places, the UNSC set up of tribunals to deal with genocide in Yugoslavia and Rwanda which led to the prosecutions and convictions of the many culprits who took part in the atrocious acts that took place in these countries (McLay, 2011).

While there are many more instances whereby the Council has helped to bring increased world stability and peace, these few examples serve to highlight the importance and the positive contributions that the UN and the UNSC has had on small state security. It is of course well known that the Security Council has often shown itself to be unable to arrive at or implement solutions to many of the world's political crises such as the Rwandan genocide or prevention of many other conflicts. Nevertheless it has shown that it still has a large role to play in safeguarding peace and security for the world. Also the creation of the UN has been a key factor in enabling small states to represent themselves on a higher level platform, engage with the international community and tackle matters that directly affect their sovereignty and core values. The working methods of the UN has thus made it possible for small states - on the appropriate platforms - to have a strong stake in the international decision-making processes of international peace and security.

1.2.4 Small state security and international law

The growing responsibilities of small states in global peace and security have to a large extent contributed to a more balanced international system. However despite of their growing statures and their admission in the UN, small states are well aware that they have not reached the end of the road in their hope for helping the world to attain global peace and equality of states. As Kevlihan (n.d) points out, the challenge for small states in the modern era no longer lies only on the principle of survival but rather in the "strengthening of collective action with states and other actors at regional and international levels in support of norms and processes that encourage co-operation for mutual benefit". Thus in becoming more influential actors and promoters of collective action, small states had an even bigger task which was to help enforce international law and ensure that this new pattern of stability and respect for international law would continue and be applicable to all states. More importantly they had to ensure that international decisions that they now had a say in took on board the security considerations and vulnerabilities of small states. In support of this assertion, Asgrimsson (2003) observed that;

"in recent years, smaller states have generally attempted to ensure their own security on the basis of international law and by supporting the negotiation of legally binding instruments under the auspices of international or multilateral organisations and institutions. Many of them have advocated and participated in regional co-operation and become members of multilateral organisations and alliances. Experience has shown that smaller states can successfully strengthen their positions on the basis of international law, and even pursue their specific interests".

This is because mostly all small states do not have the hard power capabilities to act unilaterally beyond their own borders. Thus they turn towards international law as their best option for support and safety to their sovereignty. As a result, the UN and the international legal system provides small states "with a framework of international treaties and laws that protects their

sovereignty…Indeed, some view rules-based multilateralism and its underlying principle of collective security as their very means of survival" (Súilleabháin, 2014, p.4). Thus the clear imbalance between small states and big states has shown that the multilateral system endorsed by the UN, based on the international rule of law is very important for small states in bridging this deficit and in their mission to safeguard their sovereignty.

This is because the parameters set by international laws reduces the imbalance from being used to the disadvantages of the small states and reduces the opportunities for the strong states to influence them. Thorhallson (2012, p. 141-142) further elaborates on this reasoning by stating that the strength of international institutions that attempt to uphold international law also lies in the structure, consisting of laws and treaties, which states can create and by which they have to abide. Refusal to follow international laws, norms and treaties means any state (including larger states) will face several difficulties despite their traditional political and economic powers. This guarantee is very important for small states that have limited hard power capabilities because it serves as an additional layer of protection to their borders, peoples and ultimately their sovereignty. However, while international law is binding and expected to be respected by all states, guarantee for total respect of international law has on many occasions been breached. Illegal occupation of foreign territories such as Russia's annexation of Crimea or the USA-UK invasion of Iraq are only but a few examples that serve to show that sometimes not every international law applies to every state nor do they find it required to adhere to them.

1.3 Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter has outlined the two main definitions of a small state and has given a concise understanding to the evolution of small states security. This understanding has changed in consequence to the changing circumstances of world security, politics and economics. Through the analysis of the evolution of small states security we have come to recognise that small states no longer play the role of a bystander in international relations. Rather small states have become more involved at decision-making forums such as the UNGA where states share an equal significant voice and vote along with the big powers.

While to some extent their influence is less effective at the UNSC, their contribution as non-permanent members must not be disregarded. The gain in prominence of small state security has been made possible as a result of the change in global governance caused by a number of global waves, such as the end of the two World Wars, decolonization and creation of the UN amongst many others. These new global waves have created a new basis for global governance and international peace and security, cemented on the foundations and spirit of collective security, rule of law, respect for human rights, democracy and principles of non-violent collaborations.

The next chapter will now look at the issues related to small states security and globalization by elaborating on the correlation between the growing security matters and the vulnerabilities of small states in a globalized world. It will look at the pre-conditions for economic development in small states and introduce the concept guns or butter dilemma in relation to its impact on small state and world security. It will also discuss the growing roles of humanitarian intervention and

further elaborate on international law as added protection for the vulnerable security capabilities of small states. The chapter will also discuss the negative impacts of globalization and the global economic inequality in relation to their influence on small states economies and ultimately their security. Moreover, it will make a brief analysis of the security impacts on small states of three particular emerging security threats which are transnational crime, migration and the refugee crisis and terrorism.

Chapter 2–Globalization and small states security

Just as an epidemic first strikes at the weaker people, the weakest members of the world community sustains greater damage from the growth of negative consequences of globalization than the countries that are protected by their financial and economic might.

(Ivanov, 2003)

2.1 Small State vulnerabilities and globalization

Many case studies and outcries from small states have shown that they have always been the first to be affected by any circumstance that stands to threaten international peace and security. This is why, for small states it is of the imperative belief that disputes, conflicts and wars are to be avoided at all costs. For the simple reason that their development and prosperity is heavily dependent on constant worldwide and regional stability, free from any international shocks or dangers, it is pertinent for small states that the world remains stable and safe (Kassimeris, 2009). Moreover, as for the survival of any sovereign state, keeping at bay any form of threat that could bring negative impacts to national or regional peace, political and economic stability, as well as the physical health of their people will figure at the centre of the national security agendas of any country.

Small states are generally known for their peaceful nature, weak military presence and capacity, scarcity of resources, high dependence on international trade and small economic power - and to date for many of these countries this has not changed much. As a result of globalization, most of these small states have been afforded the opportunity to join the bandwagon of modernization. Those that have been able to - financially - afford it have adopted the use of many advanced

methods, weapons and technologies in their development and security systems. In addition, in comparison to the circumstances presented to them in the past, many of these states now have better access to possess such tools in order to progressively move forward as a nation and safeguard their territory. Yet, due to the vulnerabilities to a number of global factors, many developing small states face many challenges that keep them behind the economic progress and security development levels of the developed states especially the western post-industrialised states.

The emergence of the concept of globalization resonated an opportunity for states to connect and enable their economies to grow, increase people to people ties and enhance the connectivity of the world. Further to this Kay (2004, p.10) explains that "globalization is often seen by its proponents as facilitating a new idealism of economic openness, political transparency, and global culture. Globalization provides an opportunity for the advancement of common human standards and equality as norms and rules are channelled throughout the world. This global proximity is thought to foster cooperation and to increase security". By such definition and with the clear examples that surround us all, globalization has indeed created many positive international integration effects such as exchanges of views, cultures, services, products, and advances in transportation, communication and infrastructure. In this essence, economic globalization has introduced a rapid increase in cross-border movement of services, goods, capital and technology, resulting in more trade, more connectivity, more markets, and more openness. Despite some of the challenges of globalisation, the positive impacts it boasts have been instrumental in the global integration process and in the advancement of many states, especially for small developing ones that were once undeveloped states.

Furthermore, globalization created and facilitated economic integration between states, leading to the emergence of a global market place. As a result of globalisation, developed economies became more integrated with developing economies all over the world by means of trade, foreign direct investment (FDI) and reduction of trade barriers. Through the advances of world communications people and countries far apart have been brought closer together by the instant click of a button on the computer, a phone or video call or by following 24/7 news which was now as easily accessible via television, radio, computers and smart phones. Moreover, as it blurred the lines of international borders through increased global trade and migration, globalization strengthened the sense being part of the international community.

2.2 Security as prerequisites for economic growth and integration

In the globalized world, the booming of one economy has a positive effect on not only its own people and prosperity but also it has a positive effect on the world economy. However, for any economy to grow, stability and security is key - thus asserting itself as an important precondition for economic development. For small states, global economic integration has helped many of them to strengthen their own economies. FDI and bilateral or multilateral development aid has pumped a huge inflow of foreign exchange in the economies of many developing small states. It has also led to many positive infrastructural developments, growth in local productivity and advancements in many sectors of small states which they would have not been able to afford to make available on their own national budgets. While local job opportunities have also increased due to economic growth, many small states that had undergone the process of industrialisation

were also afforded the opportunity to diversify their economies. This has led to creating various positive economic and socio-economic impacts in many small states.

Such positive strides have been ideal for many developing small states as they continue to work hard and aspire to have the socio-economic indexes of the mature developed small states such as the Nordic countries. However, because of their high dependence on FDI and bilateral or multilateral development aid, many developing small states have found it to be even more important in finding the means to preserve and ensure their stability and security. This is because developing small states are fully aware that no investor, company, or Multi-National Corporation (MNC) would dare invest in a conflict prone or unstable country. It would basically be a waste of money - investment suicide - for the investor. Moreover, bilateral or multilateral development aid would also be reduced until a stable power with the right governance principles is established so as to avoid corrupted practices.

2.3 <u>Guns or butter dilemma</u>

While contributing to positive economic and socio-economic growth, an improved and bigger economy affords small states the ability to strengthen and modernise their defence structures, whether it be their military, navy or police forces. It also affords them the opportunity to strengthen their health systems through better health facilities and medication for their people. After all, the strength of your country is determined by the good health of your work force. As mentioned earlier in the quest of attracting more investors into ones country, having an adequate defence system is more than a necessity. Altogether, a bigger economy gives a state the

opportunity to strengthen other sectors of importance and help to improve the living standards of its people.

However spending a superficial amount of the country's finances into the defence sector rather than into other important sectors such as education, health, agriculture or sports is a cause for alarm that will reflect the state of a country of mirroring a militarized nation. Hence, the quality and size of investment in the defence sector of a state will be determined by how much money and resources the country has and is willing to spend on. In such a national conundrum, a country is faced with the classic macroeconomic debate termed as the 'guns or butter dilemma' which demonstrates how much money a country spends on its defence against how much money is expended on non-military and other domestic goods.

To further explain this dilemma, Wei (2005) describes it as follow;

"Building a strong defence force has one drawback. Often the development of a powerful defence force has evolved at the expense of the growth of the economy. When a significant proportion of the limited resources of a state's Gross National Product (GNP) is laid aside for defence expenditure, then that amount will not be available for use in improving the living standards of the population as a whole. This situation is commonly referred to by economists as the 'guns or butter' situation. A good illustration would be Israel. Undoubtedly, the possessor of the finest defence force of any small state, Israel also suffers from a problem-riddled economy with triple-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment. She relies heavily on the U.S for financial assistance in propping up her defence spending. Sweden, too, has had to divide her resources between social welfare expenditure and defence spending. Consequently, though Swedish social welfarism is highly developed, the country does not yet have the anti-submarine capability necessary to ward off the Russian mini-submarines that frequently intrude into her territorial waters. Conversely, Japan has been able to thrive economically because her defence commitments have until recently, been at a relatively low level of one percent of her Gross Domestic Product (GDP)".

The above explanation by Wei essentially reaffirms the underlying issue of why it is difficult for small states to have quality defence systems that would be adequate to cope with an increasingly insecure world or against a military attack from another state. The welfare and prosperity of the people and also the financing of infrastructural developments that are closely linked to the primary developments of a country such as the building of schools, hospitals and better connectivity is at hindsight the logical choice to make for any national development plan. However, there are countries that believe that being a militarized state is more important than the well-being of their people and the development of their country. North Korea is a perfect example of how the guns or butter dilemma can be approached in the wrong way. Through its continued self-inflicted isolation, refusal to adhere to international laws and norms, recipient of a number of global economic sanctions and by focussing most of its finances on attempting to make itself a nuclear state, North Korea has put the importance of the guns over butter. Cuba on the other hand - whom is still at the receiving end of the trade embargo with the USA - has thrived in terms of human developments, high literacy rate and life expectancy in view of their prioritisation of choosing butter over guns.

For most small states, their economies do not produce an influx amount of revenue in order for them to spend a great deal in the defence sector while still making lump sums available for raising the living standards of their people or to finance important infrastructural projects that would contribute positive impacts on its socio-economic developments. Once they have already subtracted their annual loan or debt payments, the annual budget preparation for most small states would be followed by the careful allocation of funds to their priority sectors such as health, education and followed by others. The defence sector will no doubt receive its fair share as it is a

vital sector for any sovereign state. However, because small states are normally not aggressive or defensive states, the need to heavily spend in a bigger military or to purchase quality weapons is generally seen as not essential. Indeed the real-world situations in individual countries and security spending needs of different small states will vary depending on the security threats that face them.

