

ALAN K. HENRIKSON

The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155, U.S.A.

Tel: (617) 627-2724

Fax: (617) 627-3712

E-mail: ahenriks@emerald.tufts.edu

TEN TYPES OF SMALL STATE DIPLOMACY -- *What different kinds of diplomacy have been used by small states? Which have been the most successful, and in what circumstances?*

In the discussion that follows, a number of contrasting "types" of diplomacy, all of them usable by small states, are identified.¹ They are presented in pairs, for, as suggested earlier, there is a "polarity" in small-state diplomacy which can be expressed in sudden "switches" from one attitude or tactic to another. There is often an inner logic in such apparent reversals. Of course, at times seemingly inconsistent diplomatic stratagems can be employed simultaneously, in effective combination. It is difficult to generalize about the myriad expressions and episodes of small-state diplomacy, even in recent times. Therefore the approach taken here will be to set out the basic idea of each of the ten types, and to illustrate them fairly briefly, so as to define the type as clearly as possible. No doubt many other examples could be given, and they are in fact invited, in order to refine the typology here presented, and maybe even to reconceive and to restructure it.

Overall, the purpose here is to emphasize the need for what might be called "clever" diplomacy, as distinct from either "big" diplomacy, with a heavy infrastructure, or "small" diplomacy, which may not have much infrastructure at all. There should be a premium on intellectual preparation, insight into the mind of one's interlocutor, and precision in the formulation of a country's desiderata.

The first pair of diplomatic types are:

(1) "**quiet diplomacy**." This relies on "friendships" as well as historical (post-colonial) ties with great powers, such as Great Britain. It can also take place in the form of "lobbying" international organizations, in Geneva, Washington and elsewhere. Traditionally, it is practiced

¹Six of these -- specifically, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 -- are discussed, with illustrations mainly from the Caribbean diplomatic experience, in Henrikson, *Diplomacy and Small States in Today's World*.

by professional diplomats. They are usually a country's representatives stationed abroad -- and sometimes, therefore, a bit out of touch with happenings and sentiments in the home country. It is the kind of diplomacy long practiced, for example, by the High Commissioners of the Commonwealth states in London. Inherently bilateral, such diplomacy as this, particularly between mother and daughter countries, often involves "special relationships. It can be "quiet" because, in a sense, its small-state practitioners already "have the ear" of the larger country. The tone of quiet diplomacy is usually respectful, maybe even deferential. The voice of a small Commonwealth state is not that of power but rather that of reason. While sharp points can be made, they are not made too pointedly, lest such representations suggest disloyalty or lack of basic support.

To some degree Commonwealth country relationships with the United States have developed similarly. Nowadays, for some of them, Washington may be even a more important venue than is London, the old metropole. An example of a quiet-diplomatic representation, in this case made at the highest level, is the private letter that the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Norman Kirk, sent to President Richard Nixon in Washington, criticizing the 1972 Christmas bombing of Hanoi. This "discreet behavior" contrasted with the Australian Labour government's public criticism of the American bombing, which alienated the American President. It probably did not sit too well with Nixon either, and in anticipation of that Kirk's action was taken against the advice of officials at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The private letter, however, was "entirely in keeping with New Zealand's preferred style" for dealing with the United States -- to make its disagreements known in Washington through private representations at the political and diplomatic levels.²

Increasingly, Congress must be approached directly in a similar way. Thus quiet diplomacy can encompass "lobbying" as well as formal diplomacy, conducted with the Department of State or the White House. Many of the most important U.S. decisions affecting the interests of small countries are decided there. For the Caribbean countries, "NAFTA parity" is such an issue. Pertinent committees and also special groups within the American legislature, one of them being the congressional Black Caucus, may be the appropriate targets of the small-country diplomats attention. In dealing with the U.S. government, with its many decision-making centers, ambassadors from Caribbean countries often meet together to coordinate their efforts, informally assigning tasks of representation to the White House, to congressional

²McGraw, "New Zealand's Foreign Policy Under National and Labor Governments."

committees, and to key officials to those diplomats who are believed to have the most influence in those various places. Such is the stuff of new-style quiet diplomacy.

Versus (2) "**protest diplomacy.**" This is a still-current style of diplomacy that is reminiscent, historically, of the pre-independence periods of many small states, when political "sovereignty" was the main issue. Its basic stance is confrontational. It is also "open," so that others may know that a protest has been voiced, or otherwise expressed -- such as walking out of a meeting, or simply obstructing proceedings (Rakousko-Turecko, Chorvatsko). A recent case in point in the action of the representatives of St. Lucia and Dominica, backed openly by Côte d'Ivoire, in blocking the agenda of the World Trade Organization in order to protest against the threat of the United States to ask for sanctions without a WTO ruling that the European Union's amended banana import regime did not comply with fair trade rules.³ In the short run, at least, the St. Lucian-Dominican diplomatic action was effective.

