



Governance of Small Jurisdictions: Guest Editors' Introduction

GODFREY A. PIROTTA

Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Policy, University of Malta, Tal-Qroqq, Malta

ROGER WETTENHALL

Professor of Public Administration Emeritus and Visiting Professor in the Centre for Research in Public Sector Management, University of Canberra, Australia

LINO BRIGUGLIO

Professor and Director, Islands and Small States Institute, University of Malta, Valetta

Key words: small and island states, governance, smallness, statehood, vulnerability

Abstract

This article introduces a symposium on the Governance of Small Jurisdictions developed from selected papers first presented at a conference at the Islands and Small States Institute of the University of Malta in November 1999. It notes the important role of the University of Malta in promoting the study of governance in small states, and recognises other leaders in the small and island states study movement including the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration which co-hosted the beginning conference.

The article then considers the notions of smallness and statehood as generally used in this branch of scholarship, reflects on what small states have in common, introduces the other articles which make up the symposium, and provides a list of some 90 states with populations of under one million sorted into three categories: (i) sovereign states, (ii) states in federations, and (iii) associate states, self-governing territories and self-governing colonies.

In this introduction to the “Governance of Small Jurisdictions” symposium we note first the role in the study of small states of the Islands and Small States Institute established by the University of Malta, which served as host for the conference in which earlier versions of the symposium articles were first presented. We then identify a number of other leaders in the field of “governance of small states” scholarship and practice, and comment on the way in which the defining terms “small” and “state” are used, in this scholarship generally and in this symposium particularly. Next, we connect briefly with the debate about what small states have in common, and finally we offer a short introduction to the articles which follow. Our introduction concludes with an appendix listing the states which satisfy our criteria of smallness, in the three categories identified in our earlier discussion.

The University of Malta and small states scholarship

The articles included in the symposium which constitutes this edition of *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal* have been developed from a selection of the papers presented at an International Conference on the Governance of Small Jurisdictions held in Malta in November 1999. The conference was hosted by the Islands and Small States Institute of the University of Malta in close collaboration with the Management and Personnel Office which is part of the Office of the Prime Minister of Malta and the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA).

The Islands and Small States Institute developed from a special program within the University of Malta's Foundation for International Studies. It has, within a very short span of life, developed an international reputation for academic excellence in the study of issues relating to small states, and its conferences have given rise to a number of publications in special editions of refereed journals (as on this occasion) or in book form.¹ It has been active in other ways too, notably in its contribution to the construction of a vulnerability index which aims to supplement GNP per capita statistics with an index of fragility arising from small size, insularity and proneness to natural disasters; and several University of Malta scholars now associated with it have made significant contributions to the ongoing work of the IASIA Working/Special Interest Group on Small and Island States, about which more will be said below.

The aim of the conference which gave rise to this symposium was to explore issues of governance in small states from as broad a perspective and as wide a geographical base as possible. This theme has not hitherto been as widely explored as some others, such as the issue of economic vulnerability. Where governance issues have been discussed, they have often been examined from a fairly limited public administration perspective. While this conference did not neglect those areas, it went beyond them in ranging from a search for analytical models to actual case studies of governing institutions in individual countries. The articles which follow seek to reflect these perspectives and diversity.

On the study of governance problems and issues in small states generally

There can be little doubt that the study of governance problems and issues in small states has increased dramatically as the number of small states has grown with the decolonising movements that followed the end of World War II. Not all the states which emerged from that movement were small, of course. But many were, particularly when the former imperial powers had shed direct control of their larger colonies and came to address what remained, often described picturesquely as "remnants of empire". The creation of many small states in this period swelled the membership of international associations such as the United Nations and

“The Commonwealth” that emerged from the old British Empire, and it is these states that command most of the attention of today’s small states scholarship.

But it should not therefore be assumed that small states were previously unknown in world history. Many held sway in Europe before the rise of the modern nation state: renaissance Italy “was a world of tiny city states” (*Economist*, 1998),² while the Hanseatic League of cities added many more in what is now mostly modern Germany. Even the rise of the nation state did not eliminate them all, some surviving in the late 19th and earlier 20th century Europe (AGS, 1969). But even these were no more than second and third comings of such states: consider this conclusion drawn by Aristotle from his comparative study of the many Greek city-states (*polises*) existing in and around the third century BC:

In large states it is both possible and proper that a separate magistracy should be allocated to each separate function . . . In small states, on the other hand, a large number of functions have to be accumulated in the hands of but a few persons . . . It is true that small states sometimes need the same magistracies, and the same laws about their tenure and duties, as large states. But it is also true that large states need their magistracies almost continuously, and small states only need theirs at long intervals. There is thus no reason why small states should not impose a number of duties simultaneously on their officers . . . [and] it is necessary, where the population is small, to turn magistrates into jacks-of-all-trades (Aristotle, in Barker translation, 1946, pp. 195–196).