The increase in military expenditures of Saudi Arabia in 2015 for example was largely due to its military operations in Yemen. Heightened tensions with China over the South China Sea have reflected in substantial growth in military spending in 2015 by Indonesia 16%, Philippines 25% and Vietnam 7.6%. Growth in military spending has also been seen in the countries bordering Russia or Ukraine, reflecting the escalating fear of a threat from Russia. In 2015 Poland increased its spending by 22%, Romania 11% and Slovakia 17%. Ukraine's military expenditure increased by 10% compared to what it was in 2014 and by 61% if it were to be compared to its military spending in 2006. The impact of conflicts in Africa such as in Mali reflected an increase in military expenditure by 66% in 2015 and in Kenya which has been militarily involved in the conflict in Somalia, increased its military spending by 22% in 2015 (SIPRI Factsheet, 2016). However it must be noted that despite of the increasing trends of such small states in their military expenditures, other small states that are generally safe from militarized security threats would normally not allocate the same big percentages increases out of their annual budgets to be spent on the defence sector in comparison to the much larger states.

As it can be expected the amount of money spent on the defence sector between the large and small states are very far apart. USA for example spends far more on the defence than any other

country in the world. American military spending has always eclipsed other budgets of states worldwide but the gap grew much wider when it beefed up its spending to improve its counter-terrorism units after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Its military expenditures alone topped that of the seven countries combined that followed it in the list of countries that spend the most on the defence sector. In this list it is reported that in 2015 USA spent $596 Billion, China $215 Billion, Saudi Arabia $87.2 Billion, Russia $66.4 Billion, UK $55.5 Billion, India 51.3 Billion, France $50.9 Billion, Japan $40.9 Billion and Germany $39.4 Billion. South Korea, Brazil, Italy, Australia, United Arab Emirates and Israel form the top 15 countries which altogether their military expenditure amounts to $1350 Billion, while the world total which includes other states of the world amounts to $1676 Billion (SIPRI Factsheet, 2016). This reflects that outside the top 15 states, other states of the world only spend $326 Billion on their military expenditures.

SIDS for example, possess the smallest of armies and defence budgets in the world. However, because of their large Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) they "are open to threats from the sea through the opportunities they present for the forward projection of power elsewhere (bases), for smuggling, piracy and the illegal dumping" (Sutton and Payne, 1993, p. 585-586). Consequently SIDS and other many small states often rely on the international system, regional blocs such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or countries that they share military cooperation/alliances with to assist in safeguarding their security such as USA with Taiwan and Israel. In the context of maritime piracy threats in the Indian Ocean or the Gulf of Aden, foreign naval ships and surveillance planes are often requested by SIDS such as Seychelles to assist in

the patrolling of its EEZ because most SIDS like Seychelles do not have the naval capacity to cover their own EEZ.

While such arrangements are expected to benefit SIDS such as Seychelles and other small states in terms of added security, they must ensure to be cautious in such agreements because certain terms and conditions may entail requirements that go against their normal practices and policies. In consequence to such scenarios, small states may eventually face the possibilities of endangering their sovereignty, national and foreign policies "as the great power may exploit a weaker side even in times of peace and stability; merely because great powers tend to ignore the effects of their decisions upon the interests of smaller powers" (Mathisen 1971, p.57 in Kassimeris, 2009, p. 94). This may occur in terms of involving the allied small power as a third party in regional or international disputes. It could also include increasing the military presence in the region of the small state that in the long run it leads to the need for the creation of a military base on the territory of the small state as a further assurance for the protection of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the small power (Kassimeris, 2009).

2.4 <u>Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention</u>

Although the world community failed to prevent the mass atrocities such as the Holocaust, the killing fields of Cambodia, Rwandan Genocide or the Srebrenica massacre, its shortcomings helped to re-enforce the future overall international responsibility and objectives of the global community. The unanimous adoption of the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) at the 2005 World Summit was clear testament of the lessons learnt by the international community for

its recent failings and its new agenda in the name of humanitarian intervention and protection for all. The R2P was an exceptional concept adopted by the UN because it showcased the international community's promise and burden-sharing approach to safeguard groups of foreign people from any country that were not able to be protected by the defence and security mechanisms of their own state.

Since the adoption of the concept R2P, there have been many successes for R2P initiatives such as during the 2007/2008 crisis in Kenya or the 2011 crisis in Ivory Coast amongst others. However, after the resolution for intervention in Libya 2011 was passed by the UNSC the subsequent military action by NATO resulted in negative consequences and reactions by the international community. In addition to this, the R2P concept and enforcers have been accused of double standards in their implementation mechanisms. This has been seen in their limited influence in preventing human rights violations in certain countries or in preventing the continued bombings in places such as Gaza to protect Palestinians from Israeli missiles.

The Syria crisis which has resulted in an ongoing dire civil war and contributing to one of the largest migration crisis is another example whereby the crisis meets all the requirements for the need for R2P to be involved and yet is not receiving it. This is primarily because the UNSC has still not been able to give its go ahead for an R2P intervention because of the differing power politics and conflicts of interests between Russia and western states over Syria and its government. Nevertheless of such setbacks, the R2P concept and the peacekeeping efforts by the UN and other relevant bodies remain essential in the goal of protecting the helpless and vulnerable people that are more than often located in unstable small states. While much work

remains to be done on the concept and its implementation, it remains a fundamental component in the maintenance of international peace and security that small states seek to enforce.

2.5 Globalization and influence on domestic and foreign policies

While the introduction of the UN together with the end of the Cold War contributed in creating a new global political landscape, globalization also contributed drastic changes in world dynamics as it facilitated new international forces to influence this newly created landscape. Despite military force remaining a dominant force in determining the influence of a state, the emergence of other forces relating to economic, financial, intellectual and information resources led to further changes in the understanding and practice of global politics. In this respect globalization did not completely change the central aspects of international relations, but rather changed the means and channels for the exercise of its power (Kay, 2004). These new forces either facilitated or made it more difficult for states to benefit from globalization and to some extent altered the way power was being interpreted. Moreover these new forces were seen as important bargaining tools and essential instruments for the attainment for greater power and political pressure from state to state in order to influence their national and foreign policies. Ivanov (2003) further goes on to explain this by indicating that;

"the instruments of such influence are many. They include 'investment and credit diplomacy' that takes advantage of the acute need of most countries for foreign capital investments and loans. They include information diplomacy aimed at domination in the global information space. They include 'political engineering', a combined use of economic, information and military-political levers to 'construct' the desired kind of 'partners', i.e. governments ready to accept the terms of the solution of international and internal problems that are imposed on them from outside".

As a result of such new instruments of influence, it is no surprise that when small states are confronted with the need for financial aid or security assistance they face the conundrum of becoming at the mercy of the countries and international organisations providing such aid. Financial assistance and support in the form of added security is in no way free, they are given with certain conditions and more than often these conditions have to abide to the national and global interests of the donor parties. Sutton and Payne (1993, p. 589) explains that "the pattern here is one of international patron-client relations. In such a particular relationship the client state voluntarily sets limits on its actions and makes decisions in support of the patron in return for anticipated rewards now or in the future. The small state can enter into several relationships, for example trading votes in the UN or regional organizations in return for military assistance or economic aid". In such scenarios the patron will undeniably enjoy more bargaining power in comparison to the client as they will ultimately offer the support based on terms that favour them. As a result it is only sensible that the client state behaves according to the demands of its patron and adjust its policies accordingly based on conditions of their agreement and requests (Kassimeris, 2009).

Such conditions and requests also include playing a role in regional/global strategies that is essential to the national interests of the patron countries or publicly supporting/condoning international matters that the patron country considers important to its foreign policy and strategic interests. They also involve the client being pressured into adhering to certain international conventions or being directed on how to vote on sensitive resolutions at the UNGA. Other type of conditions entails modifying domestic policies such as into adopting western-style policies in the fields of human rights and civil liberties. Such policies may include

decriminalisation and legalisation of same sex marriages which are practices that are frowned upon and is not accepted in the cultures of many conservative small states such as in Latin America, Asia, Africa and in Islamic states.

Small states with little good governance and undemocratic institutions are often subjected to adopt more transparent and other good governance practices as part of their national policies in order to receive such forms of assistance. Such practices include stricter corruption policies, ensuring the rule of law and improving the efficiency and accountability of the public sector so as to meet the requirements that conform to the agenda of the patron state or organization. Additionally, good governance and democratization practices are increasingly becoming as part of the parcel in the demands of international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank before they proceed in providing financial aid or loans to states. This is of course beneficial to the democratic process of small states and also in the attempts to reduce such negative practices. As a result the adoption of such transparent and other good governance practices avails these small states increased safe practices and the need to ensure continued stability within the country and also outside of it in order for the aid to keep pouring in.

2.6 Global economic inequality and small states security

In view of their economies of scale, not many small states can cover the cost of imports by exports. As a result, one main commonality that many small states have developed has been their over-reliance on financial aid to make up for their diminished gains. Sutton and Payne (1993, p.

590) further explain this occurrence by stating that "too much dependence on aid discourages national savings, forces the recipient to use foreign technologies and skills, and favours the donor in determining the development priorities of the country". Over-dependence on financial aid further leads to increased vulnerability to foreign sensitivities such as global or financial crises. Rather than bridging the gap between rich and poor states or developed and developing countries, the forces of globalization becomes a dangerous tool that increases global economic inequality.

This economic disparity prevents the majority of developing small states that are not rich in natural resources to lag behind while the developed states and their home-based MNC's or other companies continue to prosper and take all the spoils. In his analysis of the growing role of external factors in the development of small states, Ivanov (2003) claims that "while a small group of leading industrialized states plays mainly the role of the subjects of globalization, the vast majority of the remaining states are turning into its objects that are 'drifting' on the waves of financial economic developments". This argument further goes on to demonstrate that at the current rate and conditions of globalization the global economic inequality is highly likely to increase and as a result the socio-economic development gap between many regions of the world will continue to widen. As the saying goes; while the rich get richer, the poor get poorer.

It must not be disregarded to also factor in the growing population pattern in developing small states which will no doubt pose greater negative impacts on their security and socio-economic development. Within this conundrum the guns and butter dilemma for small states worsens even more. Unless they acquire access to large resources of highly valued raw materials such as oil, small states will remain with the same marginal financial abilities and slow paced economies. A

growing population in this context will thus mean greater demand and expectations of better socio-economic conditions. In comparison to developed states, the situation will be different. With their growing economies and slow population growth, developed countries face more favourable conditions, illustrating why they will always have higher chances to experience safer and stable circumstances. Moreover, for small states the increasing global economic gap further translates into additional negative security expectations. The increasing economic inequality can add on to its security dilemmas by destructive force as it may provide the type of conditions that breeds political and social instability.

2.7 Globalization, the rise of new security threats and their impacts on small state security

Although of being paraded under the umbrellas of the UN, new international laws, notions of the collective good and the international community, a globalized world does not offer relaxed national or regional security policies for small states; rather it offers the complete opposite. However, when referring to the diminished traditional threat of security Qing (2011) observed that "in the global context, threats of traditional security problems to world peace have been considerably moderated, and states tend to resolve disputes in the framework of the United Nation". To a large extent this is indeed true as the world distanced itself from the demands of ideological, political and military confrontation of the Cold War (Ivanov, 2003) and the UN greatly assisted a number of states in finding peaceful solutions to their disputes and to develop more peaceful natures.

But even so, it would be naive to assume that the world is now safe and free from any security threat. Persistent old disputes and conflicts continue to shake the existing stability of the world such as through the religious conflicts in the Middle East and the nuclear instability of the Korean peninsula. Moreover, over the last two decades, the number of regions involved in civil conflicts has increased in many parts of the world such as in countries that experienced the Arab Spring. These emerging conflicts have created the type of instability that has promoted new security problems such as large scale humanitarian and refugee crises. As a result of this the global security landscape has become unthinkably different than what it was 50 or 20 years ago and it is even more unsafe for the likes of small states.

The end of the Cold War may have relaxed the tension derived from superpower competitions but it lifted the lid on other global security dilemmas. The decline of the great power wars gave rise to non-traditional security challenges such as transnational criminal groups, terrorism, human, arms and drug trafficking, cyber-attacks, migration, climate change and the spread of infectious diseases such as the Ebola Crisis, which have all eroded the traditional national security orientation of states. Some of these new threats have even masked in the cloaks of globalization and others are harder to control because they are beyond human control. While many of these security threats may not all be new, globalization has facilitated the increase of their occurrences in view that the world has become more interconnected and interdependent.