Diplomatic protests attract attention. That often is a main object. On a higher rhetorical plane, protest diplomacy can be used, collectively as well as singly by states, to "espouse principled positions," in a phrase of Ambassador Ronald Sanders of Antigua and Barbuda. For Caribbean states this has involved taking stands against apartheid in South Africa and also on Middle East and South East Asia questions "which, arguably, do not have a direct bearing on their interests." Nonetheless, as Ambassador Sanders explains, "if they stand aside from these issues, they run the risk of being ignored by other regions of the world when the Caribbean may need international support to withstand hegemonistic forces or aggression."⁴

The next pair of diplomatic types are:

(3) "**group diplomacy.**" The operative principle here is that there is strength, or at least a kind of safety and obscurity, in numbers. Group diplomacy is particularly in evidence within international organizations, most notably the United Nations. In the UN there is a recognized "group system." In the General Assembly there are well-established regional groups, based mainly on geography. There is also the so-named Group of 77, consisting of an even larger number (approximately 125) of developing countries from many regions. In its various working groups, distributed at key points throughout the wider UN system, an effort is made to ensure that Africa, Asia, and Latin America are more or less equally represented. The "coordinator"

³Frances Williams, "Island Banana Growers Spike Sanctions Move," *The Financial Times*, January 26, 1999.

⁴Ronald M. Sanders, "The Relevance and Function of Diplomacy in International Politics for Small Caribbean States," *The Round Table*, no. 312 (1989): 422.

countries rotate too (Figure 5).⁵ In the General Assembly and most of the other larger UN bodies, such groupings often have controlled the votes. The small-state Caribbean, as a particularly vote-rich area, is a most desirable ally in this context. (EU!!!)

Group diplomacy often can be the most effective, in practical terms, in specific functional contexts, such as, to take what is now the paradigmatic case, the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Here the groups became actual negotiating groups. In this setting, many small countries, particularly island states, played a major part. One recalls the prominent roles of Malta and Fiji, for example. This was natural, as they had a great deal at stake, particularly as the new 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) concept was being defined. Ambassador Tommy Koh, from small-state Singapore, served with distinction as the President of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III).

Koh has said of the UNCLOS "group system" that it had both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, he explains, "it enabled countries to join forces with other countries with which they shared a common interest. In this way, a country could acquire a bargaining leverage that it would not have had if it had operated alone." In fact, as he reflects: "It proved to be impossible to conduct serious negotiations at UNCLOS III until these special-interest groups were formed."⁶ However, on the negative side, he acknowledges: "once a group had adopted a common position, it was often difficult for the group to modify its position."⁷ In negotiating, solidarity can be a two-edged sword.

From the point of view of individual participating countries, it can prove difficult to gain particular, individual national advantage in such group-managed situations. Overall group consensus is the goal as well as a method. In defining substantive positions, there can be a tendency toward the lowest common denominator. In other settings, where practical negotiations are not the immediate purpose, group-thinking can tend toward the highest common denominator. The ideological dream of a "New International Economic Order," which the G-77

⁵H. Michael Erisman, *Pursuing Postdependency Politics: South-South Relations in the Caribbean* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1992), 81. The Figure shown, from p. 82, is originally from Karl P. Sauvant, "Organizational Infrastructure for Self-Reliance: The Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77," in *The Challenges of South-South Cooperation*, ed. Breda Pavlic et al. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1983), 55.

⁶T. T. B. Koh, "Negotiating a New World Order for the Sea," in Henrikson, *Negotiating World Order*, 42. Cf. the observation by the Inter-American Dialogue Study Group on Western Hemisphere Governance that the "variable geography" of the Western Hemisphere, which has produced a variety of subregional arrangements, "has actually helped in the negotiations of consensus, in that it has permitted coordination of positions and views, and -- in the case of the very small states -- pooling leverage in order to deal with larger powers." *The Inter-American Agenda and Multilateral Governance: The Organization of American States* (Washington, D.C.: The Inter-American Dialogue, 1997), 5.

⁷Koh, "Negotiating a New World Order for the Sea," 42.

advocated in the 1970s, is an illustration of such rarefied envisioning. The dynamics of the Non-Aligned Movement, in which some smaller G-77 countries (e.g., Guyana and Jamaica) have been active participants, generated more ideological stances. There was, as Michael Erisman has pointed out, "a fairly clear-cut division of Third World labor in the decades preceding the 1990s that entailed a vigorous, high-profile role for the NAM and important, although somewhat inconspicuous responsibilities for the G-77. But the new configurations of power and issue-areas in the 1990s have in effect produced a status reversal, with the G-77 being perceived as the organization whose activities are most pertinent to contemporary Third World concerns."⁸

The enduring advantage of the group-diplomacy concept is that it enables countries to join forces with others, even far outside their own neighborhood, and thereby to gain added bargaining leverage, either in general or with regard to specific issues. The African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) grouping of developing countries, formed under the Lomé Convention to interact in partnership with the European Union, is a major example of diplomatic "group-ness," one that has considerable material importance for these former colonies and dependencies of the European power. Within the ACP negotiating context, inter-continental "strategic alliances" with other countries in other regions have long operated, among the producers of sugar, for example.

