THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WEAK STATES IN THE GLOBALIZATION ERA

LIMERI SICHINAVA

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Limeri.sichinava@gmail.com

Abstract: In this work the features of modern globalization and its influence on small states are presented. The role of international organizations and the flexible diplomacy in the globalization age to support small states in expression of their national interests related to issues of international concern and even an impact on the global events is considered. Furthermore, the specifics of different small states are investigated as conditions for a successful role in the international environment. Their potential to achieve positive outcomes related to global policy matter is considered. The ways of the development of the small states survive in the age of globalization with their national identity is proposed.

I. INTRODUCTION

In XXI century, while the irreversible processes of globalization are rapidly spreading, the issue of small states becomes more significant: specifically what is the particular place that they have taken in globalization era and what kind of role will be given to them in the future?

First of all, it is appropriate to define the term "small states" for better understanding.The concept of small states existed long before than this notion as an analytical concept got its value (this happened after World War II).[1] It should be noted that the League of Nations was mostly comprised by small and weak states.[2] Many debates were held in order to get an improved definition of "small states", but as far as it is related to many difficulties, that is why different researchers had their own opinions about to this issue. The universal decision was not made but the common concept could be mentioned in their considerations that "small countries are weak from the military-political point of view, which cannot protect its own interests".

Nicholas Spykman denotes that a "small country presents a vacuum under high pressure. It exists not because it is strong, but no one wants its territory or because its preservation as buffer country or as a pressure tool in force balance is in the interest of the big states and when this balance disappears, as a rule, small states disappear with it".[3]

The concept of Goldhammer should also be considered. He denotes that small states do not interfere in International affairs.[4] It should be noted about this that a small country cannot interfere in important matters of the world; however, in case of necessity its geopolitical and geo-economic significance can be taken into account.

The notion "small state" is often used for weak states in military-political terms, but having a large territory (Eg. Saudi Arabia, Libya, Mongolia, Mauritania and others). Thus, it is more appropriate, the term "small state", to be used for the countries which are small in terms of territory and weak from the point of military-political view. That is why, the term "weak state" is used more often and it is acceptable, because this category includes not only small and weak countries, but also the bigger ones in terms of territory, which are vulnerable based on their less military-political strength.[5]

Some researchers consider that "weakness" and "strength" of the state must be defined due to its military possibilities. Hans Morgenthau, who is one of the most distinguished representatives of the neorealism school, deems that "power" and "strength" are the most important determining factors of international politics.[6] There is a strong country, which can influence on the international arena, but a small one – vice versa, is a country which can't make any important and significant influence. Also it can't protect its own interests and security, because its leverages are not sufficient to resolve all of the above. That is why it is forced to rely on assistance offered by other powerful states, which in many cases causes a permanent commitment.

[1] Bauwns W., Clesse A. & Knudsen O., eds., Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe, (London, Washington, Brasey's 1996), p. 4

[2] Rappard E. W., "Small States in the League of Nations", *Political Science Quarterly,* 49:4 (Dec. 1934)

[3] Spykman J. N., / "America's Strategy in World Politics", (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co, 1942):20; quoted in Vandenbosch, "The Small States", 294-5

[4] Goldhammer H. R., / "The Foreign Power in Latin America", Prinston University Press, 1972, p. 237

[5] Handel M,. Weak States in the International System. Frank Cass, London, 1990, p. 11

[6] Morgenthau H., "Politics among Nations". (New York, Knopf. 1967), p. 5

There are distinguished strong and weak countries, strong and weak states. A country can be strong in military and economic terms, but too weak as a state (Eg. Nigeria, Brazil). And vise versa, the country can be weak in military and economic terms, but strong as a state (Eg.: The Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Austria). According to the position of national security, a big country with a weak statehood can have much more problems than small country with a strong statehood. These are following problems: Internal weakness, social and ethnic divisions, weak economy, strong and stable state institutions, and the absence of intolerant attitude towards minorities. All mentioned problems can be dangerous for any country's national security.[1]

II. FORMAL STATUS AND POLITICAL PECULIARITIES

Before the foundation of the United Nations and other international institutions, the countries with liberal-democratic regimes were few, weak states were separating into pieces after the lost of the war and were plundered and occupied by powerful neighbor countries.