That said, it is likely that the serious study of the small state phenomenon remained dormant from the time of Aristotle until the burgeoning of the number of small *developing* states in the post-imperial period of the later 20th century.³ Now scholars, consultants and the officials of international bodies and larger grant-giving states increasingly became interested, mostly in problems of economic development but also—as sociologists and political scientists sought to build bridges with earlier anthropological work—in social and political development; and the United Nations actually explored the possibility of establishing a new category of associated states to cope with their demands for membership (Boyce, 1977, pp. 232–244).⁴

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to identify all the contributors to this developing field, and all the centers or groups that supported them. But a few others may be mentioned by way of example. Thus UN agencies (e.g. UN, 1968; UNITAR, 1969; Selwyn/UNCTAD, 1978—through to UN, 1999) and the Commonwealth Secretariat (e.g. Ramphal et al., 1984; CS, 1985; Bray, 1991; Ross, 1997) have sponsored comparative studies and/or guides to good practice. The journal *Public Administration and Development* (growing out of the earlier British *Journal of Administration Overseas*) has run several path-breaking commentaries (e.g. Murray, 1981; Thynne, 1981; Hardman, 1984). And other dedicated conferences have been held in small/island contexts as divergent as Barbados (1972, 1994),⁵ the Canary Islands (constitutionally a

Spanish autonomous region: 1981), Tasmania (1988), Seychelles (1997) and the Faroe Islands (1999).⁶ Three concentrations of small island states emerging from the post World War II-decolonising movement—those of the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the Caribbean—have been particularly productive in terms of both academic study and regional collaboration (see e.g. Benedict, 1967; de Smith, 1970; Ostheimer, 1975; Lewis, 1976; Plischke, 1977; Dommen and Hein, 1985; Clarke and Payne, 1987; Connell, 1988; McDougall, 1997). A few universities have dedicated research centers (matching the University of Malta's initiative, the University of Prince Edward Island has established an Institute of Island Studies) or teaching programs (notably the University of Plymouth's course on Microstates and the International System, in which the near-by case of Jersey receives much attention). And a few small states have, again like Malta, played leadership roles in developing a consciousness among such states of common interests in the face of much diversity, notably Jersey in forging a network of small state parliamentarians within the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and the Isle of Man in facilitating sporting connections among the world's far-flung islands.⁷

The co-sponsor of the conference on which this symposium is based, the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (or IASIA), has had a long interest in the governing of small and island states. Its own conference and research activities operate in large part through a set of working groups, and a Working Group on Small and Island States was established at the 1981 IASIA conference hosted by the Canberra College of Advanced Education, now the University of Canberra, with support from the Commonwealth Secretariat in London and the Australian International Development Assistance Bureau (now AusAID). The group met regularly at annual IASIA conferences over the next decade and a half, and was associated with a number of other special conferences, its cross-country research program being marked by several important publications (notably Baker, 1992; Warrington, 1994; Warrington, 1998).⁸ More recently it has functioned as a "special interest group" of IASIA.

We now offer some comments on the way in which the terms "small" and "state" are used in this symposium, and more generally in the body of scholarship of which it forms a part.

The notions of "smallness" and "statehood"

On "smallness", we follow the advice given by Julie Bivin Raadschelders in the first major publication of the IASIA Working Group, and accept that the category of small states generally includes those with populations of one million or less (Raadschelders, 1992, p. 27). As Raadschelders points out, that is only one of several possible defining characteristics; however it is one that has been used in a considerable number of studies.⁹

But it needs to be acknowledged that “small” is a relative concept: it all depends on what the small unit is being compared with. Thus political scientists pursuing other interests can easily describe the Scandinavian states, Switzerland, Austria, Estonia, Australia, New Zealand and even Greece as “small” (e.g. Schwartz, 1994; Clesse & Knudsen, 1996; Goetschel, 1998); they are so in relation to e.g., the United States, France, Germany or Russia. Humorous travel writer P.J. O’Rourke describes even front-line states like Germany, Italy and Spain as “Euro-weenies . . . dopey little countries and all their pokey borders” (O’Rourke 1988).¹⁰ Again, a recently elected member of the Mongolian parliament classified her country (with 2.4 million people) as a “small jurisdiction . . . although geographically large” (Oyun, 1999).

Nonetheless, such states clearly fall outside the scope of the concerns of the IASIA Working Group and its successor special interest group. The Mongolian example does, however, draw attention to the fact that some states small in population are large in area, such as Greenland emerging from the status of a Danish colony, the new self-governing Inuit territory of Nunavut within the Canadian federation, or Australia’s Northern Territory: equally clearly, they are of interest.

At the other end of the small spectrum are the so-called micro-states—they certainly do fall within our concerns, but again it is all relative. This term produces some light-hearted banter. Boyce, who tracked the debates about UN membership, reported that they had variously been labelled “impossible” states, “postage stamp” states, “rag tags of empire”,¹¹ “see-through” states and “pocket handkerchief” states. He noted also that the UN itself was formally differentiating “very small” states from “small” states from 1966, and that scholars addressing the problem around this time were debating whether the cut-off point for “an independent political entity within its own territory” which was nevertheless “unable adequately to assume rights and to fulfil duties of States under international law”—in their view thus defining a “micro” state—should be a maximum population of 300,000 or 150,000 (Boyce, 1977, pp. 232–234, citing Blair, 1968; de Smith, 1970; Ehrhardt, 1970).¹²

While Warrington (1994, p. 130) refers to *all* small states under Raadschelders’s definition as micro-states, a Pacific perspective inclines towards restricting it to *very* small states, such as those with populations of under 10,000 (e.g. Wettenhall & Thynne, 1994). Malta often describes itself as “micro” (e.g. Pirotta, 1996), and it may seem that way in relation to much larger European states—but in Pacific terms it is relatively large. Elsewhere we can find Singapore and Estonia described as “tiny” (Lee, 1993; Abjorensen, 1998): Nauruans and Tuvaluans are likely to be amused!