The future of ACP group coherence is in doubt, as the European Union is proposing to "differentiate" among African, Caribbean, and Pacific nations, according to their individual and perhaps subregional and regional need. The European Commission's *Green Paper* on the question of a successor to the current Lomé Convention which expires in the year 2000, states bluntly: "*The ACP group is in reality neither a political group nor an economic entity. It grew up for essentially historic reasons and exists only in the framework of relations with the European Union.*"⁹ The EU, facing the incalculable costs of its own future enlargement, appears to be determined to deal with the ACP membership by negotiating separate regional economic partnership agreements and free trade zones, including a separate scheme for the Caribbean. In response to these strong hints, with the aim of expressing a clear and firm message of Caribbean resolve to maintain ACP unity, a number of Caribbean leaders have visited other ACP countries on, in effect, solidarity missions. They have been emphatic on the point that the ACP must

⁸Erisman, *Pursuing Postdependency Policies*, 139.

⁹*Green Paper on Relations Between the European Union and the ACP Countries on the Eve of the 21st Century: Challenges and Options for a New Partnership* (Luxembourg: Office for Publications of the European Commission, 1997).

negotiated with "as a single grouping."¹⁰ It will be impressive -- but surprising, under current circumstances -- if this broad-group strategy succeeds. Havelock Ross-Brewster, Ambassador of Guyana to the European Union, has, for one, suggested a somewhat "customised" relationship between the Caribbean and Europe.¹¹ Nonetheless, the broad front of ACP strategy, which has facilitated the unique "partnership" which the African, Caribbean, and Pacific have developed with Europe under the Lomé arrangement, has paid dividends.

Versus (4) "**niche diplomacy.**" A concept closely akin to a strategy in marketing, with Darwinian overtones, the idea of "niche diplomacy" is that countries' foreign policies, somewhat like their business products, can occupy secure and influential places on the international scene in accordance with a highly differentiated division of diplomatic labor. The emphasis is entirely on individual distinctiveness, not at all on group inconspicuousness. (Of course, interested if not sympathetic groups are needed to provide support, in the form of the political "market" for niche-diplomatic products.) By concentrating their limited resources and energies on certain specific objectives, and intrepidly pursuing them, such diplomatically focused countries, even without decisive power, can sometimes make decisive contributions, or at least help to do so.

For it has been, in fact, the *middle* powers, with greater resources to carry out their initiatives, that have been the originators of the "niche diplomacy" idea. The term was used by Gareth Evans, Australia's foreign affairs and trade minister in the late 1980s and early 1990s. To him it meant "concentrating resources in specific areas best able to generate returns worth having, rather than trying to cover the field."¹² The current Canadian foreign minister, Lloyd Axworthy, has also applied the niche-diplomacy concept, for example in launching the Ottawa process that has produced, against heavy odds, an International Convention to Ban Anti-personnel Land Mines. One of his academic countrymen has, however, irreverently called the minister's selection of issues and style of presentation of them "pulpit diplomacy."¹³

¹⁰"Caricom Denounces EU Lomé Proposals," *Caribbean Insight* (April 1998): 2.

¹¹Havelock Ross-Brewster, "Time to Take in the Begging Bowl? The Caribbean in post Lomé Europe," *Caricom Perspective*, no. 67 (June 1997), 15-17.

¹²Gareth Evans and Bruce Grant, *Australia's Foreign Affairs in the World of the 1990s* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1991), 323, quoted in Andrew F. Cooper, Richard A. Higgott, and Kim Richard Nossal, *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1993), 25-26. For a further development of the concept, see Andrew F. Cooper, ed., *Niche Diplomacy: Middle Powers After the Cold War* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997); Alan K. Henrikson, "Middle Powers as Managers: International Mediation Within, Across, and Outside Institutions," *ibid.*, 46-72.

¹³This is Fen Osler Hampson of The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University.

Small states that are desirous of finding diplomatic niches may need to develop symbiotic relations with larger countries, particularly some of the world's middle powers, old and new. An example is the way in which Antarctica was introduced as a political issue in the UN General Assembly for the first time in 1983. Hitherto, Antarctica has been the fiefdom of the signatories of the 1959 Antarctica Treaty, viewed by some others as a "club." In 1983 the call was issued for a special study of the status of the resource-rich Antarctic region by Malaysia and by Antigua and Barbuda. Their idea was to broaden the Antarctic regime, through UN involvement, and to establish it legally as the "common heritage of mankind." (On this topic, an older middle power, Australia, acted as the spokesman for the Treaty nations.) An explanation of the interest taken by the government of Antigua and Barbuda in the Antarctic issue given, informally, by a diplomat from that country is the following: A purpose of the initiative was, frankly, to catch the attention of, even to irritate, the United States. The very outlandishness of the topic served that function well. At the same time, Antigua and Barbuda, have no interests in Antarctica, had nothing to lose. Nor was the U.S. government, which did have interests there, so likely to feel threatened that it might overreact, punishing the small state.