There are countries that are not able to protect their citizens' fundamental rights and to ensure their minimal needs. They have neither political and economical vitality nor the strong state institutions, also the power to function according to modern international standards. But their sovereignty is guaranteed by the fact that they have the status of independent country recognized by the international community and the United Nations. Such attitude towards such countries is a way of prolongation of formal functioning or existence, regardless of their inability because they have international recognition. Formation of small states can occur at any phase of history which can be caused by the geographic, political, ethnic and other objective factors, but it should be noted that they cannot achieve it alone without interest and support of the big and powerful countries.

The peculiarities of the international policy is expressed in the theories of international relations where the main place, regardless of the forms of democratic governance, highlighting the human rights issues, relationships between the countries with the international law norms and etc., still realism i.e. modern variety – the structural realism or neorealism holds. As far as traditional realism was based on power, strength and to the small, weak states a secondary role were assigned. The states involved into the international system were creating the hierarchy based on their strength even according to neo-realism. Consequently, the small weak countries vitality in such an environment is mainly determined by the interests of the powerful states. According to such features of politics in the international system, the rescue and the status quo represent the main objective of the small poor countries. Security and independence is the primary purpose for any state, but first of all it should be said for weak countries, as it can be very difficult to achieve this goal due to in light of their own capabilities in anarchic and ruthless international politics.

III. GEOPOLITICAL ADVANTAGES, THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OR THE ROLE OF A BUFFER

Taking into account the international political state of the art, an existing reality puts the small weak countries into an unfavorable position and they even do not have a choice in some situations. They have to take into account the bitter reality that in most cases keeps them in slavery. The locations of some weak countries are regarded geopolitical and strategic importance, and it represents a bit relief for them. For example, if a weak country is an important communication conductor, in such cases it is of strategic importance and involuntarily falls into the interest of powerful countries in the area of global policy. Georgia represents such a country, and it is located at the crossroads of Europe and Asia, which has always been a bridge between the Western and Eastern civilizations. Its Black Sea coastline gives Georgia a great advantage among the South Caucasus countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan). Via the involvement into the following projects: TRACECA, BSEC, GUAM, geopolitical location, and political life in the 21st century, Georgia has obtained international importance. At the same time, it's basically on the crossroad of the interests of two superpowers, which has put it into difficult condition considering the current situation. There arises the question of is Georgia a buffer between Russia-US relations? The answer can be obtained through analyzing the interests of these two countries.

Therefore, Georgia is under huge pressure. It is hard for it to express its own independent opinion on the current international political processes and does not have the possibility of maneuvering or of announcing neutrality according to its geopolitical location. It is forced to come out of the reality in which it is present (the occupied territories), which makes it depended on current events and external factors.

IV. SMALL STATES IN GLOBALIZATION AGE

Nowadays the process of globalization is one of the main issues, which in turn covers political, economic, cultural, and other spheres. Its importance “behind the curtain” is treated as mean of the strengthening of

[1] Buzan B., People, States and Fear. The National Security Problem in International Relations. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1983, p. 66

hegemony and imperialistic intentions of the Superpower States. The features of the globalization processes are clearly reflected in all areas, especially in international economic relations between countries. Due to increased economic integration, international trade, transnational corporations, capital export, international organizations, and a variety of formal and informal global processes have greatly increased the interdependence of states.[1] Small countries, whose economies in comparison with big countries, are more "open" and less diversified; they are impacted under the influence of interdependence and integration processes. Therefore, their foreign policy becomes more "economized" and the international trade issues of small and weak countries get primary importance.

According to the complex interdependence concept, the geopolitical space gradually obtains geo-economic character and future conflicts are mostly economical rather than political. For example, when Russia imposed embargo on Georgia, the European market was less accessible for Georgia for that period and its adoption was not possible immediately. This significantly affected the Georgian economy.