The dissertation will now make a brief analysis of the security impacts on small states of three particular emerging global security threats which are transnational crime, migration and the refugee crisis and terrorism.

2.7.1 Transnational Crime

Globalization has for a fact transformed the nature of international crime and altered the way in which security policies were traditionally being conducted at the national, regional and global levels. It created a system in which terrorists, transnational and cyber-criminal groups could thrive and affect wider communities thus making the world a more dangerous place to live in. As a separate group of beneficiaries to globalisation, such groups could now conduct cyber-attacks, move trafficked persons, illegal money and contrabands within a world where the daily growing flows of information, people, money, and commodities provide excellent cover for their activities. Hence, the decline in many regulations regarding the movement of goods and people provided transnational criminals with greater freedom and expansion opportunities for their illicit networks to flourish. Corruption, limited capacity, lack of infrastructures and ineffective crime prevention mechanisms within states have further allowed these illicit activities to occur.

Moreover, it has become a common practice for terrorists and transnational criminal groups to base their operations in states with inadequate or corrupt law enforcement and also where they can launder their money without being questioned because of poor banking secrecy regulations. They also have a strong tendency to operate in regions where they cannot be extradited. These are unfortunately the type of conditions and legal loopholes that one would find in small states with ineffective security systems which are not able to prevent such type of illegal activities from taking place. The Sahel region on the African continent for example is one of the most ungoverned territory in the world which is unfortunately used for all kinds of illegal activities and has been a training post for terrorist and transfer zones for contrabands. Although the

maritime piracy activities have been on the decline, Somalia remains a command centre for piracy and for other illicit activities such as trafficking of humans, drugs and arms.

In comparison to the larger states, many small states have greater difficulties in tackling transnational crime. This is because they lack the appropriate surveillance and monitoring technological advancement, manpower and other resources to prevent such illicit activities from occurring. As a result they are often unable to conduct the required surveillance to monitor all the movements of goods at their ports of entry and blind spots within their borders where such contrabands are often smuggled in. As mentioned earlier, the large EEZ of SIDS for example is very hard for such small states to police as it is beyond their capacities. By not being able to cover such a large area negative practices are allowed to occur such as illegal fishing by foreign vessels or illegal dumping causing marine pollution and environmental degradation. Consequently, small states continue to face many new physical and human challenges that compel them to find new means to bolster their border control and patrol capabilities which always come with high costs as they attempt to devise new methods and policies in order to prevent transnational crime.

2.7.2 Migration and the refugee crisis

As it increased and encouraged the free movement of goods, globalization also played a key role in encouraging the free movement of people through lawful and controlled migration. However, the need for small states to continuously strengthen its security structures is also occurring because of this increased migration which has expedited the movement of refugee crisis inflows.

Some states have had to amend their immigration laws and impose stricter controls on their borders (particularly in Europe) so as to regulate the influx amount of refugees and migrants pouring into their countries. The present and on-going migration crisis for example, has created one of the worst refugee and humanitarian crisis caused by pressures originating from the ongoing struggle for power and civil wars in the Middle East - mainly Syria and Iraq - and poverty in some African countries such as in Somalia, Sudan and Eritrea. These negative factors have caused grave impacts on the lives and safety of the citizens belonging to such unstable states resulting in a huge increase in the numbers of displaced persons, high death tolls and deprivation to basic services.

The civil war in Syria in particular has resulted in an influx in refugee movements towards neighbouring states and even as far as European states such as Germany and Sweden. It has been reported that over 5 million Syrian refugees for example fled to neighbouring states such as Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt and Turkey. Lebanon a country of 4.4 million inhabitants, is presently hosting over 1 million refugees from countries such as Syria, Palestine and Iraq. This makes it the highest per-capita concentration of refugees worldwide, where one person out of four is a refugee (European Commission, Lebanon: Syria crisis, 2016, p. 2). On the other hand, Jordan a country of 8.1 million is hosting over 600, 000 refugees. With over 11 million people having fled their homes both inside Syria and to the neighbouring countries, shelter needs are high while children, women and the elderly are most at risk. Rape, sexual violence, enforced disappearances, forcible displacement, recruitment of child soldiers, summary executions and deliberate shelling of civilian targets have also become alarming matters as a result of the crisis in Syria (European

Commission, Syria crisis, 2016, p. 2). Additionally, over 220, 000 Syrians have already lost their lives as a result of a full blown civil war in which the primary victims have been civilians.

The refugee crisis towards European countries also resulted in many negative concerns such as high death tolls and raised many border alerts which led to stricter migration policies of the receiving countries. In 2015 over 1 million refugees and displaced persons had made their way into Europe sparking a crisis as receiving countries struggled to cope with the high influx. By June 2016 around 156, 000 migrants had still reached Europe. This created division in the EU over how best to deal with resettlement of these people as they were considered as very high figure in terms of European migration figures (European Commission, 2016). While many countries in Europe who are receiving these refugees are signatories to the Schengen Agreement (which promotes the free movement of people and less border checks), they have had to impose stricter border controls so as to regulate the influx amount of refugees pouring into their states.

Hungary for example unfortunately became a hotspot gateway into the Schengen zone and during 2015 its reaction to protect its borders was to build a fence on its border with Serbia which later extended to Slovenia and Croatia. This move was of course highly criticized by the EU member states and the international community. Other European states such as Denmark and Sweden have also stepped up their border controls by extending identity checks on all travellers to reduce the influx of migrants. Sweden has even gone as far refusing entry to anyone who has no photo identification. Presently Austria, Denmark, France, Slovakia, Netherlands, Germany, Norway and Sweden make up the list of states within the Schengen zone that have increased

their border controls – the list of countries is expected to increase and controls to become even more strict.

One of the biggest pressure point in the European refugee crisis is the ongoing dilemma of migrants who are being smuggled on overcrowded fishing boats or inflatable dinghies from Turkey to Greece across the Aegean Sea. It has been recorded that nearly a thousand of refugees attempt the trip from Turkey to Greece every day. According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), more than 3,770 migrants were reported to have died trying to cross the Mediterranean in 2015. By comparison 3,279 deaths were recorded in the Mediterranean in 2014. Globally, the IOM estimates that over 5,350 migrants died in 2015 and that the total sea arrivals to Europe in 2015 amounted to a total of 1,004,356 which is almost five times than the amount of the previous year's total of 219,000. In 2015, the deadliest month for migrants was April, when a boat capsized in the sea off Libya, with 800 people losing their lives while only 28 survivors were rescued - overcrowding is thought to have been one of the reasons for the disaster (IOM, 2016).

As a result of the migration crisis many small states in Europe are developing into stepping stones for refugees that want to reach North of Europe, however when these refugees are refused entry they eventually fall back on smaller states such as Greece, Hungary or Austria. Attempts to normalize the migration crisis have thus created a lot of tension within the EU because of the disproportionate burden faced by these small countries, particularly those where the majority of migrants have been arriving. While humanitarian aid from the UN, EU and other donor agencies to assist in the regulation of the crisis may to some extent provide the necessary financial

assistance to tackle the refugee problem, the aid does not however prevent the security and socio-economic dilemmas emerging from the migration crisis itself. When many refugees are fleeing their homes because of the violence and poverty, some of the people fleeing with them are actually criminals, radicals or terrorists that are attempting to get into Europe under the pretence of being refugees or asylum seekers. With increasing terrorist attacks occurring worldwide, many transit and receiving countries especially European states fear that terrorists may accidentally slip through the pressures that the mass turn outs of refugees are causing.

The increased global migration crisis has also caused border tensions between states such as Turkey-Syria and discords amongst xenophobic groups that share different views on the crisis. It has even caused clashes amongst the different nationalities of people who are migrating as they already share nationalistic differences between themselves. For instance in Kenya the Somali refugees are seen as trouble makers and such perception is also used for Kenyans belonging to the Somali ethnic group. This has led to sympathy by the native Kenyan Somali's to the Somali refugees which they feel more connected to as they share same ethnicity, culture and even religion, and in return less connection and understanding with the ordinary Kenyan person or way of living.

The migration crisis has also contributed to negative impacts on the socio-economic conditions of the transit and receiving states. The community resources, infrastructure and social services of such states have been seriously overstretched and have added strain on the socio-economic, infrastructure and national emergency response capacities of such countries. The pressure is felt in almost all sectors including education, health, housing, water and electricity supply. Moreover,

in view of their low health records many refugees pose potential health risks as carriers of epidemics or diseases that may eventually spread into areas of the receiving or transit states and as result it places more pressure on the healthcare systems of these small states. Means to prevent such eventualities has resulted in firmer rules at border controls and increased manpower resources which have eventually led to the incorporation of the army of some small states whose border control personnel have reached their maximum capacities.

Consequently, the best proposed way forward to prevent the migrant and refugee crisis is to address its root causes such as conflict, human rights abuses or poverty and help to restore peace and stability in the countries where most of the refugees are coming from. However, this remains an uphill battle in view of the complexities that surround the conflicts in the Middle East for example. Until the day that peace and stability finds its way in these unstable states, the humanitarian crisis for the refugees will only worsen and its troubles will continue to overspill in surrounding states.

2.7.3 Terrorism

Terrorism is not a new concept in the field of international security. However with the assistance of the modern tools of globalization, the networks and strikes of terrorist attacks have thrived at the expense of our societies becoming more integrated and interconnected. As a result terrorist organizations have grown in numbers and multiplied in different corners of the world. Amongst many others, radical groups such as Al Qaeda, Taliban, Boko Haram, ISIS, Al Shabaab and Hezbollah have become household names each time there has been an attack related to terrorism.

Their means of attacks have evolved and become more ruthless whether through suicide bombings, arson, kidnapping groups of people for ransom, depositing detonated bombs in crowded areas, public executions and other gruesome methods such as beheading. Their impacts on foreign policies and global security have been enormous and have raised the security alerts in many major capital cities where the terrorists have conducted their attacks such as New York, Paris, London and Brussels. However, this does not mean that other cities belonging to small states should feel unthreatened or worry less that they will not feature in the line of attacks of these radical groups.

Throughout its growth cycle terrorist attacks have begun to frequently occur in a number of less prominent parts of the world and in particular in small states. The October 2002 Bali bombings in Indonesia resulted in 202 people dead with nearly 230 people injured. In November 2008, Pakistani men associated with the terror group Lashkar-e-Tayyiba stormed buildings in Mumbai, India killing over 160 people, leaving countless injured. In January 2016, a group of Al-Qaeda backed militants attacked the Splendid Hotel - a popular meeting place for Western diplomats - in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso killing 30 people and injuring over 50 others. In Kenya, the September 2013 siege of Nairobi's upscale Westgate Mall left at least 67 dead and many wounded. Again in Kenya, the attacks by gunmen at the Garissa University College in April 2015 left at least 147 people dead while also leaving many injured. Both attacks were conducted by Al-Shabaab militants (Kealing, 2016a; Kealing 2016b).

In August 1998, two massive bombs exploded outside of the U.S. Embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya killing 224 people and wounding nearly 5,000 people. In

November 2015 a group of Al-Qaeda-linked militants took 170 people hostage, killing 20 and injuring seven others during a mass shooting at the Radisson Blu Hotel in Bamako, Mali. In November 2015 a bus loaded with Tunisian guards were struck by a suicide bomber killing 13 people in what was the third significant attack attributed to ISIS in Tunisia in 2015. In February 2016, a group of militants linked to Al-Shabaab killed at least 20 people and left a dozen wounded after a suicide bomber detonated a bomb at the gate of the SYL hotel a beachside restaurant-hotel in Mogadishu, Somalia. In March 2016 at least 18 people were killed and another 33 were injured when an al-Qaeda-linked group attacked the Étoile du Sud Hotel in Grand-Bassam, Ivory Coast (Kealing, 2016a; Kealing 2016b).

While the aforementioned examples have only been able to single out only a number of the most recent terrorist attacks that have struck small states, it further sets out to prove that large states are not the only targets of terrorism. It is also equally important to highlight the ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan, Yemen, Iraq, Libya and Syria as another casualty of terrorism. Conflicts in these states originate in the uprisings of radical groups such as Al Qaeda and ISIS. The ongoing agenda and operations of ISIS for example have resulted in mass casualties, deaths and destruction of protected cultural sites across most of these small states. Their quest in establishing an Islamic State in the Middle East has rocked the security foundations of not only the region but also the world, as their activities have included suicide attacks and detonation of bombs in major cities abroad such as in Istanbul, Paris and Brussels.

