

# The Development of Multilateral Diplomacy and its Fundamental Role in Global Security and Progression.

Andrea Giallombardo

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

December 2016

## Declaration of Authenticity

I, the undersigned Andrea Giallombardo declare that this dissertation is my original work, gathered and utilised to fulfil the purposes and objectives of this study, and has not been previously submitted to any other University for a degree. I also declare that the publications cited in this work have been personally consulted.



Signature

27th December 2016

Date

ANDREA GIALLOMBARDO

Name in block

# Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere appreciation and thanks to all those who helped me in the completion of this dissertation. My first word of thanks goes to my tutor, Professor Joseph Pirotta, who patiently reviewed my work, giving me sterling advice and suggestions towards the completion of this work.

Finally, a last word of thanks goes to my family and partner Maria, who have been extremely supportive not only while writing this dissertation but also throughout my life.

To my parents, Giuseppe and Jacqueline.

# Abstract

This dissertation is written to present the notion of peace and security to be the direct result of international cooperation through multilateral means. Delving into different international theories and the very essence of the practice, through examples which are presented as evidence, the thesis of this dissertation should emerge. This dissertation is not presented through an argumentative approach, but rather through a compilation of evidence to prove to the reader the power of the practice of multilateralism and its key role in modern diplomacy.

# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
THE TRIUMPH OF WILSONIANISM. ....	1
INTRODUCING THE THEMES .....	3
<b>METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>6</b>
LITERATURE ON MULTILATERALISM, SECURITY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT. ....	6
<b>CHAPTER 1: DEFINING MULTILATERALISM AND SECURITY.</b> .....	<b>17</b>
WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM ‘MULTILATERALISM’? .....	17
AN INTRODUCTORY PERSPECTIVE INTO THE PURSUIT OF MULTILATERALISM. ....	19
THE DEFINITION OF SECURITY IN A MULTILATERAL WORLD. ....	23
THE RELIANCE ON MULTILATERALISM FOR A MORE SECURE WORLD. ....	26
<b>CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MULTILATERALISM AND ITS THEORIES.</b> .....	<b>29</b>
THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTILATERALISM – FROM THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.....	29
THE LIBERAL INTERNATIONALIST THEORY.....	33
THE REALIST MODEL .....	36
NEOLIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM.....	38
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE THREE THEORIES.....	40
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS – A NEW PLAYER.....	41
<b>CHAPTER 3 – MULTILATERALISM: HOW IT WORKS.</b> .....	<b>44</b>
THE GAME THEORY AND DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO MULTILATERALISM. ....	44
THE EUROPEAN UNION – AN EXAMPLE OF REGIONALISM .....	47
MULTILATERALISM IN THE MEDITERRANEAN. ....	50
THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS CHALLENGES. ....	53
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>REFERENCE LIST</b> .....	<b>1</b>



# Introduction

Eban (1966) quotes Pierre Teilhard de Chardin saying, "Everything that formerly made for war now makes for peace. Pressed against one another by the increase in their numbers and relationships, forced together by the growth of a common travail, the men of the future will in some sort form a single consciousness". These words put together the main point of this dissertation quite accurately. Written in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Teilhard de Chardin had predicted the future of internationalism. We now live in the age of multilateralism and like any other milestone in human history, the notion itself would not have existed if it were not for pioneers in the field, pioneers that saw a vision of the future and contributed directly or indirectly to the establishment of that particular notion. It is important for one to understand the vision of these so called pioneers of the idea of multilateralism. Therefore, the reader will find a very brief introduction to one who can be considered as the pioneer of this modern multilateral mindset. This is followed by the introduction of the themes found of this dissertation.

## The Triumph of Wilsonianism.

President Woodrow Wilson is one of the most relevant out of the group of initial pioneers and he leaves behind an ideology and a legacy which we call wilsonianism today. Woodrow Wilson towards the end of the devastating Great War of 1914-1918 presented his famous 'fourteen point' speech. In this speech, he pushed forward the idea of world peace through peaceful negotiation and cooperation and introduced the idea of a new world order. Many of the points reflected domestic issues translated



into foreign policy and Wilson's main argument was to bring a "just and secure peace" not "a new balance of power" (Office of the Historian, no date).

During the formulation of this foreign policy, Wilson asked for an inquiry to draw up recommendations for a peace settlement, through which he extracted his 14 points. 8 of these points addressed territorial issues left unanswered towards the end of the war. The 5 of the remaining 6 points addressed the general principles for a world of peace which are; open covenants (addressed later on in this dissertation), freedom of the seas, free trade, reduction of armaments and the revision of colonialism based on self-determination. The last point was to trigger the League of Nations Project to guarantee the "political independence and territorial integrity [of] great and small states alike."<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, Wilson's vision would be completely shattered by the events that followed the end of the Great War and the war that was supposedly to end all wars. The outbreak of an even bigger war on a much larger scale, followed by decades of bilateral tension between the East and West during the Cold War period put this new world order on hold. Nevertheless, after the end of the Cold War, the new world order appeared to be a striking resemblance of Wilson's vision as Tucker (1994) explains.