There is, finally, a tendency to regard all city-states as small, because they are small in area (e.g. Singapore again, Hong Kong, or the city-states within the German federation). With Raadschelders, however, we limit our use of “small” in this symposium to states with populations of under one million¹³—although precepts from some that are only relatively small may sometimes be useful in

expanding understanding of problems and needs in the really small (e.g. Quah [on corruption], 1999).

Applying this criterion of smallness, Raadschelders uses 1987 data to list 32 small states enjoying full sovereignty, 20 of them natural islands (1992, p. 30). But she also points out that, in the same book, Baker presents a list which is much larger: it contains non-sovereign territories as well as sovereign states (Raadschelders, 1992, pp. 29–30; Baker, 1992, pp. 12–13). Baker acknowledges that he includes both “internally self-governing territories and territories that remain dependent” (p. 11). Neither, however, includes states in federations, many of which have highly developed governmental systems with wide-ranging functions, and some of which actually assert claims to sovereignty.

Our own view is that it is appropriate to consider as states not only fully and unambiguously sovereign states but also constituent states in federations and others which possess many of the attributes of self-government—such as associate states (e.g. Cook Islands and Niue in association with New Zealand), self-governing colonies and territories, and now arguably (because China would probably resist this interpretation) special administrative regions like Hong Kong and Macau.

The Australian Capital Territory in which one of us now lives justifies inclusion in these terms, even though—because it is also the federal capital—most Australians assert that it must never become a “state” in the formal Australian constitutional sense. For this reason it has been described, for Australian purposes, as a “quasi-state” (Wettenhall, 1998), though it seems appropriate to point out that the domestic jurisdictions housing two other federal capitals (Vienna and now Berlin) are treated unambiguously as states within their own systems (c.f. Rowat, 1989, pp. 29, 33).

The jurisdictions that currently satisfy these definitions of smallness and statehood are listed in the appendix to this introduction. The appendix is arranged according to the three categories of sovereign states, states in federations, and associate states and self-governing colonies and territories—although, as explained in a note to that appendix, an element of discretion is involved in determining at what point a colony or territory becomes self-governing.

This last comment points to a final general complication in the understanding of statehood. In reflecting further on the kinds of issues about governance which have emerged in the various IASIA-related inquiries, Baker (who edited the first IASIA symposium) has observed that there is a vast range of power positions as between small sovereign states and those in various stages of colonial emancipation. If sovereign responsibility for major governmental functions remains with the metropolitan power—as with some included in this symposium—it may be that what has emerged so far is simply a form of “hollow statehood” (Baker, 2000). Notwithstanding, there may also be considerable variation according to whether the colonial power

is rigid or relaxed in the way it exercises its remaining constitutional responsibilities.

What do they actually have in common?

What all these states have in common is the quality of smallness, and the very existence of those bodies of small-states scholarship to which we have already drawn attention indicates an acknowledgment that there is a considerable degree of shared experience among such states. That scale makes a difference is thus fairly widely accepted. But, as one of the authors in this symposium suggested in a more wide-ranging paper presented at the Malta conference, it is not so easy to explain why this should be so. He focused on the notion that small states are particularly “vulnerable”, but also challenged that view:

For a long time, it was customary to believe that small scale, and in particular very small scale, was to be regarded as a kind of ‘negative’ access—a kind of handicap. It was believed that tiny states were, if not born losers, then at least societies that had very low possibilities to become successful and rich economies. The built-in proposition was that a microstate was a particularly vulnerable entity. Still, as Harvey W. Armstrong and Robert Read have shown, there is no unequivocal, objective ground for such a conclusion. Indeed, the degree of economic success among microstates varies extremely and, for the sake of argumentation, it needs to be added that some of the richest states in the world are microstates. Obviously this leads back to the question what is the objective social function of scale, if there is such an objective social function. And if there is such a function, how does it work? (Nielson, 1999 p. 5).

This author adds that, whatever the “form and logic” of the mechanism involved, it is one which offers significant scope for a combination of different features, and thus challenges the student of small states to apply scientific rigor in understanding the “combinatory complexity” involved (Nielsen, 1999b, p. 5; and see Armstrong & Read, 1999).

Elsewhere this author suggested two “basic features that characterize all microstates”. First, they are

doomed to become international actors by the very logic of their mode of production-consumption correlate. (They) cannot facilitate their consumption pattern by the productivity of their own industry to a degree that is compatible with larger states (so that there is) an extremely high share of foreign trade in the nation’s GDP.

And second, a microstate has “relatively limited capacity to achieve the appropriate level of structural differentiation both within society as well as in its

economy". Baldacchino's observation that successful microstates "qualify as being the prototype global villages" is cited in support (Nielsen, 1999a; also Baldacchino, 1990).