Radicalism, terrorism and globalization have thus become a vile recipe for destruction in the stability and safety of cities and countries worldwide, big or small. The spread of information

and technology has greatly increased the risks associated with any given terrorist attack whether in the streets of London, Paris, Damascus or Ouagadougou. Moreover, globalization has greatly enhanced the likelihood that terrorist groups can get their hands on a number of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) whether biological, chemical or nuclear, which is a very alarming security concern. While the community of states continue to work together whether through the UN, INTERPOL, EUROPOL, regional alliances or with bilateral partners, reducing the capabilities and cutting of the resources that terrorists and radical groups feed of remains an ongoing battle that has yet to see its end.

2.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, globalization has been a tale of two sides of the coin. On one side, it has enhanced world economic integration, promoted technological, communications and transportation advancements resulting in more trade, openness and connectivity. This has made the idea of a global community feasible and provided the required tools and resources for foreign countries and non-state actors to have direct impact and influence on each other's lives. Together with the new global political dynamics, new instruments of globalization, the UN and the notion of collective security, the global family, R2P and new international laws the world has entered a new era of togetherness that has provided additional security for small states. The positive impacts of globalization have also helped many developing small states to boost their economies and socio-economic development. In return this has also afforded some of these countries the opportunity to strengthen their military and security capacities provided that their budgets permit so as per the conditions of the explained guns or butter dilemma.

On the other hand, when globalization has gone wrong its economic impacts on small states security has been colossal and even worsening the dilemma of the guns or butter situation for small states. The unequal balance of economic gains and growing patterns of over-population in such states have aggravated the global economic and socio-economic gaps leaving these states with even less favourable economic conditions to benefit from. Furthermore, globalization has provided the key to Pandora's Box as it facilitated the emergence of new global security threats – traditional and untraditional. These new global security threats present many problems for states all over the world however they present an even bigger threat to small states because of their vulnerable security capabilities and resources.

Given that the guns or butter dilemma plays a key role in the security capability of a country, the resilience of small states cannot be compared to those belonging to larger states. With limited capacities and economies of scale, many small states find it difficult to ensure their own safety and sovereignty through their own military, economic and political means. As a result they have to turn to bilateral partners, regional alliances and international organisations to ensure their safety. This in return comes at specific costs which can often endanger the sovereignty of the small state. As a result of globalization, small states security is thus provided with more problems rather than solutions and those with lesser financial means have to re-prioritise and re-strategize their important sectors and allocation of funds resulting in an even trickier guns or butter situation.

The next chapter will now outline the key roles of small states in relation to the maintenance of world peace and stability. These actions have not gone unnoticed and in the absence of many of these main contributions, the world that we currently live in would probably reflect more instability and conflict. While small states may struggle to limit the effects of the old and new global security threats, their contributions in the maintenance of global peace and security have shown that they are closely linked with the safeguarding of their own sovereignties. Moreover their noble actions in this quest have proven that they are able to punch above their weight.

Chapter 3 – Key contributions by Small States to the maintenance of peace and security

All the world owes much to the little 'five feet high' nations.
The greatest art of the world was the work of little nations.
The most enduring literature of the world came from little nations.
The heroic deeds that thrill humanity through generations were
the deeds of little nations fighting for their freedom.

President John F. Kennedy addressing the Irish Parliament (Oireachtas), June 1963

Making up more than half of the UN, small states have - through the UN - made many meaningful contributions to international law, peace and security in a world where globalization, unstable states and emerging security threats have become a very dangerous combination. However many IR literature and the general consensus largely reflect that the contributions of large states as being the most influential and often the most recognised contributor to international law, peace and security (Neumann and Gstöll, 2004). Regardless of this misconception, small states have not been discouraged in their pursuit to be part on the good side of history. In this regard they have been the bright lights to a dark future by becoming international norm-entrepreneurs (Thorhallson, 2012), peace enablers, agents and messengers of peace with the aim to create a more secure world.

Thus, despite of their shortcomings the success of many small states through the maximisation of their soft power has proven to be beneficial to the international security system and global peace policies. Moreover they have proven that their contributions should not be underestimated or disregarded. In support of this assertion, former Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan (1998) stated that:

"it is easy for small nations to feel daunted by the global forces at work…Large countries with enormous labour forces, abundant natural resources, arsenals of high-tech weaponry and fleets of expert technicians and negotiators may seem to have all the advantages…I would like to sound the strongest possible note to the contrary. My long experience at the UN has shown me that the small States of the world…are more than capable of holding their own. I would even go so far as to say that their contributions are the very glue of progressive international cooperation for the common good".

In his speech, during the meeting of the FOSS, Secretary General of the UN Ban Ki-moon (2012) equally echoed the same views tabled by Mr. Kofi Annan as he noted that "despite their size, small states can meaningfully contribute to global peace and development. They are well placed to serve as bridge-builders and mediators. They also often help to magnify important issues that affect nations both big and small. Being small does not mean an absence of big ideas". As indicated in the previous chapters, in view of the challenges that they face, the necessity for them to be more involved at multilateral and other international platforms "in order to maintain the status quo and prolong stability in their region" (Reid, 1974, p. 48 in Kassimeris, 2009, p.93) is vital for small states. Moreover the role that small states are now playing in the maintenance of international peace and security has become even more important as their levels of responsibility keeps on increasing. In the words of Annan (1998);

"Name the issue and I can point to a small State playing a central and innovative role: Reform of the United Nations? Austria served as co-chair of the working group of the General Assembly that examined the chronic financial difficulties experienced by the Organization. In the context of Human rights, Ireland has given the UN a new High Commissioner for Human Rights, former President Mary Robinson, a well-known expert who has brought new dynamism to the field. In terms of Environmental concerns, the small island developing nations of the world, which are especially vulnerable to natural disasters and the impact of climate change through rising sea levels, are on the front-lines of our work for sustainable development. They may be small islands, but big issues are involved, with implications for all of us. In matters related to Disarmament, Norway was a driving force behind the international coalition that brought about the adoption of a convention banning the production, sale or use of anti-personnel landmines".

In view of such factors, small states view multilateral and international platforms as an opportunity to safeguard their core values and sovereignty by offering them the protection under international rule of law and other international norms. Adding to this Corgan (2008) observes that "while there are enough examples to show that small states cannot have the impact that the great powers do…under the right circumstances they can prevail against far larger powers and can even have palpable influence on the world stage". As a result, the growing role of small states in global security has led to many positive outcomes to the notions of global peace. Amongst other contributions they involve being key contributors in peacekeeping missions, becoming mediators in moments of crisis and also becoming key promoters and enforcers of the rule of law. Through their overall contributions, small states have shown that they have the guile and capability to play a significant role in international matters that is normally assumed to be out of their league or disproportionate to their size.

3.1 <u>Membership of Small States in multilateral organizations</u>

The multilateral stage provides small states the appropriate platforms to voice out their concerns in order to safeguard their territories and core values. Their membership in multilateral forums affords them the opportunity to promote their own ideals, influence international politics and ideally ensure the protection of their national sovereignty under the auspices of the UN Charter and other international laws. Looking back to the most early influences of small states towards the UN, Mclay (2011, p.121-122) founded that;

"When the 'Big Four' (US, USSR, UK and China) got together at Dumbarton Oaks in 1944 to discuss the outline of the draft Charter, the result was unacceptable to any small state…The prominence of the Security Council, the diminution of the General Assembly, and only a single

reference to human rights buried deep in the text, unleashed a stormy and vociferous debate. No matter how important the role of the great powers in defeating fascism, many other countries had contributed blood and treasure to that effort, and they were not impressed…and so it was that, unhappy with the Dumbarton Oaks' outcomes, the world's small and mid-sized nations brought their own agenda to the following year's San Francisco conference that formally agreed on the Charter. Countries like - and as unalike as -New Zealand, Australia, Norway, Lebanon, Egypt, Mexico, Guatemala, and Paraguay (some who had fought in the global war, others who had not) pushed strongly to give human rights a central role in the Charter. The final Charter still included much of the original draft, particularly the primary role of the Security Council, with its P5 veto, but human rights had much more prominence and the Charter addressed the contentious issue of the rights of indigenous peoples. This example of small countries standing up to the great powers and influencing that founding document has been repeated throughout the UN's history - indeed, throughout wider post-war history".

To some degree the assertion noted by McClay illustrates and showcases how early small states were successful in using the UN to push for matters that were important to them. It showed how important a multilateral system such as the UN was for them to not only get their views across but also to enforce the recognition of their sovereign territories with ideas that they felt required to be taken in consideration. In this essence, small states promoted ideas in order to positively transform the international order by acting as innovators and as catalysts of international change because ideas help to limit the relevance of hard power. As a result small states often work towards the 'civilisation' of international relations which in return reinforces their soft power (Goetschel, 2013). While the great powers were focusing on issues that they thought was important, the contributions of small states in this case reflected the critical contributions that they would continue to advocate in the future that sought to make the world we live in a more harmonious, selfless and reflective of a more compassionate international community.

Throughout history, there have been many instances where the security dilemmas of small states were shown to be somewhat different from that of great powers. In their assessment of small state security, Sutton and Payne (1993, p. 579-580) indicated that "during the cold war,

arguments by ruling elites of the developing states called for an expansion of the definition of national security from only political independence and territorial integrity. The plan was that it also reflected core values such as economic development, public welfare, organic survival of the national population and communal harmony as this was perceived as vital national security concerns". This was because the security problems that small states were facing were qualitatively different from those facing the large states.

This derives from the reality that the security threats of small states goes beyond territorial threats and they encompass the notion of putting human security at the forefront of this understanding. Sutton and Payne (1993, p. 580) further claim that this approach "originated from the belief that economic and social factors affected national values which in return would play a direct influence on political and military decision of any country or region". As a result of this approach the promotion of human security and human rights abuse to be considered as a security threat was one that small developing and undeveloped states would relentlessly go on to promote because for them it formed part of what they perceived as one of their main security concerns. Decades after the cold war, within the present UN system and other international platforms the same values are in fact prominently featured and promoted as important international human values and have become significant cornerstones for humanitarian law. To a large extent such ideals would not have been a reality to being promoted by small states without the emergence of the multilateral context and more importantly the UN.

However, the same small states, through the engagements in the global arena, have come to realise that voicing their concerns and getting their points across are hindered by numerous

obstacles. In consequence to this they devised an effective method by which they maximize their influence on international platforms through cooperation with like-minded states or regional partners in what can be termed as the 'strength in numbers approach'. This has been successful on many occasions such as in the intergovernmental processes by SIDS through the frameworks of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) to urge the international community to approach climate change as an issue that has serious security implications for global states as a whole and not only for island states.

In addition to the plight of AOSIS promoting climate change to be recognised as a national and global security threat, in 2007 Malta raised the issue of climate change at the Human Rights Council in Geneva, as a question of human rights by urging the council to make a human response to the impacts of climate change. This position of Malta has been echoed by other SIDS such as Seychelles, Maldives, Bahamas and many other SIDS as they also view climate change as a direct threat to the livelihoods of their citizens and their sovereignty. In their claims, the consequences of climate change could eventually lead to making people from SIDS face a future of not having a country to live for due to increased global warming, carbon dioxide emissions and rising sea levels. To a very large extent, without the collective efforts of AOSIS on climate change, the decision to conclude the Paris Climate Change Agreement in December 2015 could have been delayed by another 2, 5 or 10 years, thus leading to further aggravation of the climate change crisis on the world.

3.2 Small States at the UNSC

The UNSC is viewed by many as the highest table of international relations where it is often termed that 'if you are not on the table then you are on the menu' or it is 'where the lions and the lambs are separated'. It is also referred to as the 'exclusive power club' or the 'horse shoe table' with the primary responsibility to maintain international peace and security (Monnakgotla, 1996). With the power to authorize UN peace missions or interventions resting with the Council, the vote as a non-permanent member in the UNSC carries a heavy burden because nine votes are required to adopt a resolution at the UNSC. Hence the presence of small states at the UNSC during such important voting periods holds great responsibility and necessity to provide good advice and proposals on the way forward as the UN mission mandates or goals are drafted. However, the P5 states have on many occasions been blinded by their own national interests and their uses of their veto power have prevented and delayed crucial resolutions, interventions and overall these inactions have reduced the effectiveness of the UNSC. Moreover, the contributions of small states at the high table have been limited primarily due to their short two-year mandate. But regardless of such shortcomings, the majority of small states have made their non-permanent membership count by bringing positive and constructive impacts to the work of the UNSC and to world security.