One can think of various international initiatives that small islands, acting more independently, have taken and might in the future take that would qualify as niche diplomacy. Some of these might be of a very hard-headed, business-oriented kind. Such instances might occur in the form of international leadership in the tourism policy field -- a traditional but also a very modern service sector, in which many small countries, particularly island states, have distinctive attributes. One area in which this is needed is in the control of pollution by cruise ships.¹⁴ An earlier result, in part, of small-country diplomatic effort in the environmental field is the important 1994 Barbados Declaration and Plan of Action on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. Another Caribbean case is Jamaica. With the International Seabed Authority, authorized under UNCLOS, located in Kingston, one can imagine that the Jamaican government will be interested in advancing initiatives in oceans policy.

Niche diplomacy, though the term itself may suggest troglodytism, can be a way by which some of the world's smallest can position themselves in the international limelight. Niche-diplomatic efforts truly make sense, as already suggested, if and only if initiatives are devised, very precisely, that correlate closely with basic national and probably also regional interests, and not just political protagonism. Altruism, in the espousal of wider causes, must be linked to self-interest. This may be especially true for small countries, which should select their causes -- that

¹⁴Douglas Frantz, "Gaps in Sea Laws Shield Pollution by Cruise Lines," *The New York Times*, January 3, 1999.

is, the ones they particularly wish to make *their own* -- carefully and well. There should be, it might further be noted, a close correlation between the external policy of a country and its internal politics when it undertakes niche-diplomatic initiatives. Here is a case where civil society and public opinion are vitally important. Such diplomacy, lest it be exposed as the idiosyncratic interest of the leader, must have democratic support. Democracies, however, can choose leaders.

The next pair of contrasting diplomatic types are:

(5) "**diasporic diplomacy.**" This, also a relatively new idea, which refers to the "diasporas," or spreading of seeds, which countries with large out-migrations have.¹⁵ The novelty of it lies in the perspective adopted toward a country's emigrants not merely as a source of remittances, which they have long importantly been for many states, but also a source, direct and indirect, of international support for it. Such diasporic diplomacy involves the use of continuing ties, familial and other, with nationals and also former nationals in a foreign country, especially large ones with resources and decision-making power, (Madarsko, CR – visa)

There are, to be sure, some "classical" cases of this essential idea, including that of Greece (*diaspora* being a Greek word).¹⁶ The pattern of Armenian dispersal, and continued interest in the homeland, is another. Then there is the Jewish case, a particularly complicated one owing not only to its long and broken history but also to the reality that the small State of Israel has never actually be the home of most Jewish people, many of whom emigrated from Europe.

Diasporic diplomacy is what Dimitri Conostas and Athanassios Platias term a "triadic relationship" involving (a) the minority ethnic group, (b) the host-country, and (c) the country of origin.¹⁷ The minority ethnic group may be of different kinds. John A. Armstrong distinguishes between two kinds: "mobilized" diasporas, or well-connected and politically active ones, and "proletarian," or, basically, labor, diasporas, which may in fact have the more immediate ties to the "old" country.¹⁸ Obviously, the "mobilized," or at least mobilizable, diasporas are socially

¹⁵I am indebted for this term to Dr. Keith Nurse of the Institute of International Relations at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago. I am grateful to him also for bringing to my attention the very useful Robin Cohen, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997).

¹⁶Dimitri C. Conostas and Athanassios G. Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics: The Greeks in Comparative Perspective* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., in association with The Institute of International Relations, Panteion University, 1993).

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁸John A. Armstrong, "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas," *American Political Science Review* 70 (June 1976), 393, cited by Conostas and Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, 4-5.

so place as to have the greater usefulness to the origin-country in dealing with the host-country. By the same token, however, they may be much less capable of being controlled, or even manipulated. This is in part because of the vexed issue of "dual loyalty" that can be raised. Nonetheless, relations can be close. In the case of Israel and American Jews there is AIPAC, the American-Israeli Political Action Committee, as well as other, larger and less focused organizations, such as the American Jewish Committee. It is not well known, even in Israel, that in the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs there is a Diaspora Department.¹⁹ Not that the Israeli government's interest in the diaspora is necessarily highly secretive. One of its current programs, organized and jointly financed by the Israeli government, a group of Jewish donors from North America, and the Council of Jewish Federations, is Birthright Israel, an undertaking that "will pay for any Jew in the world between age 15 and 26 to travel to Israel for 10 days."²⁰

A commitment like this would be hard for other smaller countries to match, and in any case the Israeli case, which has a religious purpose, and others are not fully comparable. Nonetheless, official efforts of outreach to diasporas may, generally, be advantageous for a country -- assuming, of course, that they are not *émigrés* or political refugees. The premise of effective diasporic diplomacy must, therefore, be democracy, or at least tolerance and openness at home. Thus diasporic diplomacy can backfire. More commonly, however, it can engender goodwill. An example of this, on the recent occasion of President William J. Clinton's State of the Union Message in January, there was, sitting in the gallery with Mrs. Clinton, the Dominican baseball star, Sammy Sosa, highlighting his and role in, and the need for, helping the Dominican Republic cope with its hurricane damage. There are more complex and subtle matters on which diasporic elements can be helpful. One concerns the banana issue. On that matter, concentrations of West Indians in certain congressional districts can be mobilized to a degree to sensitize their legislative representatives, countering the political influence of Chiquita Corporation with its vast Latin American banana plantations, to the damage that current U.S. policy can do to the Caribbean.