Security, viability and self-sufficiency are other conditions that have received considerable attention in the literature, but they are in a sense inversely related to that of vulnerability (e.g. Faber, 1984; Alford, 1984; Doumenge, 1985; Sanders, 1997). The special concern about the likely vulnerability of small states was echoed in two other presentations to the Malta conference. Thus Professor Paul Sutton of the University of Hull, England, spoke about the work of the Commonwealth Advisory Group which, in reporting on small states' vulnerability to the 1997 CHOGM (Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting), dealt with a complex of particular economic, environmental and political problems; Sutton had been a consultant to that group (Charles et al., 1997; Sutton, 1999). And Nielsen was joined in challenging the view that "small" must necessarily connote "weak" and "vulnerable" by David Milne, formerly of Prince Edward Island and now of Malta, who argued that "the development of good policy and public administration" could counteract the disadvantage of smallness (Milne, 1999).¹⁴ Reflecting on this debate, we as guest editors adopt the middle-ground position that a small state may be successful and yet still vulnerable!

An associated and also fairly widely held view is that small island states lack institutional capacity, and that they therefore need support from international aid agencies in developing such capacity (c.f., UN, 1999, p. 19). Indeed, it may well be that the forces of globalization are likely to have greater impact in small than in large states, and even that they are more prone than larger states to experience the downside of such forces: they may, for example, find it harder to resist the evils of the drug trade, and even be tempted to "cash in" on things like shady banks and passport markets as instruments of self-defense.

But all this will be much more true of some than of others, and some have manifestly had good institutional capacity over a long period. One fairly affluent and capable small island state—Jersey—is itself an international aid donor, operating an overseas aid program through one of its legislature's executive committees (States of Jersey, 1993, p. 23), and from time to time it has assisted others in their capacity-building.

It is unlikely that we will ever be able to match laboratory-style precision in measuring political, administrative and social phenomena, whether or not related to small states. But careful observation of particular cases, complemented by comparisons across cases, can surely take us forward in the understanding of these phenomena. It is in this spirit that we now draw attention to the articles in this symposium—they, and the conference at which they began life, are all dedicated to the better appreciation of the nature of small states, of the problems and challenges they encounter, and of the steps they have taken in the past and may take in the future to cope with these challenges and problems.

Introduction to the articles which follow

The article which follows this introduction looks at machinery of government issues and challenges confronting small states generally. It shows how the author came to study public sector organizational arrangements in one small state in a federation, originally contemplating comparisons with other states in that federation and with the relevant federal government. But he quickly recognized that some of the most interesting comparisons were with other small states, and that an appreciation of small-state problems and issues actually prompted questions that were useful in machinery-of-government study generally. From this beginning, a number of areas needing to be considered in any investigation into institutional development in small-state government are identified, with particular attention given to how smallness impacts on innovative capacity. Small states may often be constricted by inappropriate systems inherited from others; there is nevertheless much evidence of a willingness to adapt to accommodate local traditions and situational factors, among which remoteness is frequently a driving force. Obviously some have advanced further along this path than others, and there is a further research challenge to explore the processes that are at work, not only to aid understanding but also to assist system designers towards strengthening governmental capacity in small states.

The other six articles present case studies of aspects of governance in several small states which have hitherto received little notice in the public administration and organization studies literature. The sequencing follows a rough spectrum, with concerns ranging from the more socio-cultural, through broadly institutional, to more specifically institutional. A striking feature is the variety of governance issues and institutions that are considered, from local councils and central banking institutions to ombudsmen, and from fully-fledged micro-states to territories in some degree of constitutional dependence on metropolitan powers. The variety is important, for it calls into question the conventional wisdom which tends to view small states as forming a single, undifferentiated category having rudimentary governing institutions.

The case studies thus provide a good deal of interesting new information on governance behavior in this group of small states. But an important question remains about whether they actually demonstrate how the factor of smallness itself has affected institutional configurations. It is likely that it will always be easier to demonstrate the impact of smallness in matters of economics—such as constraints generated by very small markets, or heavy dependence on imports—than in matters of social or political character. This is reflected in the conclusion drawn from an in-depth study of the Maltese Public Service that smallness issues played a contributory rather than a primary role, and that the most important factors impinging on public service development were economic rather than political (Pirota, 1996, ch. 13).

It may thus be that case studies of the sort included in this symposium tell us more about what goes on in a range of small states than elucidate the question

about the complications and implications of smallness; that there is a temptation to assign to the factor of smallness arrangements which, on closer examination, will be found to exist in much larger polities. It is often enough suggested that there is a more pervasive state presence in small states—but we do not need to reflect much to realise that that condition was present in all states with centrally planned economies whether big or small. Indeed, state expansion in many small states was often the product of the efforts of former colonial regimes.

The essential problem is that, wherever behaviors or characteristics are identified that may well be conditioned by this factor of smallness, it is also possible to see other factors at work which are largely independent of the factor of smallness. Thus our case study of French Polynesia gives a fascinating account of how clan-related loyalties disrupt bureaucratic (in the best sense of that word) systems in those islands.¹⁵ In doing so, it points strongly to the related influence of e.g., masonic linkages—but then it indicates that they are of no little significance in metropolitan France itself.

Thus again, the author of the Greenland case study stresses the need for that small state to achieve “societal sustainability”, and seriously doubts that there can be economic sustainability without it. He spells this out in the context of optimistic predictions that Greenland is about to become “oil-rich”. But, in his view, the social implications of such a development would diminish rather than enhance societal sustainability. Though he does not develop the connection, his message is consonant with that of a recent study demonstrating the immense adverse consequences—economic as well as social—of Nigeria’s displacement of an agricultural economy “in favour of oil money” (Onu, 2000, pp. 6–8).