During their two year term, each elected non-permanent UNSC member, along with the P5, will at least once (sometimes twice) be given the opportunity to preside over the UNSC. During this period of being President of the Security Council, the country acting as President can introduce thematic issues into the Council's monthly programme of work. The discussions regarding specific thematic issues typically involves the diversity of speakers including members of the

Secretariat (e.g. the Secretary-General), representatives of non-governmental organizations, Council members and non-Council members, and other persons who might provide added insight on a subject to the Council as it examines a particular agenda item (UN 4 MUN, n.d). Through this procedure non-member countries are invited as outsiders to the Council meetings, affording them an opportunity to exert their views, influence or awareness on the specific issue under discussion. States such as Israel, Libya, Palestine, Lebanon, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Burundi amongst others have often been invited because they have direct involvement in the proceedings by being parties to the conflict in question and/or neighbouring states to the conflict region.

On the other hand, states which are not party to conflicts such as Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Liechtenstein, Belgium, Finland, Netherlands and Ireland amongst others are often invited because they possibly share a particular expertise/knowledge on certain policy fields which is being discussed (Thorhallson, 2012) such as human rights issues. When given such opportunities, invited small states tend to want to make an impact through their speech or deliberation. This is because for some of them it is a unique opportunity to get their views across and also promote interests or values which they feel the Council should be protecting or enforcing, relating to the matter under discussion of course. This can often be issues relating to humanitarianism, human rights, women rights, climate change, global health risks or development issues which often go under the radar of the extensive work of the UNSC.

In July 2015 while New Zealand held Presidency over the UNSC, it held an open debate on 'peace and security challenges facing SIDS'. The open debate afforded participating SIDS an extraordinary opportunity to voice out their concerns directly to the Council regarding the most

pertinent peace and security issues affecting them. Over 70 speakers participated with 19 at heads of government and ministerial level coming from SIDS in the Pacific, Caribbean, and the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. For most of these SIDS it was the first time in their history that they had been given the chance to address the Council on such an important issue, and their high attendance reflected the importance which the debate meant to them. The issues that were identified as having a significant impact on the security of SIDS included climate change, natural disasters, transnational organised crime and maritime piracy, among other peace and security challenges that they face. SIDS also took the opportunity to reaffirm their role as active multilateral actors, including through their contributions of personnel to UN peace operations (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, 2015).

One soft issue that was once brought up to for the consideration of the UNSC was an informal discussion on LGBTI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex) rights, which was co-sponsored by Chile and the USA (held in August 2015). During this informal discussion a handful of Security Council members and participating states spoke out by condemning violence against LGBTI people and in favour of the international community to make more efforts to eradicate impunity for crimes against LGBTI people. The focus of discussions was also focussed on the violence experienced by LGBTI people in Syria and Iraq at the hands of Islamic State militants. This informal discussion was in fact the first time that the Council met to discuss LGBTI rights (Greenland, 2015).

However, like the informal consultations of the UNSC this issue was only able to be raised for the attention of the Council through the format of 'Arria-formula meetings'. The 'Arria-formula' meetings are normally held in a Conference Room or at a Permanent Mission and not in the

Security Council Consultation Room. This type of meeting is a relatively new practice of the members of the Security Council. Like the informal consultations of the whole of the Security Council, they are not envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations or the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure (UN 4 MUN, n.d). However they offer the council members to have frank and private exchange of views, within a flexible procedural framework, with persons whom the inviting member or members of the Council (who also act as the facilitators or convenors) believe it would be beneficial to hear and/or to whom they may wish to convey a message. (United Nations Security Council, n.d).

Moreover, many small states at the UNSC have played a key role by being vocal and very strong advocates for reforms of the UN and more importantly the UNSC's need to have a Council that is reflective of the reality of the 21st century. It cannot be ignored that the current multilateral institutions in the form of the council reflects a 20th century institution dealing with 21st century realities and problems. As a result calls for reform of the UNSC have been made on a constant basis with the calls coming from the majority of the small states community. Such reforms have called for the improvements of the working methods of the Council, greater transparency and removal of the veto power as it hinders the work of the UNSC. However amongst the highest of call for its reform has been for the increase of permanent members on the Council so that it reflects regional representation or the current geo-politics with emerging powers such as Brazil, Germany, Japan and India waiting in line. A permanent member representation from the African continent as per the recommendations of the AU through the Ezulwini Consensus is also regarded as one of the most debated subjects in the demands for reform of the UNSC.

3.3 Enforcers and promoters of international law

One of the most prominent contributions of small states in multilateralism has been their knack to prioritize and promote international law. Súilleabháin (2014, p.5) further observes that "small states tend to place a high value on upholding the international rule of law and serve as strong advocates of the UN system and international cooperation in general. Because they lack traditional forms of hard power, the international system is their safeguard small state coalitions…help the UN as a whole operate toward consensus building". A multilateral system that is based on strong and effective international law has proved to be very beneficial for small states. It provides them with an additional layer of security and it also keeps larger states on a leash from overstepping the boundaries of international rule of law. Hence it is to no surprise that their involvement in forming a number of key institutions that overlooks issues that are of close concern to them has been a frequent occurrence.

Arguably a strong multilateral system and international rule of law has shown to provide the correct support to many countries in need. Mussolini's fascist ambitions and ease to invade Abyssinia (Ethiopia) in 1935 or the Japanese conquest in Manchuria in 1931 reflected a clear demonstration of the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations and the weak international rule of law that sought to protect the sovereignty of states of that time. Same can be said on the Leagues failure to prevent the Chaco War (1932-1935) between Paraguay and Bolivia and its inability to stop Hitler from invading states within Europe. The structure and composition of the League of Nations gave way to too many of its failures, thus it is to no surprise that the forming of the UN

was carefully worked upon so that its mandate and actions would attempt to not reflect the same as its predecessor.

One example of a much effective multilateral platform and international rule of law was reflected for example during the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq in 1990 which was followed by prompt and positive reaction by the global community as US led coalition forces intervened to push back the Iraqi forces into Iraq. Additionally the UNSC condemned the invasion while other countries such as USSR and China placed embargoes on Iraq. The invasion itself was also unanimously condemned by all major powers which were as a result of the paradigm shift that the new international rule of law bestowed by the UN unto the global community. NATO's successful involvement in the Bosnian and Yugoslav Wars in the 1990s to prevent further war crimes and human rights abuses also reflected this paradigm shift through a more effective and respected international rule of law. Moreover, the ideals of R2P and peace missions by the UN and other regional bodies such as the AU through the African Standby Force (ASF) further reflects the new mind-set and how the new international rule of law has transcended into meaningful operations aimed at maintaining world and regional peace and stability.

The creation of the UN Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has been of great benefits to the interests of the international community in particular small states with oceanic borders. As the globally recognized system dealing with all matters relating to the law of the sea, all countries big or small and non-state actors are obligated by international law to abide by the convention. The convention ultimately sets clear guidelines regarding all aspects of ocean space, such as rules for navigation, delimitation, protection of the marine environment, marine scientific

research, economic and commercial activities, transfer of technology and most importantly the settlement of disputes relating to ocean matters (Oceans and Law of the Sea, United Nations, 2013). In addition while defining international rules on the use and ocean access, UNCLOS greatly benefitted SIDS and mid-oceanic archipelagos as the convention safeguarded their oceanic based resources by means of international law and extended their oceanic boundary lines which were previously high seas. Its realization came through as a result of the hard work by small maritime countries such as Malta, Singapore, Fiji, and New Zealand who played significant roles in the process of negotiating the UNCLOS.

In another field of concern for small states the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in which Trinidad and Tobago played a key role in its establishment signified another step forward by small states in taking the initiative to get the international community on board to form such an important institution. The ICC has the mandate to prosecute individuals for genocide, crimes against humanity, crime of aggression and war crimes. Such crimes are unfortunately more frequent in small states in view of their limited security capabilities and proneness to being victims to the likes of warlords, mass killers or people who commit war crimes. Although the idea of an ICC had been talked of for some decades after the UN's establishment, the spur for the effort that actually led to the Court's establishment was begun by former Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago Mr. Arthur Robinson, in 1989 in a speech to the UNGA as a way forward to deal with drug traffickers (Corgan, 2008). Prime Minister Robinson asked the UNGA in December 1989 to re-open the talks for the establishment of an ICC and in 1994 Trinidad and Tobago presented a draft Statute which later became the Rome Statute and the creation of the court less than a decade later.

However, over the years the ICC has been accused of unfairness and as being an instrument of Western imperialism aimed at punishing leaders from small states while ignoring crimes committed individuals from developed and more powerful states. This sentiment has been expressed particularly by African leaders due to an alleged unequal concentration of the Court on the African continent. This dissatisfaction even led to a proposal at an AU Summit in 2013 calling for mass withdrawal of African states from the ICC (Cluskey, 2013). However due to insufficient support for the idea the AU did not endorse the proposal and signatory African states remained part of the ICC.

The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) grew out of a concept and early documents, introduced by Costa Rican President and 1987 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Óscar Arias. Costa Rica then went onto contribute to the intergovernmental process that produced a treaty following more than a decade of intense advocacy and negotiation (Ki-Moon, 2012). Since its adoption the ATT has resulted in stronger regulation of global trade of conventional weapons and ammunition and has brought significant decrease in its impact on human security. The realization of the ATT is of course of great importance for small states. This is because it is small states belonging to hot spots such as in the Middle East or the Sahel Region where civil wars are most prominent who are the victims that experience the casualties and death tolls due to the acquisition of illegal weapons by armed militant groups. Moreover, poorly regulated international trade in conventional arms is a proven factor that fuels conflict, poverty and human rights abuses. Thus the necessity to eliminate the black markets that traffic these types of illicit arms and ammunitions with such troubled small states is pivotal in weakening rogue states, terrorists, militant groups and armed uprisings in the

unstable parts of the world.

In international law abiding and non-civil war inflicted countries, the ATT has established a common international standard for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms and ammunitions. This controlled and monitoring system by the global community ensures – to the best of its ability – transparency and accountability between states in relation to the trade of conventional arms and ammunitions. However, even in such states illegal trade on the black market of conventional arms and ammunition is still difficult to control and as a result millions of people are getting killed, injured and abused. The irresponsible trading of arms and ammunitions has thus resulted to roughly half a million people killed every year with firearms whether in the battlefield, by armed criminal gangs or in terrorist attacks. Nevertheless the ATT has hugely minimized the flow of arms into places plagued by human rights abuses by closing the many loopholes used by arms dealers and unscrupulous governments. Further effective implementation of the ATT is expected to set new standards and enshrine in international law stricter controls on the trade or arms and ammunitions which has been poorly regulated for generations (Oxfam International, 2016; Amnesty International, 2014).

The ATT, ICC, and UNCLOS are only a few examples of major ideas and outcomes initiated by the UN's small state members to the international legal framework. Together with other examples illustrated in this dissertation, small states have demonstrated that they can come up with the big and even the smallest but most meaningful ideas that would serve to re-enforce international rule of law and to safeguard the sovereignty of states. The international law system has proven to be a safe haven for small states and because all states are expected to abide to them,

small states are assured that their securities and concerns will be protected. They also know that the culprits that go against international rule of law and other international norms will be firmly dealt with by the international system whose mandates are to protect and uphold these norms and rules. However as mentioned earlier, it is not alays the case that all states respect international law.

3.4 <u>Niche Diplomacy</u>

Over the years mostly all small states have shown that they are excellent multilateral team players and that their contribution at the multilateral levels is productive, positive and moreover it incorporates a genuine interest to safeguard the ideals of global progress, peace and security. The type of foreign policy that they practice and promote encourages for the deepening of international friendships and collaboration between states and non-state actors in the spirit of the common good. Small states are however well aware that they cannot cover every range of issues on the global agenda compared to the larger states.

To add to their strength in numbers method, a number of small states have developed a new practice in which they prioritize issues strategically in order to get the best out of their foreign policy approaches and the issue that they want to focus on and excel in. "The importance of prioritization is widely documented wherein states cultivate an area of expertise; 'norm entrepreneurship', wherein states champion a certain issue or area in the multilateral arena; or 'magnetic attraction', wherein small states engage the world community on an appealing or relevant topic" (Súilleabháin, 2014, p. 6,). This practical prioritization or commonly known as

'niche diplomacy' has led to many accomplishments when it comes to the contribution of small states in key peace and security matters.