Versus (6) "**multicultural diplomacy.**" This is, in a sense, the reciprocal of diasporic diplomacy. The emphasis is on the host-country rather than the home-country. While "multiculturalism" as a political and, to a degree, a foreign policy issue is most often associated with the large immigrant-receiving countries, such as Australia or, in the Americas, Brazil, the

¹⁹Gabriel Sheffer, "Jewry, Jews and Israeli Foreign Policy: A Critical Appraisal," in Constan and Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, 208.

²⁰Laurie Goodstein, "To Bind the Faith, Free Trips to Israel for Diaspora Youth," *The New York Times*, November 16, 1998.

United States, and Canada, it is a central question also for many smaller countries. Among the small states that have been severely challenged by it are Fiji, Trinidad and Tobago, and Guyana. In all of these cases the government of the country has found it to be in its interest, externally as well as internally, to project an image of racial balance and cultural diversity, practices guaranteed by protections of human rights if not special allocations of privilege to particular groups.

In the Fijian case, a new Constitution, changing the one of 1990 which assured the political dominance of indigenous (Melanesian) Fijians, made it possible for the country to re-enter the Commonwealth, from which it had been suspended after the May 1987 military coup. The change also made possible the resumption of diplomatic relations with the government of India, which had taken a protective interest in Fiji's ethnic Indian population, a portion of which fled the country after the coup. The Constitution (Amendment) Act of 1997, which came into effect last July, "reaffirms recognition of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all individuals and groups" and recognizes Fiji's multicultural society. It also established a Human Rights Commission, which is the first among Pacific island states. This won the plaudits of Amnesty International and other nongovernmental groups interested in promoting human rights. The reform was well "timed" to anticipate the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, celebrated on "International Human Rights Day" (December 10, 1998).²¹

Multicultural diplomacy, or the projection to the world of an image of a culturally rich and politically fair society, can be carried out in ways other than signing up to international human-rights standards. In the case of Trinidad and Tobago, the phenomenon of the Carnival, second only to that of Brazil, adds vibrancy to the image of a multicultural single nation, enjoying itself. The event attracts visitors from the region and from around the world. And it is being replicated, in smaller versions, in other larger countries, such as the United Kingdom and also Canada and the United States where many Trinidadians and other West Indians now lives. These celebrations serve to maintain links with the homeland which are not merely sentimental. They can be organizational, with economic-commercial potential, as well.

This brings me to the next pairing of diplomatic types:

(7) "**enterprise diplomacy.**" This is a name which might be given, drawing loosely from "enterprise theory," to the international practice by which a country aggressively exploits a

²¹Amnesty International put further pressure on the Fijian government by calling upon it to declare its commitment to the Universal Declaration's values for the Fijian people, and also to prepare for Fiji's accession to the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. "Fiji: New Era for Human Rights with New Constitution," public statement, July 22, 1998, International Secretariat of Amnesty International, London.

natural locational or some other, artificially generated advantage (e.g., convenient ship registry, tax haven, flexible incorporation legislation) in order to promote its economic and perhaps also political position, sometimes though not necessarily at the expense of others (competitors). As Michael E. Porter, in his *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (1990) points out, the national government remains important in this process, which remains "highly localized," even in an era of globalization. He explains: "While globalization of competition might appear to make the nation less important, instead it seems to make it more so. With fewer impediments to trade to shelter uncompetitive domestic firms and industries, the home nation takes on growing significance because it is the source of skills and technology that underpin competitive advantage."²²

Examples of small-state enterprising, for economic and other purposes, are numerous. The Maldives, a country of more than a thousand low-lying islands surrounded by spectacularly beautiful coral reefs, has developed a tourism industry on this basis, with luxury hotels on some seventy-five islands. "Creating a sort of Venice in the Indian Ocean has been a clever enterprise," notes *The Economist*. Because of the vulnerability of the country's tourism industry to coral-bleaching resulting from increases in ocean temperature (and other factors) and the threat to the country itself posed by a rise in the ocean's level, Maldives has become a site for some six observatories to monitor global warming, which brings attention from the international scientific community.²³ An even more ingenious strategy by an Indian Ocean country is that of the Seychelles, which has become the home of the Miss World contest, assuring a vast television viewership. *The Economist* here comments: "For the Seychelles, the staging of Miss World is a brilliant business move."²⁴

Small-state enterprise is not without major problems. One of them is the challenge of raising international capital, which tends to have a high cost for small countries. Of course, setting up offshore financial havens helps. George Soros's Quantum Fund, for example, is based in Curaçao, and has generated billions, some of which must have stayed in the country. More commonly, small-country emerging markets must compete abroad to raise funds. A key factor, apart from relations with investors and lenders themselves, is a country's attractiveness to the increasing number of metropolitan-country firms (besides Standard & Poor and Moody's, Fitch Investors' Service, Duff & Phelps, and others) that provide the risk ratings on which capital

²²Michael E. Porter, *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), 19.