To give a third example from this set of cases, the author of the Vanuatu case study notes the statutory formula to govern the handling of conflicts between that country’s Reserve Bank and its Minister of Finance, and implies that the small-state syndrome leads away from proper observance of that formula. There is a similar formula in the Australian Reserve Bank Act, hammered out at a royal commission inquiry in the 1930s—it is not unlikely that Vanuatu copied it. The interesting thing is that it has never been observed in Australia, because when differences occur neither party—government or Reserve Bank—wants to come out in the open: they’d rather negotiate in secret, and then leave everybody guessing about who really calls the shots, which is not good for accountability. So Australia is not so different! Nonetheless, there does seem to be more stability about its Reserve Bank governor and board appointments.

Clearly the small-state governance behaviors and characteristics recorded in these case studies demonstrate distinctive features. In the end, however, the several studies are not really able to isolate the impact of smallness from that of other factors which are operating. Very specific examples of such factors are the influence of the OECD mission to Greenland, international pressure to shape Vanuatu’s Comprehensive Reform Program, and Cyprus’s desire to join the EU.

As guest editors of this symposium, we suggest that this exploration of aspects of the governance experience of several small states leads pretty inevitably to two

conclusions. There can be no doubt that these states have special needs which impact on governance as well as economic arrangements: the first conclusion therefore is that there is a need for a more scientific approach to the study of the impact of smallness on governance arrangements in small states, so that we may come to understand their condition better. The second is a contradictory caution: we need also to recognize that a conclusive answer to the question about the impact of the factor of smallness may never be found, and consequently to accept the inevitability of a contingency approach to the problem, as speculated in the article which follows on machinery of government issues.

Notes

1. See for example Briguglio and Kaminarides (1993); Briguglio (1996); Bowe et al. (1998).
2. Thus the London *Economist* has reminded us (1998, p. 63) that "Florence, that cradle of so much art, had some 70,000 citizens in its heyday", and "Venice, the Hong Kong of the medieval world, had 115,000".
3. While Machiavelli wrote in a small state context, his message has been taken as one for rulers of states everywhere, not just for those of small states!
4. Boyce's (1977) study looked particularly at the efforts of new small states to establish diplomatic services.
5. The 1972 conference was organised by the Institute of Development Studies of the University of Sussex (reported in Selwyn, 1975). And in 1994, Barbados hosted the United Nations Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.
6. Special Conference on Small Island Economies, held in the Canary Islands, September 1981 (on which see Cohen, 1983); *Islands '88*, the Second Conference of Islands of the World, held at the University of Tasmania, Hobart, in Australian Bicentennial Year 1988 (on which see Chapman et al., 1988); *Microstates 99*, an International Conference held in Nordic House, Torshavn, Faroe Islands, 26–29 April 1999. The first Islands of the World Conference, *Islands '86*, was held in Vancouver, Canada. On the Seychelles conference, see note 8 below.
7. See also p. 182 of the article in this symposium by Roger Wettenthal.
8. Thus it was co-sponsor with the Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management (CAPAM) of the Small and Island States Conference held in Seychelles in April 1997: see Collins and Warrington, 1997.
9. For an earlier exploration, see Dommen, 1985.
10. In a distortion which suggested that he did not understand the point, an Australian journalist cited O'Rourke but implied that he was referring only to the really small: the Vatican City, Andorra, Gibraltar, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco and San Marino (McGonigal, 1999). This journalist's contribution was of particular interest in that it presented a list of around 30 of "the world's smallest nations" based on the criterion of area rather than population (Andorra being the largest of this group at 453 sq.kms); but a few of those listed were islands lacking a separate government of any sort and so qualifying neither as state nor as "nation".
11. A French variant of this one is "confettis of empire": Guillebaud (1976).
12. Rather later, a significant Dutch study investigated the question of how microstates (adopting the below-300,000 criterion) functioned in international law and the international community generally, and presented a much more positive view: Duursma, 1994.
13. This does, however, beg another question, illustrated by the case of Kuwait: according to the *Europa World Year Book 1999*, there are 665,000 Kuwaiti nationals, but they are supplemented by over 900,000 foreign workers and their families—should we consider just the

nationals who enjoy whatever voting rights that may exist (etc.), or the total resident population? Similarly, as Richardson demonstrates (1992, p. 119), there were only 290,000 nationals in the United Arab Emirates in 1980, as against 751,000 non-nationals.

14. Writing out of the Singapore environment, Linda Low is another to press the view that "a distinct advantage of small nations lies in social invention which is probably more flexible and nimble": Low, 1998, p. 10. Similarly, in another University of Malta conference Streeten argued (1991) that smallness brought with it advantages as well as constraints, the ability of small states to adjust quickly to sudden changes being a significant advantage.
15. The assumption that this condition is fairly typical of small island societies raises an interesting question about Malta, host of the original conference from which this symposium has developed. How was it, then, that Malta had become the host, 150 years before, for what was, in the context of prevailing European governing systems, a most exciting and innovative experiment: making recruitment to the civil service subject to competitive written examination. In reporting this development, Pirotta indicates that the Civil Service Commissioners appointed in Britain in 1855 to conduct examinations on behalf of individual departments sought information from Malta "on the workings of the system adopted there" (Pirotta, 1996, pp. 189–194).