As such, small states have developed into becoming recognized connoisseurs in their carefully chosen areas of focus. As mentioned earlier the championing of specific ideas has led to marriages between states and major international agreements, such as the aforementioned cases of Malta and UNCLOS, Trinidad and Tobago and the ICC, Costa Rica and the ATT and SIDS with the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. In other UN wide examples in 2010 Qatar successfully proposed that in emergency or humanitarian crises, the need for education be considered on the same level as food and shelter. Norway on the other hand was a driving force behind the 'Ottawa Treaty' which is the convention that banned the production, sale, and use of landmines (Mclay, 2011, p.124).

3.5 <u>Conflict Resolution and Mediation</u>

Conflict resolution and mediation has developed as a key niche practice for many other small states. Countries such as Switzerland, Norway, Austria, Denmark, Finland and Sweden have all developed successful focussed strategies in the fields of international peace making, conflict prevention and mediation. Their status of neutrality and non-violent history adding to their promotion of peace policies entailing peaceful ideas and norms of behaviour were viewed as exportable unto conflict ridden states as they provided their services as arbitrators or mediators to the international community. As a result of their continuous engagements in civilian peace building, mediation and conflict prevention, such countries have become synonymous with these

practices. However, as members to the EU, Austria, Sweden, Finland and Denmark have seemingly lost their neutral status as they are inclined to commit to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the EU and also reflect European solidarity. Regardless they have retained their soft power approaches as they have progressively integrated their peace building ideas and activities in the EU and retained strong engagement for the development of international norms such as the 'culture of prevention' and R2P (Goetschel, 2013).

Following this approach a number of other small states have also adopted a similar foreign policy approach. As conflicts between groups of different beliefs or regions with uncommon interests continue to persist throughout the world, mediation is seen as the ideal solution. One reasoning behind this is because it is far less costly than trying to fix what has once been broken as it safeguards development gains and most importantly it saves lives (Wallström and Soini, 2016). The post-conflict realities of the recent Iraq war, civil war conflict in Libya, Yemen and Syria, intervention in Afghanistan or the Palestine-Israeli conflict amongst others have shown the dire human, infrastructural and other negative consequences that such tensions and conflicts can produce in the absence of appropriate conflict management and post conflict peace building mechanisms.

While small states do not share the same economic or political leverages or bargaining tools as the more influential or powerful countries, small states fit a different criteria of being much effective and reliable mediators compared to the large states. This also results from the impartial, non-violent history of small states and ideals of their continued friendly international cooperation. Moreover, small states are generally not the type of countries that will approach the process of

mediation with self-interested motives so they are regarded as neutral partners with clear intentions to restore a certain level of normalcy and cooperation between states or parties that are in conflict. A Win-Win strategy is vital in the mediation method of small states placing the ideals of the greater good and partnership ahead of self-interests in the process to achieve peaceful coexistence.

Persistent and patient negotiations resulted in the long awaited agreement on the Iran nuclear issue between the EU 3+3 (France, Germany, United Kingdom, Russia, China and the U.S) and Iran. However, there is limited literature and awareness that it was the key role played by the Oman that led to the brokering of the deal. The ground work that paved the way for the interim Iran nuclear deal was initially instigated in March 2013 in Oman, whose government had recurrently offered to discreetly host the US-Iran talks safely away from the international spotlight. The preliminary and secret talks were held between the U.S and Iranian negotiating teams that were led by former U.S Deputy Secretary of State William Burns and former Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Ali Asghar Khaji. Both Burns' and Khaji's teams, as well as their Omani hosts, went to great lengths to keep the unofficial meeting a secret (Rozen, 2014; Borger and Dehgan, 2013). As a result their persistence throughout the diplomatic stalemate and their quiet efforts to forge US-Iran dialogue eventually paid off. The historic Iran nuclear deal put an end to decades of standoff between Iran and the West and paved the way for lifting Western sanctions on Iran.

As one of the oldest diplomatic services and group of mediators the Holy See or the Vatican established itself in a unique position with a large sphere of influence that bodes well with its role as a key mediator in international disputes or controversies. Pentin (2010) observes that;

"What really singles the Holy See out is its access to a vast network of missionaries, prelates and lay Catholics throughout the world, making it a valuable global 'listening post'. As a result, Vatican diplomats are themselves very well informed and in a unique position to mediate disputes, prevent conflicts and ultimately save lives. Usually these achievements take place behind closed doors and rarely make the headlines…The effectiveness of Holy See diplomacy can also be attributed to the fact that it represents both a sovereign state and a faith with privileged status, vital in this age of heightened religious sensitivity, as an interlocutor with the two other Abrahamic faiths, Judaism and Islam".

The recent re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Cuba and the U.S owes much credit to the Vatican which acted as mediator and guarantor during the 18 months of secret negotiations between the two countries. As a result diplomatic relations were resumed in July 2015, re-establishing ties that had been suspended in 1961. The Vatican is also credited along with Cuba for the breakthrough in peace talks in Columbia between the Columbian Government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The breakthrough is said to have occurred during the visit to Cuba in September 2015 by Pope Francis after he "warned the two sides that they didn't have the right to fail in their best chance at peace in decades" (Al Jazeera, 2015).This important breakthrough in the Columbian peace talks has initially set the stage that could lead to the conclusion of Latin America's longest running armed conflict.

Shortly before Easter 2007, following the capture of 15 military personnel from UK by Iran who was allegedly trespassing in Iranian waters the UK government had to make an unorthodox and special request to the Holy See for assistance regarding the matter. This was because they couldn't rely on partners such as the UN, the EU or any of its close allies to mediate the issue

because of their differences over the nuclear programme of Iran. This left the Vatican as the only viable neutral mediator which the UK could approach and have faith in. In consequence to their request, Pope Benedict XVI agreed to send a letter to the Supreme Leader of Iran Ayatollah Khamenei, appealing for the release of the UK detainees. Following the letter from Pope Benedict XVI former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad freed the captives, calling their release an 'Easter gift' to the UK which was a phraseology that was almost identical to the one used in the Pope's letter, which called for an 'Easter gesture of good will' (Pentin, 2010).

In other examples, in January 1990 although Panamanian leader Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega had turned himself in at the Vatican Embassy with the idea of seeking political asylum in countries such as Spain or Cuba as his place for exile, it was the actions of the Holy See that got him out of the Vatican Embassy in Panama City and into the hands of U.S forces. In 1978 Holy See diplomats led by John Paul II were instrumental in preventing the 'Beagle conflict' from escalating into an all-out war between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel. Archbishop Pablo Puente Buces, a former apostolic nuncio played a key role that brought an end to the 1975-1990 Lebanese civil war when he reached out to various militia groups and heads of Islamic political parties (Pentin, 2010). Similar peace efforts have been made and are still being conducted by other Holy See diplomats in various countries and regions countries as they continue to be a powerful and successful mediating force.

While for unknown reasons, much of the mediation works of the Vatican remains concealed or kept behind closed doors, their contribution in placing opposing groups at the mediation tables has brought significant decrease in conflicts and tensions worldwide. Together with other

mediation processes conducted by small states, the world has witnessed growing beliefs for regional and world peace. Small states have demonstrated that they are proactive and capable to foster peace and encourage conflict prone states or groups to reconcile and avert any forms of future conflicts or heated disagreements that could cause national or regional instability. Moreover, the practice of modern mediation has introduced a key component in its development which is its new initiatives to involve and increase the role of women in peace negotiations.

This notion has been vastly supported by multiple international platforms such as UN Women and in particular states that promote initiatives to educate women in conflict prevention and mediation with the aim to strengthen gender balance in this field. As such the Nordic states have formed the Nordic Women Mediators Network, as one response to the need to increase women mediators in the field and to strengthen women as agents for peace (Wallström and Soini, 2016). In view that women and children are the most vulnerable groups during conflicts this endeavour to train, empower and increase the number of women in peace negotiations is a positive initiative for the world. It further reflects the worlds evolving behaviour towards gender equality which has a direct impact on the peaceful conducts in all societies and states. Such progress will no doubt lead to the further strengthening of women human rights activists and women's organisations focused on economic, social, cultural and political equality and emancipation.

However, it must be pointed out that the plight of women and girls are often romanticized and it is often neglected that a lot women who are actually from the zone of conflicts are not the ones trained to deal with such challenges. Rather it is more than often women from other countries with limited understanding of the core issues of that country who are provided the opportunities

to learn on what to do in such conflict situations. Additionally there is also a worrying lack of gender balance for child soldiers because the focus is also more than often on boy child soldiers whilst girls are often sidelined despite also being used as soldiers and also sex slaves. This aspect of mediation and post-conflict peace building will hopefully be considered as equally important because if it is not then most conflict mediation can be regarded as not successful because one of the biggest faction of society is not being included in the process of post-conflict peace building.

3.6. Important contributors to UN peace missions

Inspired by the ideals of R2P and increasing consensus on achieving global peace for the common good, the involvement of small states in the make-up of UN peace operations has been a key component in the international peace process. The consistent high contribution of UN military experts, troops and police to the UN peace missions reflect their willingness in wanting to have a direct impact in worldwide peace actions. Since the creation of the UN peace operations nearly 130 nations have contributed military and civilian police personnel to the operations and it is estimated that up to one million have served under the UN flag. The mandates of UN peace missions have become increasingly dynamic considering the issues that demand its assistance and involvement. Such issues include the protection and promotion of human rights, assistance to restore the rule of law, protection of civilians in armed conflicts, support the organization of elections and other complex political processes, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (United Nations Peacekeeping (a), 2016).

As of December 2015, the total number of UN Military experts, troops and police which states

had contributed to peacekeeping missions amounted to a grand total of 107, 088 personnel. However, in spite of the great numbers of contributors, states with large military powers only provide a fraction compared to smaller states. As of December 2015 the P5 countries contributed only 4429 personnel; France (934), China (3045), Russia (80), UK (290) and U.S (80). Excluding China which over the years has increased its personnel contributions, contribution from small states greatly surpasses the contribution by larger states such as Bangladesh (8496), Benin (1490), Burkina Faso (2906), Ethiopia (8296), Ghana (3198), Indonesia (2855), Jordan (1617), Morocco (2308), Nepal (5344), Niger (2055), Nigeria (2954), Pakistan (7645), Rwanda (6077), Senegal (3475), Tanzania (2324), Togo (1804) and Uruguay (1446). It is encouraging to note that there are middle power states that provide substantial numbers to peace keeping missions, however (excluding India) they still do not figure in the top ten contributors. These include states such as Brazil (1231), Egypt (2809), India (7798), Italy (1087), Kenya (1231), Netherlands (1005) and South Africa (2131). Other states that reflect poor contributions are Belgium (8), Canada (113), Germany (175), Japan (272), Mexico (12), Norway (87), Turkey (193) and Denmark (46) (United Nations Peacekeeping (b), 2016).

While it must be acknowledged that between 1948 and 1990 reflected a higher participation incidence in UN peace missions of the big states and middle power states such as the U.S, Canada, Australia, India and Italy, their recent participation patterns have decreased by a large margin. In return small states have grasped the opportunity and stepped up by demonstrating their importance and commitment to safeguarding the global community and to the maintenance of international peace (Monnakgotla, 1996). As a result, over the past 15 years it has become a recurrent statistic that the presence of small states has been more dominant than other states in

UN peace missions. Furthermore, their valuable contribution has continued the tradition of UN peace operations and played an instrumental role in the pursuit for world stability and security.

It is important to note that contributing states are not obliged by the UN to take part in peace missions nor are the personnel's forced to participate. The decision to second and contribute them is based solely upon the interests and ideals of the contributing states and on the voluntary of the personnel themselves. Thus the continued high contribution by small states has been perceived as noble acts considering the challenges that they face and their incapacities to have advanced and well-trained local forces. The desire of their personnel's and foreign policy to encourage for participation in UN peace operations also reflects their positive attitude to cooperate in the promotion of global peace (Cabuyao, 2014; Monnakgotla, 1996). However it cannot be ignored that the high involvement of small states pertains to certain beneficial factors such as economic, professional and political interests.

While they do not encourage seeing more conflicts or problems to spring up in the world, participation in UN peace missions by small states is seen as a great income generator for the individual and the contributing country. Compensation that the UN gives to contributing countries is considered as an important source of revenue for small states and participating personnel's which view the opportunity as a great way to earn some extra needed money. Personnel's from non-western small states have a stronger appeal to the salary that they earn from their services while on UN peace missions, as the conversion rates to their local currencies often reflect a double or triple equivalent of what they would have earned from their home countries (Cabuyao, 2014). This can probably explain why western personnel's are not so keen

in providing their services to such missions and also why the contribution trend reflects more developing countries compared to developed states.