Globalization is offered by big and powerful states, and the small and weak states implement bandwagoning policy due to various reasons. In this situation, many questions arise: what will happen to the small states in the globalization age? What does globalization mean for them? Is it only survival way for small and weak states or the end of their national identity?

It must be assumed that the new increased role of international law and international organizations in international relations and global political and economical life will significantly improve the conditions of small states. Strong diplomatic corps can also have a positive effect on them, but attention should be paid to the fact that the diplomacy of any state is firm when it is supported by military and economic strength. Many people believe that the only way of survival for the small states in the globalization age is a flexible diplomacy, but the issue cannot be stated so rationally. It should be remembered that power is still dominated in international politics.

Although the powerful states have recognized the rights of the weak states in the Hague at the first (1889) and second (1907) conferences, but in fact the double standard policy is dominating.[2] A clear example of it is that in the UN Security Council only strong states have a permanent seat and veto power.[3]

Liberalists argued that in the League of Nations and then in the United Nations that weak states had almost the same rights as the powerful states. The powerful and weak states had the same rights in the League of Nations, but real power of the weak states was minimal and all decisions in the League of Nations were dependent on the will of powerful states.

M. Handel- found in his book, "Weak States in the International System" that despite the foregoing, mostly the equal participation of the small states in the international organizations was a new historical stage, the great achievement. However, the wish of big powerful countries to implement various activities contradicted the Charter of these organizations. In this case, the "equality" remained only on paper as a written law, clear evidence of which is that: Reigan bombed Grenada, Clinton – Belgrade, Bush – Iraq and all this happened without the sanction of the UN Security Council, with violation of the UN Charter.[4] Russia also violated the UN Charter, when it was carrying out occupational activities against Georgia. If the small country would carry out such policy (unless of course it has the resources) it would fall in isolation from the rest of the world – it will be subject to various types of financial sanctions. Its citizens face problems in obtaining visas, political pressing, and etc.

As we see the liberalism in globalization is not true, because if necessary, the strong states apply "power policy" immediately. Superpower states with imperialistic intentions send the "Jackals" in disloyal states to implement their own interests - the change government and the "reconstruction" of state structure, in order to make the state's policy to be adjusted to their interests. The powerful states, in order to justify their own aggression, upon small and weak ones use as a reason a hostile act and attack committed by the small and weak states. By this way they create the moral basis for their actions in the eyes of the world community.[5]

CONCLUSION

From all the above said, the following questions arise: what is a solution? What should the small and weak states do in order to protect their own interests, preserve their identity, and survive? - The solution, in our opinion, is in following:

1. Join any union and this will cause a redistribution of a power of balance. Membership of a

[1] Keohane O. R., Nye S. J., Power and Interdependence. 2rd Edition, Scott, Foresman and Company, 1989, pp. 23-24

[2] Carr H. E., / The Twenty Years' Crisis: Appearance and reality in World Politics 1919-1939. 1939, p. 28

[3] Handel I. M., / Weak States in the International System, 1990, p. 269

[4] Tchipashvili H. / diplomacy, Tbilisi, 2007, p 21 (In Georgian)

[5] Rondeli A. / International Relations. Publishing house "Nekeri", 2006, p .278 (In Georgian)

union assigns certain responsibilities to its member countries and it also includes defense, as expected, and the possible dangers. It should also be noted that the countries joining a union, which have territorial problems, it is less unlikely because even such countries present a threat to a union;

2. Formation of alliance of the weak countries, which enhance the defense and security of the country;

3. To use effectively its available resources, geopolitical location, natural resources and improve their own economic potential and provide its modernization. A small country should not be dependent only on one partner country's market. It must constantly seek new ones;

4. Be guided with flexible diplomacy and acquire friendly countries. A small country has no right to make mistakes in international relations, because a mistake, which is a small problem for big state, can be a disastrous for a small and weak state.

Accordingly, I believe that the small and weak countries can stand "as a nation among the others" and say their own words in the international arena. Otherwise it will always be something real by the powerful states.

In the 21st century the approach that "the strongest is always right" should not exist, but unfortunately, even today "only the strongest are taken into account".

★★★