Appendix: Small states in three categories

		Associate states, self-governing territories, self-governing colonies ^(b)	
Sovereign states		States in federations ^(a)	
<i>Population: up to 100,000</i>			
Vatican City	800	Niue	2,100
		Norfolk Island	2,300
		Montserrat	2,800
Tuvalu	9,500	Anguilla	11,000
Nauru	11,000	Wallis & Futuna	15,000
Palau	17,300	Turks & Caicos	16,200
		Br. Virgin Is	18,700
		Cook Is	20,200
San Marino	25,100	Nunavut	24,000
Monaco	30,000	Åland Is	25,100
Liechtenstein	31,000	Gibraltar	27,100
		Yukon	30,700
St Kitts-Nevis	41,000	Cayman Is	35,000
		North-West Territories (Canada) ^(c)	40,000
Marshall Is	43,400	Faroe Is	44,300
		Greenland	56,100
Andorra	65,300	Guernsey	58,700
Antigua & Barbuda	68,600	Northern Marianas	58,800
Seychelles	68,600	American Samoa	59,600
Dominica	74,000	Bermuda	60,100
Kiribati	77,900	Isle of Man	71,700
Tonga	97,400	Jersey	85,100
Grenada	98,600	Aruba	91,400

Appendix (Contd.)

Sovereign states		States in federations ^(a)		Associate states, self-governing territories, self-governing colonies ^(b)	
100,000 – 400,000					
Micronesia	105,500			US Virgin Is	101,800
St Vincent & Grenadines	111,100	Prince Edward Island	134,600	Guam	149,200
St Lucia	151,700			Northern Territory (Australia)	182,000
Samoa	166,000			New Caledonia	196,800
Vanuatu	177,400			Netherlands Antilles	207,200
Belize	228,700			French Polynesia	219,500
Maldives	263,200				
Barbados	266,100				
Iceland	275,300				
Bahamas	288,900			Australian Capital Territory	308,000
Brunei Darussalam	323,600				
Malta	378,100				
Solomons	391,000				
400,000 – 1,000,000					
Cape Verde	406,000	Sikkim	406,500		
Luxembourg	418,300	Tasmania	475,000		
Equatorial Guinea	420,000	Wyoming	481,000		
Suriname	437,000	Newfoundland	551,800	Macau SAR	425,100
Comoros	446,800	Vermont	591,000		
Qatar	520,500	Alaska	614,000		
		Montenegro	615,000 ^(e)		
Cyprus ^(d)	602,000	North Dakota	638,000		
Bahrain	620,000	Mizoram	689,800		
Djibouti	634,000	South Dakota	738,000		
Bhutan	637,800	New Brunswick	738,100		
Fiji	775,000	Delaware	744,000		
		Arunachal Pradesh	864,600		
		Montana	880,000		
Swaziland	912,900	Nova Scotia	909,200		
		Rhode Island	988,000		
		Saskatchewan	990,200		

Note: Arranged in ascending order of population (to nearest hundred), information about which is drawn mostly from *Europa World Year Book 1999*.

(a) States of the following federations not included in this list: Malaysia, Micronesia, Palau, Russia, United Arab Emirates.

(b) Colonies etc., with immature domestic governing institutions (such as the French *départements d'outremer*, the Portuguese autonomous islands in the Atlantic, and British colonies like the Indian Ocean Territory, the Falklands, Pitcairn, and St Helena and Dependencies) not included. There will always be argument about the point at which self-government arrives. In the case of Australia's external territories, however, it is abundantly clear that Norfolk Island is self-governing but that Christmas Island

and the Cocos Islands are not. American visitors to Australia also have no difficulty in contrasting the governing arrangements for the respective federal capitals: the Australian Capital Territory is self-governing whereas the District of Columbia is not.

(c) That is, the balance of the Territory after the separation of Nunavut—it is likely to be renamed.

(d) Cyprus detail excludes Turkish zone.

(e) 1991 population figure.