UN peace operations also offer another type of reward in the form of additional training and exposure to field experiences which personnel's would not have had the chance to experience in their home countries. As a result these personnel's gain new skills and the opportunity to exchange best practices with other people from foreign countries that are also part of the UN peace operations. Moreover, small states view their participation in UN peace missions as being a good international citizen and taking on board the moral and physical responsibility that adds to the preservation and promotion of world peace. States such as Pakistan for example view their participation in UN Peace operations as a means to improve their political clout on the international scene. By no means is it a small state but middle power countries such as India which aspire to become considered as a great power subtly advocates for participation of its personnel's in such operations as part of its ambition to become a permanent member of the UNSC (Cabuyao, 2014). Many other small states in Asia and Africa also share similar approaches as they want to reflect that they are progressive states with keen interests in helping to combat international ills that threaten world peace.

Renowned for wearing their blue helmets or berets, UN peace operation forces have played a fundamental role in helping to restore, maintain or introduce peace in conflict ravaged zones. Contributing small states have shown that they can play a key role in measures to achieve world peace through their excellent track record as contributing states in UN peace missions. Although a number of personnel's taking part in UN peace operations have not been shy from

controversies such as being accused and entangled in sexual abuses cases, their overall services and contributions is still highly valued and appreciated by the global community. Moreover, although the top 10 contributors to the UN peace operations are not from the small state category, the keenness for the increased participation by the actual small states showcases their contributions in the form of instruments of international peace and security.

3.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, it has been discussed that small states play a much bigger role in the quest for global peace and stability than what they are credited for. While their contributions are often over shadowed by the world politics of the large states and not picked up by the media or recorded in the literature of international security, they have succumb the odds and built a strong case for themselves as important agents and messengers for peace. For a number of small states they have not let their vulnerabilities or size limitations hinder their contribution levels in various important fields of international peace and security. As a result their involvements in multilateralism, being instigators in the creation of key international institutions, becoming mediators and the largest personnel contributors in UN peacekeeping missions have had many positive impacts in creating a safer world for humanity. Nevertheless, while they may have wished to have a larger impact on global peace and security, the vulnerabilities and limitations of small states have led to many challenges that lessen their impacts on the maintenance of global peace and security. The next chapter will address these key challenges that affect the role of small states in their quest of being peace enablers in their aims to achieve world peace and stability.

Chapter 4 – Key challenges faced by small states in the maintenance of international peace and security

'The strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must'
Thuycides

As mentioned earlier, despite of the number limitations and emerging security threats that they face small states have developed themselves into important agents for world peace and sturdy advocates for rules-based multilateralism. Yet, while many small states have served as key contributors of personnel's to UN peace missions, mediators, negotiators and norm-entrepreneurs on a variety of global security issues, they face a number of key challenges that limit their contributions and influence on global peace and security. This is of course not to their fault of not trying to avoid such limitations, but rather due to a number of factors that are beyond their control and means of influence. As a result large states (in particular the P5) have a superior quantifiable and qualitative influence over the maintenance of international peace and security in comparison to small states.

4.1 Under-representation at the multilateral level

Many small states face a number of challenges that affect their ability to engage fully in at the multilateral level. The high costs of funding a permanent mission and having adequate diplomats translates into excruciating costs and capacity constraints for most small states. The outcome of such a dilemma can be noticed by the size of the missions of small states at the UN. For example the mission of Jamaica operates with just 8 diplomatic staff; Liechtenstein and Timor-Leste

operate with 3; Seychelles with only 2, while Switzerland has 23. By contrast, China has nearly 80 personnel and the US mission at the UN exceeds 150 diplomatic staff (Súilleabháin, 2014). Even the size of the Foreign Ministry of small states is much smaller than their larger counterparts. As a result of their small missions at the UN and also at other multilateral forums, the capability for them to be present in all security related meetings or to thoroughly cover all issues that influence world peace has proven to be a very difficult task for them.

At such levels where information is crucial, daily reporting of meetings to resolutions is seen as a struggle for many small states due to their capacity challenges at such multilateral fora's. Evaluation or preparation of background information on peace and security matters requires time and quality security expert numbers that small states often have very little of at both their UN Missions and Foreign Ministries. While readily summarized information is made available for them at the UN such as through the UNSC monthly reports, small state missions still face many issues to filter and process information at such levels. This is because they are occupied by other UN related matters (due to the ever present daily meetings of the UN) or the other significant work duties of their respective missions (Súilleabháin, 2014).

For small states, the struggle to process the intake of abundance of information is at the heart of their capacity challenges. The same dilemma can also be found at their headquarters whereby their sections that cover international security matters are very small and in the cases of even smaller states such as SIDS often non-existent. To further explain the resource constraints plaguing some small states, Menon (2009, p. 2) - Ambassador Vanu Gopala Menon, former Permanent Representative of Singapore to the UN - founded that;

"this resource and concomitant coverage problem means that most small states end up being led by their noses by the larger delegations that know what they are talking about. And because many small delegations are not able to be present at various meetings, the problem gets further compounded. During negotiations in particular, other delegations want to work with states that they can rely on and which they know will be present at the meetings. So, if you are not seen as being reliable, that is, not there all the time to lend support to a position, you get cut off and become a non-player. You end up being marginalised".

This outlook is one that epitomizes the struggles of small states at the UN and at other security related multilateral platforms as their lack of representation means that they miss out in many important negotiation processes or working-group meetings. Being left out of discussions relating to peace and security matters can be crucial because it can often lead to the onward transmittal of incorrect hearsay information back to their Governments or the drafting of reports based on biased interpretations from other missions that were actually in attendance of such security meetings. Moreover, the lack of representation of small states at the UN missions or at other headquarters of other key multilateral platforms whether in Geneva, Vienna or at The Hague means that their inputs or proposals are not considered and their interests are eventually left out.

4.2 Capacity Constraints at higher levels of diplomacy

Due to their limited resources, small states face capacity constraints at other important levels in multilateral diplomacy. "Running as candidates for election to UN bodies raises many capacity hurdles for small states. Representation on elected bodies is crucial for UN member states and effective diplomacy, but small states tend to face financial and political barriers in advancing their candidacies" (Súilleabháin, 2014, p.12). Having the appropriate levels of influence at the

multilateral level is a necessity to be part of international candidature roles in various international bodies. Becoming a member of the UNSC for example is a high call and a great responsibility to help curb international peace and security mandates. However, it involves huge financial and human costs from campaigning to being present (if voted) at the Council and taking part in a range of other meetings that are related to the work of the Council.

Elections for international candidatures for individual representations in UN organs or committees also entail high costs which strains their already tight budgets. This in return has a direct impact on the foreign policies of small states and is reflected in their minimal presence on international bodies at such high levels. In addition by not being able to be represented at such high and influential levels means that many small states lack access to crucial insider information especially at the UNSC. Thus it is to no surprise that large states are more active in international candidatures because they have the resources, capacity and international motives to do it. Moreover, the strong interests and approach of large states to exert effective diplomacy at such levels is seen as one strong factor in them having greater influence on the discourse of international peace and security matters compared to small states.

4.3 The UNSC remains the UNSC

Calls for reforms of the UNSC or change in its working methods that would make the Council appear to be more credible and reflective of modern geo-politics continue to fall onto deaf ears. As a result, the very little progress made over the past years on these reforms continue to affect the ability for member states of the UN to contribute to its work and as such it undermines the

Council's legitimacy (McLay, 2011). However, as expected some of the P5 actively oppose such notion of reforming the UNSC and to change its working methods, which would unquestionably reduce and challenge their own powers and influence on international peace and security. As a result the veto power remains the carte blanche of international peace as the P5 countries continue using it at their own prerogative.

While the Council may require nine votes to pass a resolution, the use of the veto power by any of the P5 can prevent the adoption of any substantive resolution at the UNSC. Since 1946 – 2016, 269 vetoes have been exercised. The word 'veto' itself does not actually occur, though a 'NO' vote from any permanent member has the effect of vetoing a substantive resolution. Amongst the P5, Russia has used its veto prerogative more times than any other permanent member. The vast majority of those vetoes were undertaken before 1991, when Russia was part of the USSR. Even if small states at the Council were in favour to pursue resolutions that would have afforded the UNSC to play a more effective and nobler role in preventing certain conflicts or interventions to happen, the use or threat of the veto on certain key issues prevented so. Such issues involve the Algerian War in 1954–62; the Tripartite Aggression in 1956, the Vietnam War (1955–75), U.S invasion of Panama (1989), Invasion of Iraq (2003), Russo-Georgian War (2008) and the Syria crisis (2011-present).

4.4 <u>Small states still lack the global military influence</u>

As a result of not having large, advanced, well-trained, well-funded armies, small states find themselves in a very disadvantageous position in comparison to the larger states. While the use

of nuclear weapons is anticipated to be one of last resort, the survival of small states in the eventuality of conventional warfare remains slim because of their weak military capabilities. Military power continues to be a dominant factor in determining the strength of a country and the real protecting line of defence between safety and invasion in the event of a Third World War or faced with a state to state conflict. The pursuit of national interests remains a sleeping threat that large states possess and that is something that neither small states nor international rule of law can control or have greater influence on. As such small states continue to do their maximum at promoting and reinforcing international rule of law and international norms with the hope that they provide the required protection against all type of security threats, even from the larger states.

Large states pose other superior quantifiable influence on international peace and security because of their possession of nuclear, biological and chemical power which the majority of small states lack. In an increasing unsecure world, threats related to the use of such powers are beyond the control of small states and their impacts on deterrence continue to multiply. This has emerged from the trend towards nuclear proliferation between nuclear states and the possibility that terrorist groups can get their hands on WMD such as nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. Therefore the likelihood that nuclear weapons along with the radiological so-called 'dirty bomb' might be used by terrorist groups is dawning (Qing, 2011).

This has led to the continued dominance of great-power politics in the modern day and as a result the possession of such advanced and powerful weapons is still viewed as defining the great-power status among states. In November 1961, former French President Charles de Gaulle said

that "a great state that does not have nuclear weapons when others do 'does not command its own destiny'. The belief held by many of the non-nuclear small states remains that nuclear-weapon states are still clinging on to nuclear weapons as their political claim to great-power status" (Graham, 2004). While posing an equal threat to the global community, the safety of small states and the world looms on the hope that the states and even the non-state developers of nuclear power and bio-defence weapons only go as far as to use such technologies for peaceful purposes such as for clean energy, medicine and progressive scientific and research developments. Because many states are signatories to treaties and conventions related to the control and safe use of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons the prospects for world peace and stability lay on the peaceful behaviours of nuclear states to adhere to them.

4.5 Conclusion

To conclude the key challenges faced by small states in the maintenance of peace and security derive from the real power variance between them and the large states. This has affirmed the position of large states into having greater qualitative and quantifiable influence on world affairs allowing them to remain the great-power states that they are. While small states continue to persist at the multilateral levels for stronger international laws and norms, the most important organ of the UN remains unreformed and as a result the P5 countries remain the most influential agents of global peace and security. The lack of adequate representation at the multilateral level, weak individual military powers and the authoritative roles by the P5 at the UNSC are only a few but crucial reasons that explain why the level of influence on global peace and security for small states remains dim compared to the greater influence of the large states. Moreover, the continued

practice of deterrence remains a constant threat for the safety of all states worldwide and it is to no surprise that the countries that hold nuclear capabilities have a much larger say in the future of global security. While the majority of small states may have the right ideas and intentions that seek to promote and safeguard the notions of the collective good and peaceful ideals, the final decisions pertaining to global peace and security do not belong in their hands, but rather in the hands of the P5.

5.0 <u>Conclusion</u>

No country, no matter how big or powerful, can ward them (security threats) off alone or address them in isolation. If this is our reality, then the importance of small nations is clear. We cannot do without you. We need you.
Kofi Annan Former Secretary General of the UN addressing the Uruguayan Parliament, July 1998

This dissertation has illustrated that to a large extent small states have a very important role to play in the global peace and security spectrum. Throughout the history of global security, the subject of small state security has gained prominence by becoming a key factor in the contemporary international security agenda and its decision making mechanisms. The increasing numbers of small states that have emerged following decolonization and the creation of the UN afforded these newly created small states with a platform to voice out their concerns and aspirations for the protection of their own security and that of the global community. The creation of the UN and other important multilateral platforms also gave small states the opportunity to become strong promoters of multilateralism and for the enforcement of international laws (that are legally binding so that all states are subjected to abide to it).