²³"Maldives: On the Beach," *The Economist* 350, no. 8101 (January 9, 1999): 39.

²⁴"Seychelles, Saved by the Belles," *The Economist* 349, no. 8096 (November 28, 1998): 48.

inflows are based.²⁵ Part of "enterprise diplomacy" would be for small-state, capital-poor countries assiduously to cultivate these firms.

Much of national enterprise strategy involves trying to steal a march against the opposition, in some cases in violation or near-violation of the rules. Enterprise diplomacy has a transgressive quality. It can generate international tensions, which may contribute to larger international rivalries. The European Commission has applied to the World Trade Organization to request a panel to investigate U.S. export subsidies estimated at 2 billion dollars per annum. "This is the value," David Jessop explains, "placed on the tax exemptions granted to American companies exporting through foreign sales corporations (FSCs) registered off-shore in countries such as Barbados, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands and elsewhere."²⁶ The Commission argues that these offshore arrangements give U.S. goods an unfair advantage, and amount to a clear violation of WTO subsidy rules. Although this dispute between the EU and the U.S. does not involve the Caribbean island bases of the FSCs directly, it does jeopardize advantages they have gained. It makes sense, therefore, for them to participate in the resolution of this and other such problems, at Geneva where they have standing. "Although the battles may be in Brussels and Washington, the WTO as the regulator of the global trading system of the future, is the battle ground on which Caribbean countries need to take their place if small states have any hope in the war for global trade supremacy."²⁷

Versus (8) "**regulatory diplomacy.**" This is the counterpoint to, and an obvious implication of, enterprise diplomacy, which can call for a definition of "the rules" in the more general interests of small states, and others. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, has stated: "regulatory systems must be improved in every part of the world; solid and sustainable safety-nets must be crafted to shield the poorest and most vulnerable; and

²⁵The role of the risk-rating firms, particularly the competition between them, is highlighted by Gerry McNamara and Paul Vaaler, of the Broad School of Management, Michigan State University, and The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, respectively, in their study "Competitive Positioning and Rivalry in Emerging-Market Risk-Assessment" (January 1999).

²⁶David Jessop, "The Week in Europe," July 10, 1998.

²⁷*Ibid.* Jessop notes that some Caribbean governments such as Jamaica already have permanent representation at the WTO, and others, such as Barbados, are looking for ways "to upgrade their presence." He comments that "it will be ever more important to parallel the newly emerging regional negotiating capacity with the highest possible regional profile in Geneva if Caribbean interests are to be protected." This refers to the Regional Negotiating Machinery (RNM). Created at the CARIFORUM level (with Suriname and also Haiti and the Dominican Republic included), the RNM is being led by Sir Shridath Ramphal as Chief Negotiator. It hopes to supervise and perhaps also to conduct many of the negotiations in which Caribbean countries are now and will be involved. See Sir Shridath Ramphal, "Securing Our Future," *Caricom Perspective*, no. 67 (June 1997), 5-6.

transparency must be advanced on all sides." In his view "the *political* aspects" of globalization have not been sufficiently recognized.²⁸ One way of doing so is through regulatory diplomacy.

The sheer "harmonization," internationally, of policies and rules may not sufficiently protect the interests of the small states in any precise way. It is necessary for them, and their needs, to be recognized at an early stage of any negotiation aimed at setting up a new regime. In the negotiations leading to the establishment of a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), for example, it was possible (after a difficult fight) to secure at least recognition of, if not necessarily beneficial special arrangements for, the "smaller economies" of the Hemisphere.²⁹

On the underside of international commerce there are other important issues which raise regulatory questions. One is the issue of bribery, paid by large corporations to officials of, especially, smaller and poorer countries, in order to secure business, sometimes to the detriment of sound national economic planning and the efficient allocation of resources. Corruption has a terrible cost. A new international consensus against it has developed, with the governments in which many multinational corporations are based cooperating. The result is the new "bribery convention," an international treaty prepared by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This has been signed by all twenty-members of the OECD and five non-members, including Bulgaria. It also has the enthusiastic support of international lending agencies, like the World Bank. The agreement requires its signatories to make it a crime to bribe any foreign official to win or retain business or for any other "improper advantage." Enough signatures have now been gathered for the convention to take effect. (kožený)³⁰

The more controversial International Criminal Court (ICC) project, to which smaller countries have made a greater input, also may benefit them. In 1989 the government of Trinidad and Tobago, at the United Nations, re-focused the world's attention on this long-suspended endeavor (originally proposed at the end of World War II during the Nuremberg and Tokyo

²⁸Kofi Annan, "The Politics of Globalization," address at Harvard University sponsored by the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies, Cambridge, Mass., September 17, 1998.