References

- Abjorensen, Norman. (1998). "Independence smiles on tiny Estonia." *Canberra Times*, 7 July.
- AGS (American Geographical Society, Around the World Program). (1969). *Five Little Countries of Europe*. New York: Nelson Doubleday.
- Alford, Jonathan. (1984). "Security Dilemmas of Small States." *The Round Table*, 292, pp. 377–382.
- Aristotle. (1946 translation). *Book IV: Actual Constitutions and Their Varieties*. In Ernest Barker (ed.), *The Politics of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Armstrong, Harvey W. and, Robert Read. (1999). "Comparing the Economic Performance of Dependent Territories and Sovereign Microstates." Paper to International Conference on Microstates 99, Nordic House, Torshavn, Faroe Islands, April.
- Baldacchino, Godfrey. (1999). "Strategies for Self-Reliant Development." Paper to International Conference on Microstates 99, Nordic House, Torshavn, Faroe Islands, April.
- Baker, Randall (ed.) (1992). *Public Administration in Small and Island States*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Baker, Randall. (1992). "Scale and Administrative Performance: The Governance of Small States and Microstates." In Baker (ed.), pp. 5–25.
- Baker, Randall. (2000). Personal Communication.
- Benedict, B (ed.) (1967). *Problems of Smaller Territories*. London: Athlone Press.
- Blair, Patricia. (1968). *The Microstate Dilemma*. New York: Carnegie Endowment.
- Bowe, Michael, Lino Briguglio, and James W. Dean, (eds.) (1998). *Banking and Finance in Islands and Small States*. London: Pinter.
- Boyce, P.J. (1977). *Foreign Affairs for New States: Some Questions of Credentials*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Bray, Mark. (1991). *Making Small Practical: The Organisation and Management of Ministries of Education in Small States*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Briguglio, Lino (ed.) (1996). *Sustainable Tourism in Islands and Small States*. London: Cassell.
- Briguglio, Lino, and John Kaminarides (eds.) (1993). "Islands and Small States: Issues and Problems," *World Development*. 21(2), special issue.
- Chapman, R.J.K., R.A. Herr, and Claire Clark (eds.) (1988). *Islands '88: Proceedings*. Hobart: University of Tasmania.
- Charles, Dame Eugenia (Chair, Commonwealth Advisory Group). (1997). *A Future for Small States: Overcoming Vulnerability*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Clarke, C. and T. Payne (eds.) (1987). *Politics, Society and Development in Small States*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Clesse, Armand, and Olav F. Knudsen (eds.) (1996). *Small States and the Security Challenge in the New Europe*. London: Brassey's.
- Cohen, Robin (ed.) (1983). *African Islands and Enclaves*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Collins, Paul and Edward Warrington. (1997). *The New Public Administration: Lessons from the Experiences of Small and Island States*. A Report on The Seychelles/CAPAM/IASIA Conference, April 11–17, 1997 Toronto: CAPAM.
- Connell, John. (1988). *Sovereignty & Survival: Island Microstates in the Third World*. Sydney: Department of Geography, University of Sydney.

- CS (Commonwealth Secretariat). (1985). *Vulnerability: Small States in the Global Society*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- de Smith, Stanley A. (1970). *Microstates and Micronesia*. New York: New York University Press.
- Dommen, Edward. (1985). "What is a Microstate?" In Dommen and Hein (eds.).
- Dommen, Edward and Philippe Hein (eds.) (1985). *States, Microstates and Islands*. London: Croom Helm.
- Doumenge, François. (1985). "The Viability of Small Tropical Islands." In Dommen and Hein (eds.).
- Duursma, Jorri. (1994). *Self-Determination, Statehood and International Relations of Microstates: The Cases of Liechtenstein, San Marino, Monaco, Andorra and The Vatican City*. Leyden: University of Leyden.
- Economist* (1998). "Little Countries: Small but Perfectly Formed". Issue of 3 January.
- Europa World Year Book 1999*. (1999). 2 Vols, London: Europa Publications.
- Ehrhardt, Dieter. (1970). *Der Begriff des Mikrostaats*. Aalen: Scientia Verlag.
- Faber, Mike. (1984). "Island Micro States: Problems of Viability." *The Round Table*, 292, pp. 372–376.
- Goetschel, Laurent (ed.) (1998). *Small States Inside and Outside the European Union: Interests and Policies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Guillebaud, J.-C. (1976). *Les Confettis de l'Empire*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Hardman, D.J. (1984). "Public Financial Administration of Microstates: South Pacific Forum." *Public Administration and Development*, 4(2), 141–154.
- Lee, Khoo Choy. (1993). *Diplomacy of a Tiny State*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2nd Edition.
- Lewis, V (ed.) (1976). *Size, Self-Determination and International Relations: The Caribbean*. Mona, Jamaica: Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Low, Linda. (1998). *The Political Economy of a City-State: Government-Made Singapore*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- McDougall, D. (1997). "Indian Ocean regionalism: perspectives from Mauritius, the Seychelles and Réunion." *The Round Table*, 341, pp. 53–66.
- McGonigal, David. (1999). "Tiny treasures: don't blink or you'll miss them." *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 October.
- Milne, David. (1999). "Thou Shall Not Squander Neither Jurisdiction, Nor Policy, Nor Culture." Paper to International Conference on Governance of Small States, University of Malta, November.
- Murray, D.J. (1981). "Microstates: Public Administration for the Small and Beautiful." *Public Administration and Development*, 1(3), 245–256.
- Nielsen, Jens Kaalhauge. (1999a). "Parameters for the Theoretical Analysis of Microstates," Paper to International Conference on Microstates 99, Nordic Hall, Torshavn, Faroe Islands, April.
- Nielsen, Jens Kaalhauge. (1999b). "The Microstate with a Hinterland, or Greenland's Special Problems as a Microstate." Paper to International Conference on the Governance of Small Jurisdictions, University of Malta, November.
- Onu, Godwin. (2000). "Institutional Consequences of Policy Choices: How Public Employees and Policy Elites Respond to Administrative Policy for Innovation—A Case Study of Public Corporations in Nigeria." Paper to International Political Science Association, World Congress, Quebec, 1–5 August.
- O'Rourke, P.J. (1988). *Holidays in Hell*. London: Picador.
- Ostheimer, John M (ed.) (1975). *The Politics of the Western Indian Ocean Islands*. New York: Praeger.
- Oyun, Sanjaasurengin. (1999). "Developing a National Anti-Corruption Strategy: Perspective of an Economy in Transition." Paper to World Conference on Governance, Manila, 31 May–4 June.
- Plischke, E. (1977). *Microstates in World Affairs: Policy Problems and Options*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute.