These international laws seek to safeguard global ideals for the common good, enhance the international rule of law and encourage for more peaceful approaches to global security policies. The strong advocacy by small states towards international law is mainly rooted in the fact that small states are aware of their limited hard power and their other insecurities. For small states it is imperative that countries around the world continue to collaborate**,** deepen friendly ties and share a common vision for collective peace and security. As a result, small states maximise the use of their soft power for the strengthening of the international legal system as a mechanism that

provides them with an additional layer of protection for the safety of their borders and peoples.

While it has addressed the dynamic facets that make up small state security, this dissertation has also sought to address the multiple effects of globalization on small states security. These effects have proved that the tentacles of influence of globalization are more than far reaching but also embedded in the socio-economic and security development of the world. While it has provided many positive contributions to the world, globalization has at the same time developed into an undesirable wave that has facilitated a number of negative global effects which have increased world economic inequality and worsened global security dilemmas in many corners of the world. As a result the emergence of new security threats such as new forms of terrorism, migration and global health crisis, climate change, cyber-attacks, piracy and other forms of transnational crime has put the security shields of small states to new tests. While the large and developed states have proven that their security shields avails them with better chances to counter or eliminate these threats, the majority of small states have fallen victim in becoming easy and fragile targets. The adoption of the concept of the 'guns or butter dilemma' in this dissertation attempted to explain the disparity between the large and small states in their own respective attempts to attain the right socio-economic developments and the equal option to spend big in the military expenditures to fight off such security threats.

But this has not meant that all small states have succumbed to these international pressures and security threats by becoming a cluster of unstable, undemocratic or unsafe group of states. Rather many of them have faced these threats and unfavourable security circumstances with great strides that have enabled them in becoming key international players in the attempts to

strengthen the global peace and security policies. As vocal proponents and enablers of multilateralism, small states have proven that they can be relied upon to provide constructive and substantive international ideas that are valuable to the enforcement of global governance and security. Their intensive involvement in niche diplomacy, mediation and conflict resolution processes have also proven their stature as important agents and messengers of peace. Additionally, their valuable contributions of personnel's in UN peacekeeping missions have shown that while they cannot provide the big funding resources to the running of the UN, their contributions of personnel's helps to execute the peace and security mandates that the UN ultimately decides upon.

However when it comes to global peace and security small states can only achieve what their own capabilities and the international system avails them to. While their membership to the UN affords small states an equal one vote in the UNGA which is shared by all member states, the most important peace and security organ of the UN - the UNSC - does not provide them with the same conditions. As a result the P5 countries hold executive member power status and any final decision regarding global peace and security missions are ultimately decided upon their prerogative. The limitations of small states at the UN are also rooted in their partial and restricted access to information, capacity constraints, and other structural barriers to their full partaking of the multilateral processes at the highest of levels. Moreover, their lack inability to control the use of nuclear, biological and chemical by countries that have such capabilities entails that the future of world peace and security is further away from their means of influence, and states that do have them hold a stronger foothold of it. As a result, large states have a superior quantifiable and qualitative influence on global peace and security compared to small states.

To conclude, small states have shown that despite their vulnerabilities, limitations and history of not being influential powers in global politics they have what it takes to punch above their weight and that they are the glue of progressive international cooperation for the common good (Annan, 1998). Their contributions and support at the multilateral levels have proven to be very valuable in upholding and fostering international principles that seek to safeguard world peace and security. More importantly, continued efforts by small states to encourage states worldwide to attain a more peaceful and equal order governed by international rule of law further relies on the willingness of the large and powerful states to also share the same ideals. This is because the importance in attaining such targets would highly depend on the large states leading the way in order for other states to follow. Finally, while global security affairs continue to be commanded by the P5, small states have shown that their contributions and appeals for continued international cooperation, promotion and enforcement of international rule of law is transforming them in becoming important agents and messengers in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Bibliography

- Al Jazeera. (2015). *Colombia's president, FARC rebels announce breakthrough in talks.* [Online] Available at: http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/9/23/colombia-government-farc-rebels-step-closer-to-peace.html [accessed 21 March 2016].

- Amnesty International. (2014). *Q&A: Global Arms Trade Treaty enters into force.* [Online] Available at: www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2014/12/global-arms-trade-treaty-enters-force/ [accessed 11 March 2016].

- Annan, K. (1998). *SECRETARY-GENERAL LAUDS ROLE OF SMALL COUNTRIES IN WORK OF UNITED NATIONS, NOTING CRUCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/press/en/1998/19980715.sgsm6639.html [accessed 11 March 2016].

- Asgrimsson, H. (2003). *The Position of Small States in the 21st Century.* [Online] Available at: http://www.mfa.is/news-and-publications/nr/1983 [accessed 4 February 2016].

- Borger, J. and Dehghan, S.K. (2013). *Secret talks helped forge Iran nuclear deal.* [Online] Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/nov/24/secret-usa-iran-talks-nuclear-deal [accessed 11 January 2016].

- Cabuyao, P. (2014). *UN Peacekeeping: Bangladesh, India, Pakistan's Troop Contributions.* [Online] Available at: http://www.e-ir.info/2014/06/18/un-peacekeeping-bangladesh-india-and-pakistans-top-troop-contributions/ [accessed 15 March 2016].

- Cluskey, P. (2013). *Kenya pushing for African split from International Criminal Court.* [Online] Available at: http://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/africa/kenya-pushing-for-african-split-from-international-criminal-court-1.1549427 [accessed 5 February 2016].

- Corgan, M. (2008). *Small State Diplomacy.* [Online] Available at: http://www.e-ir.info/2008/08/12/small-state-diplomacy/ [accessed 5 January 2016].

- European Commission. (2016). *Refugee Crisis in Europe* [Online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/refugee-crisis_en [accessed 10 August 2016].

- European Commission, Syria Crisis. (2016). *Syria Crisis ECHO Factsheet.* [Online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/syria_en.pdf [accessed 31 March 2016].

- GCSE History. (n.d.). *The League of Nation.* [Online] Available at: http://www.gcsehistory.org.uk/modernworld/interwarperiod/index.htm [accessed 20 July 2016].

- Graham, T. (2004). *Avoiding the tipping point.* [Online] Available at: http://www.armscontrol.org/print/1673 [accessed 20 March 2016].

- Goetschel, L. (2013). Bound to be peaceful? The changing approach of Western European small states to peace. *Swiss Political Science Review.* 19(3), pp. 259-278.

- Greenland, J. (2015). *UNSC discusses LGBT issues for first time.* [Online] Available at https://www.lawsociety.org.nz/news-and-communications/latest-news/news/unsc-discusses-lgbt-issues-for-first-time https://www.globalpolicy.org/globalization/defining-globalization/27662.html [accessed 11 February 2016].

- IOM. (2016). *IOM Counts 3,771 Migrant Fatalities in Mediterranean in 2015.* [Online] Available at https://www.iom.int/news/iom-counts-3771-migrant-fatalities-mediterranean-2015 [accessed 10 May 2016].

- Ivanov, I. (2003). *International Security in the era of globalization.* [Online] Available at https://www.globalpolicy.org/globalization/defining-globalization/27662.html [accessed 11 March 2016].

- Kassimeris, C. (2009). The foreign policy of small states. *International Politics.* Vol. 46, 1, 84-101.

- Kay, S. (2004). *Globalization, Power, Security.* [Online] Available at http://www.comw.org/pda/fulltext/0403kay.pdf [accessed 11 March 2016].

- Kealing, J. (2016a.) *Between Paris and Brussels, the world saw hundreds of terrorist* attacks. [Online] Available at: https://www.thestar.com/news/world/2016/03/23/between-paris-and-brussels-the-world-saw-hundreds-of-terrorist-attacks.html [accessed 2 April 2016].

- Kealing, J. (2016b). *This weekend's terrorist attacks are just a handful among hundreds. Most of them you don't hear about.* [Online] Available at: http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-03-22/paris-there-have-been-hundreds-terrorist-attacks-many-have-gone-unnoticed [accessed 19 July 2016].

- Kevlihan, R. (n.d). *Small states in the International System: What theories of international relations have to say.* [Online] Available at: http://www.academia.edu/7485155/Small_states_in_the_International_System_What_theories_of_international_relations_have_to_say [accessed 2 January 2016].

- Ki-moon, B. (2012). *Secretary-General Tells Forum of Small States Their Size Does Not Mean Absence of Big Ideas as They Are Well-Placed to Be Bridge-Builders, Mediators.* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/press/en/2012/sgsm14558.doc.htm [accessed 11 March 2016].

- McLay, J. (2011). *Making a Difference: The Role of a Small State at the United Nations.* [speech]. 27 April, Huntingdon. [Online] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265061720_Making_a_Difference_The_Role_of_a_Small_State_at_the_United_Nations [accessed 5 March 2016].

- Menon, V. G. (2009). *Challenges Facing Small States at the UN.* [Online] Available at http://acuns.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Challenges_Facing_Small_States_at_the_UN.pdf [accessed 8 March 2016].

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand. (2015). *Small Island Developing States have their say in the Security Council.* [Online] Available at https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/media-and-resources/news/small-island-developing-states-have-their-say-in-the-security-council/ [accessed 8 March 2016].

- Monnakgotla, K. (1996). *The Naked Face of UN Peacekeeping: Noble Crusade or National Self-interest.* [Online] Available at https://www.issafrica.org/pubs/ASR/5No5/Monnakgotla.html [accessed 18 March 2016].

- Neumann, I.B. and Gstöhl, S. (2004). *Lilliputians in Gulliver's World? Small States in International Relations.* [Online] Available at http://rafhladan.is/bitstream/handle/10802/5122/Lilliputians%20Endanlegt%202004.pdf?sequence=1 [accessed 13 February 2016].

- Oceans and Law of the Sea, United Nations. (2013). *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/convention_overview_convention.htm [accessed 13 January 2016].

- Oxfam International. (2016). *Why we need a global Arms Trade Treaty.* [Online] Available at https://www.oxfam.org/en/campaigns/why-we-need-global-arms-trade-treaty [accessed 13 March 2016].

- Pentin, E. (2010). *Vatican Diplomacy.* [Online] Available at: http://www.diplomatmagazine.com/issues/2010/march/253-vatican-diplomacy-v15-253.html [accessed 13 February 2016].

- Qing, L. (2011). *What are the Existing and Emerging Threats to International Security? Deterrence: Its Past and Future: Panel One* [speech]. 20 May, London. [Online] Available at http://www.nuclearsecurityproject.org/publications/deterrence-its-past-and-future-panel-one [accessed 13 March 2016].

- Rozen, L. (2014). *Three days in March: New details on how US, Iran opened up direct talks.* [Online] Available at: http://backchannel.al-

monitor.com/index.php/2014/01/7484/three-days-in-march-new-details-on-the-u-s-iran-backchannel/ [accessed 7 January 2016].

- SIPRI Factsheet. (2016) *Trends in world military expenditure, 2015.* [Online] Available at: http://books.sipri.org/files/FS/SIPRIFS1604.pdf [accessed 15 July 2016]

- Súilleabháin, A.Ó. (2014). Small States at the United Nations: Diverse Perspectives, Shared Opportunities. *New York: International Peace Institute.*

- Sutton, P. and Payne, A. (1993). *Lilliput under Threat: the Security Problems of Small Island and Enclave Developing States.* [Online] Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1993.tb01657.x/full [accessed 7 March 2016].

- The World Bank. (2016). *Small States.* [Online] Available at http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/smallstates/overview [accessed 7 March 2016].

- Thorhallson, B. (2012). *Small States in the UN Security Council: Means of Influence?* [Online] Available at: http://uni.hi.is/baldurt/files/2012/08/Small-States-UN-Security-Council-by-Thorhallsson.pdf [accessed 7 February 2016].

- UN 4 MUN. (n.d). *Security Council.* [Online] Available at http://outreach.un.org/mun/guidebook/introduction/un-at-a-glance/un-structure/sc/ [accessed 7 April 2016].

- United Nations Security Council. (n.d). *Background Note on the "Arria-Formula" Meetings of the Security Council Members.* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/en/sc/about/methods/bgarriaformula.shtml [accessed 7 March 2016].

- United Nations Peacekeeping (a). (2016). *The present.* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/present.shtml [accessed 12 March 2016].

- United Nations Peacekeeping (b). (2016). *Troop and police contributors.* [Online] Available at http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors.shtml [accessed 12 March 2016].

- Wallström, M. and Soini, T. (2016). *Mediation: The real weapon for peace.* [Online] Available at http://www.government.se/opinion-pieces/2016/01/mediation-the-real-weapon-for-peace/ [accessed 17 March 2016].

- Wei, C.T. (2005). *Security for Small States.* [Online] Available at http://www.mindef.gov.sg/safti/pointer/back/journals/1999/Vol25_4/9.htm [accessed 7 February 2016].