²⁹For an analysis of the continuing Miami process, aimed at setting up an FTAA, see *From Talk to Action: How Summits Can Help Forge a Western Hemisphere Community of Prosperous Democracies*, A Policy Report by the Leadership Council for Inter-American Summitry (Miami: North-South Center, University of Miami, March 1998). A Supplementary Comment by Dr. Winston Dookeran drew attention, with regard to the interests of the smaller economies of the Caribbean, to the likelihood that the FTAA would be "devoid of any special trade and tariff advantages unless we use the Summit process to bring our unique characteristics to the fore" (p. 20). Dr. Richard L. Bernal, Jamaica's Ambassador to the United States and Chairman of the FTAA Working Group on Smaller Economies, similarly reflects: It is "at the stage of conceptualization" that the Caribbean region "stands the best chance of effectively impacting on the process." Richard L. Bernal, "CARICOM States and the FTAA: Adequacy of Preparation, Participation and Negotiating Structure," in *Small Caribbean States and the Challenge of International Trade Negotiations* (St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago: Institute of International Relations, University of the West Indies, 1998), 98.

³⁰"Honest Trade: A Global War Against Bribery," *The Economist* 350, no. 8102 (January 16, 1999): 22-24.

trials). It proposed that efforts be resumed to draft an ICC statute for an international judicial body capable of dealing with, among other threats to small-state security, the increase in crimes of international drug trafficking. The Trinidadian initiative prompted a general interest.

In the diplomacy that proposed the ICC statute, finalized at a Diplomatic Conference in Rome in June 1998, there was a strong regional contribution, including, as noted, a noteworthy Caribbean contribution. A broad coalition of some sixty-five "like-minded states," working in the Preparatory Committee to draft an ICC statute kept up the momentum. Among the various regional bodies and grouping that have expressed their support for establishment of a permanent ICC were the Southern African Development Community, some twenty-five African countries meeting in Dakar in February 1998, the European Parliament, the Rio Group of Latin American states, and the Caribbean Community. With that range of support, even though the United States for technical reasons and concern about how an ICC might inhibit its military has decided to oppose the final product of the Rome conference, this international regulatory project has a good chance of succeeding.

The final pair of diplomatic types are:

(9) "**summit diplomacy.**" Though usually associated with great-power, even nuclear superpower relations, meetings "at the summit," in Winston Churchill's phrase, now very commonly occur among leaders of middle- and smaller-sized countries. Some of these can be large affairs. The 1973 Non-Aligned Summit in Algiers was attended "by the largest number of heads of state or government ever gathered at an international conference."³¹ On the regional level, summit meetings are even more frequent than on the global plane. As countries are represented by their leaders, many of whom have remarkable personal qualities, disparities of size among countries can be forgotten.

Many examples, particularly from the era of the "founding fathers" of countries, could be given, but one may suffice as an illustration: Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore. As one of Singapore's most accomplished ambassadors, Tommy Koh, has rightly noted, "Lee Kuan Yew has personified Singapore to the world. He has been the principal architect of Singapore's foreign policy. He has also been Singapore's chief diplomat to the world." In dealing with other countries, Mr. Lee has proven that a country can be "mini" in size but not influence. "In a world where the big fish eat small fish and the small fish eat shrimps,"

³¹Odette Jankowitsch and Karl P. Sauvant, "The Initiating Role of the Non-Aligned Countries," in *Changing Priorities of the International Agenda: The New International Economic Order*, ed. Karl P. Sauvant (New York: Pergamon Press, 1981), 66-67, quoted in Erisman, *Pursuing Postdependency Politics*, 74.

Ambassador Koh quotes Lee Kuan Lew as saying, "Singapore must become a poisonous shrimp."³²

More generally, relations among the leaders of small countries, who get to know each other very well in meetings of regional and subregional organizations such as CARICOM and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) are less prickly than this figure of speech suggests. Caribbean-style governance and politics, and diplomacy as well, are quasi-collegial. Disputes can be buffered by their fraternal character. Considerable allowances were for a long time made by the other West Indian governments, for example, for the People's Republic of Grenada (PRG) under "errant brother" Maurice Bishop. The Caribbean sociologist Anthony Maingot regards this tolerance, which is based in part on personal relationships, as "a very important characteristic of politics in archipelagic areas." There is a "diffuse reciprocity," as he calls it, which exists above and beneath relationships based on state-to-state treaties and other rational-legal bonds at the interstate level.³³ Such relationships, fostered by personal contact among leaders at the summit level, exist as well to a degree in other areas of the world, not just archipelagic ones, where there are numerous small countries side by side (Fico, stále větší význam, stále více záleží na Bruselu)).