- Pirotta, Godfrey A. (1996). *The Maltese Public Service 1800–1940: The Administrative Politics of a Micro-State*. Msida, Malta: Mireva Publications.
- Quah, Jon ST. (1999). "Comparing Anti-Corruption Measures in Asian Countries: Lessons to be Learnt." Paper to World Congress on Governance, Manila, 31 May–4 June.
- Raadschelders, Julie Bivin. (1992). "Definitions of Smallness: A Comparative Study." In Baker (ed.), pp. 26–33.
- Ramphal, Shridath et al. (1984). "Security of Small States," Symposium in *The Round Table*, 292, pp. 367–382.
- Richardson, Sam Scruton. (1992). "The Continuing Role of Nonnationals in the Administration of the United Arab Emirates: The Dilemma of a Small Sovereign State." In Baker (ed.), pp. 116–130.
- Ross, Ken. (1997). "The Commonwealth: A Leader for the World's Small States?" *The Round Table*, 343, pp. 411–419.
- Rowat, Donald. (1991). "Canberra in International Perspective." In W.K. Oakes and L.J. Reeder (eds.), *Governing the Two Canberras: Canberra as Federal Capital and Canberra as a Place to Live*. Canberra: University of Canberra.
- Sanders, Ronald M. (1997). "The Growing Vulnerability of Small States: The Caribbean Revisited." *The Round Table*, 343, pp. 361–374.
- Schwartz, Herman. (1994). "Small States in Big Trouble: State Reorganization in Australia, Denmark, New Zealand and Sweden in the 1980s" *World Politics*, 46(4), 527–555.
- Selwyn, Percy (ed.) (1975). *Development Policies in Small Countries*. London: Croom Helm.
- Selwyn, Percy. (1978). *Small, Poor and Remote: Islands at a Geographical Disadvantage*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex (for United Nations Conference on Trade and Development).
- States of Jersey. (1993). *Committees of the States and Other Delegations, Tribunals, etc.* St Helier: States of Jersey. [In the Jersey context, "States" = parliament.]
- Streeten, Paul. (1993). "The Special Problems of Small Countries." In Briguglio and Kaminarides (eds.), pp. 197–202.
- Sutton, Paul. (1999). "On Governance in Small States: The Commonwealth Report," Paper to International Conference on Governance of Small States, University of Malta, November.
- Thynne, Ian. (1981). "The Ministerial System in Niue." *Public Administration and Development*, 1(1), 47–54.
- UNITAR (United Nations Institute for Training and Research). (1969). *Status and Problems of Very Small States and Territories*. New York: United Nations.
- UN (United Nations Public Administration Division). (1968). *Comparative Analysis of the Distinctive Public Administration Problems of Small States and Territories*. New York: United Nations.
- UN (Division for Public Economics and Public Administration). (1999). *Redesigning Methods and Procedures for the Delivery of Local Services in Small Island Countries*. New York: United Nations.
- Warrington, Edward. (1994). "A Capacity for Policy Management: Re-appraising the Context in Micro-States." In Warrington (ed.), pp. 109–133.
- Warrington, Edward. (1997). "Professional Development: The Seychelles CAPAM/IASIA Small and Island States Conference." *Public Administration and Development*, 17(3), 369–370.
- Warrington, Edward. (ed.). (1994). "Symposium on the Governance of Small And Island States." Special number of *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 16(1), June.
- Warrington, Edward. (1998). "The Impact of External Relations on the Domestic Policies and Governing Institutions of Micro-states." Special number of *Public Administration and Development*, 18(2), May.
- Wettenhall, Roger. (1998). "Governing the ACT as a Small Quasi-State." *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration*, 87, pp. 8–20.
- Wettenhall, Roger and Ian Thynne. (1994). "Machinery of Government Innovation in Micro-States: The Cases of Nauru, Niue and Norfolk Island." In Warrington (ed.), pp. 60–86.

Godfrey A. Pirotta Dr. Godfrey Pirotta is senior lecturer in Government and Policy Studies in the Department of Public Policy. He has helped to pioneer the study of politics and public administration at that University of Malta and has contributed extensively to the growing body of literature on public administration and politics in Malta and in small island states. At the University of Malta he is responsible for the teaching of a course on politics and policy-making in micro-states. He has represented the Government of Malta at several international conferences, including the Committee of Experts on Consumer Affairs at the Council of Europe, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Euro-Mediterranean Process.

Roger Wettenhall Roger Wettenhall is Professor of Public Administration Emeritus and Visiting Professor in the Centre for Research in Public Sector Management in the University of Canberra and Co-Chairman (formerly Project Director) of the Working Group on Public Enterprise Management and the Public-Private Mix in the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration. He was Editor of the Australian Journal of Public Administration from 1989 to 1995, and has published widely on, and has major research interests in administrative organisation, public enterprise and privatisation, the administrative consequences of natural disaster, and the governance of small and island states.

Lino Briguglio Professor Lino Briguglio is Head of Economics at the University of Malta and Director of the Islands and Small States Institute of the Foundation for International Studies. He is known internationally for his seminal work on the "Vulnerability Index" for small states and is the General Editor of the Islands Series published by Cassell-Pinter of London and a co-editor of the *Insula International Journal of Island Affairs*, published in collaboration with UNESCO. He has published extensively on issues relating to small island states. He has also acted as consultant to UNCTAD, UNEP, CARICOM and various bodies within the British Commonwealth.