Through direct participation in major and even in selected minor international meetings, a country's top leadership, with a president or prime minister engaging with his or her counterparts, face to face (and often in a "club"-like atmosphere), can take his or her counterparts' measure and form bonds. On these, in lieu of alliances of a formal kind, "reliances" can be built. A novelty in recent years, made possible in part by the increased ease of travel, is the phenomenon of a touring group of small-state political figures, typically headed by at least one leader at the prime ministerial level. An example is the Commonwealth delegation, headed by Prime Minister Owen Arthur of Barbados, that visited UNCTAD in Geneva and also international organizations in Brussels and in Washington in July of 1998 to win greater recognition of small states in their common attempt to deal with the economic problems resulting from their small size and inherent vulnerability.³⁴

³²Tommy Koh, *The Quest for World Order: Perspectives of a Pragmatic Idealist*, ed. with an introduction by Amitav Acharya (Singapore: The Institute of Policy Studies, Times Academic Press, 1998), 175, 177.

³³Maingot, "The English-Speaking Caribbean and Hemispheric Security Policy: The Lessons of Grenada," 240-45.

³⁴Other members of the delegation were Don McKinnon, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, Kelebone A. Maope, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture of Lesotho, Rajkewsur Purryag, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Mauritius, Berenado Vunibobo, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Fiji, and the Deputy Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Secretariat, Sir Humphrey Maud.

Versus (10) "**cyber diplomacy**." This may be described as diplomatic networking by other means. Though "virtual," and not face-to-face, these methods are not necessarily impersonal. Indeed the use of e-mail, in particular, can be quite intimate in its feel. A near-revolutionary consequence of the introduction of Information Technology (IT) in diplomacy is that it more firmly integrates a resident ambassador or high commissioner or the head of a delegation overseas into foreign policy, which he or she can more easily help *make*, and not just carry out. No only need an ambassador "lying abroad" be out of the loop, in policy terms. As the current British ambassador to Washington, Sir Christopher Meyer, has commented, apparently from his own experience, an ambassador can now on occasion actually "instruct himself." A diplomat's dream! It may not go too far to suggest that on some issues, like complicated trade-policy matters being discussion at the WTO in Geneva, the "center" of policymaking will be the "delegate."

A related way in which IT can be used is to form "virtual teams" and even "virtual embassies" by which developments in a particular place overseas are monitored and interpreted by knowledge persons physically far removed from the scene. Thus diplomats who have been shifted to new posts or rotated home, or even retired, can be brought, electronically, into detailed deliberation of problems that may require a country's statement or action. Obviously, this can all be done more quickly than before. So too can bureaucrats within governments, and between governments, keep in closer touch with each other in order better to coordinate their foreign policies and diplomacies in view of world events. In this field, the big states, with their heavier infrastructures and more sluggish procedures (including security procedures), do not necessarily have an advantage, an inherent advantage, over smaller ones. Indeed, small states, such as Malta, have attempted to pioneer in this new field.³⁵ Even in the more conventional field of telephonic communication, as the World Bank's new *Knowledge for Development* report shows, some of the developing countries have "leapfrogged" over the richer industrial ones (Figure 6).³⁶

³⁵See, e.g., Dietrich Kappeler, "The Impact of Information Technology on Preparation and Support of Small State Participation in Economic Negotiation," in Gonzalez *Small Caribbean States*, 143; see also idem., "Malta and the European Union: Experience in Maximising Negotiating Capacity for Possible Entry into the Union," in *ibid.*, 151-54. Professor Kappeler is Director of the Diplomatic Studies Programme at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, and a former Director (subsequently Chairman of the Board) of the Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta, which has a specialized Unit for Information Technology and Diplomacy (web site: www.diplomacy.edu). A recent report which urges that the U.S. State Department get up to speed in the IT field, with corporate rather than small-state standards being the benchmark, is *Reinventing Diplomacy in the Information Age*, a Report of the CSIS Advisory Panel on Diplomacy in the Information Age, Project Co-chairs Richard Burt and Olin Robison and Project Director Barry Fulton (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Affairs, December 1998).

³⁶*Knowledge for Development*, World Development Report 1998/99 (Washington, D.C.: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank, 1999), 59.

Information technology can also be used in a *public*-diplomatic way to "project" the image of a country, in very precise and rapid ways, to interested IT users, who are increasingly numerous the world over. "Cyberboosterism," the political geographer Stanley Brunn calls it.³⁷ Nearly every country, no matter how small, now has a website. Some of them (e.g., that of Singapore) are very impressive. It should be noted that some non-state political actors, such as the Sendero Luminoso in Peru and the rebel movement in Chiapas, Mexico, have their sites on the world wide web. The field of IT is a "leveling" one: it de-stratifies foreign ministries and it equalizes countries, large vs. small, and also political entities, states vs. non-state actors.

³⁷Stanley D. Brunn and Charles D. Cottle, "Small States and Cyberboosterism," *The Geographical Review* 87, no. 2 (April 1997): 240-58.