We now live in an era where a new international order has become based on the notion of a community not power. Some may also argue that America retains the role of leadership as is mentioned by Tucker (1994) which is very much in line with Wilson's primary idea. We also see prospects of a more democratic world which naturally demands more freedom, harmony, peace and order. Events in today's world continue to strength this argument and it may lead experts and academics alike, to wonder if Wilson was right after all. Many of Wilson's successors in office and his counterparts around the world claim to be Wilsonian in their foreign policy. Nowadays it is easy to forget the difference in mentality regarding world order that people held in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Tucker (1994) claims that most people consider themselves to be Wilsonian in the sense of being one's commitment to multilateralism and the expansion of democracy. The changes in state mentality and behaviour proves this point. This was highlighted even when the US invaded

---

<sup>1</sup> Ross A. Kennedy, *A Companion to Woodrow Wilson* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2013)

Iraq in 2003, despite it being borderline multilateral, there was a great emphasis by the US Foreign Secretary and President Bush to push for a multilateral intervention in order to gain the backing of the United Nations and give their action a veneer of legality. This was seen in dealings undertaken with the United Nations by the US and the formation of the “Coalition of the Willing” where only the US, UK, Australia and Poland contributed troops for the invasion. There clearly is a different mentality at play here and one that is very much inclined to the practice or at least the appearance of multilateralism. If the same situation had happened 50 years earlier, it would have been handled very differently.

According to Tucker (1994), the general perception of Wilson, is that he is was a statesman who seems to have parted ways with the traditional diplomatic practice at a time when it appeared to be vital. He not only broke away from traditional diplomacy, he broke away from the comfortable pre-set diplomatic environment maintained and formulated by his predecessors. As Tucker (1994) notes, “Wilson refurbished a legacy that goes back to the republic’s beginning, though in doing so he added new dimensions to that legacy and invested it with new meanings”.

Wilson’s idea did not stem out of nowhere as the notion of internationalism was very much alive in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The fact that the League of Nations was created without any initial hesitation goes to show that Wilson assumed that his league would not create a world community, but strengthen an already existing one. This community as Tucker (1994) puts it, was based on consent more than coercion and the great power within this community was the power of the public opinion.

### Introducing the Themes

This dissertation will be delving into different themes of multilateralism and why states have chosen to pursue the practice. Initially the term multilateralism is defined and followed by the new definition of security in a modern, multilateral world. The argument that security cannot be guaranteed without the pursuit or practice of multilateralism will be very much highlighted within the first chapter.

Of course, without a proper understanding of the history of such a vital practice in modern diplomacy there is a danger that it would be under-appreciated. Therefore, a section of the second chapter is dedicated to the history and the development of the multilateral mindset and the growing importance of non-governmental organisations. This attempts to express just how strikingly different the world system was a mere century ago and how multilateralism is something many take for granted in today's world. On that historical note, different theories of multilateralism are explored and the dissertation's main line of argument on the matter identified. The three key theories are as follows; The liberal internationalist theory, the realist model and neoliberal institutionalism.

In the third chapter a section is dedicated to the science behind how multilateralism works theoretically and also in practice. This section is where the reader may find the mathematics behind the practice such as the Game Theory and the Nash Equilibrium as a representation of the theoretical side. The practicality of the practice is presented to the reader in the form of case studies, namely; the United Nations as a successful global example, the European Union as a successful regional example and the Mediterranean as an example of a troubled region which is still pushing forward the idea of multilateral harmony which is yet to be achieved. This chapter anchors the key ideas and beliefs that infuse this work by means of solid, concrete real life evidence through the case studies mentioned.

# Methodology

The methods used to accumulate research on the proposed themes of this dissertation were separated into three approaches. The first being a linguistically oriented, a method designed to define the themes such as 'security' and 'multilateralism' presented in this paper in order to establish a basic understanding of the subject as a whole. This was then followed by a theoretical approach, an approach which helped understand the pure practice of multilateralism from different perspectives within the academic field. This approach combined with the first, helped the author illustrate his opinion clearly in the final chapter. The final approach is an analysis of tangible examples and case studies of multilateralism spanning from regional examples such as the European Union and the Mediterranean, to a global example presented as the United Nations.

This methodology was followed as the author recognised the vastness of the subject at hand and thought it best to cover all aspects directly, yet thoroughly, to deliver the thesis statement of this dissertation as accurately as possible. The first two chapters are written through a theoretical lens and are purposely detached from reality. This was approach was specifically chosen to highlight the difference between theory and reality, whilst in turn describing the difficulties reality poses to such a practice. The final chapter is written in order to prove to the reader that the views of the author are not simply theoretical and there is physical evidence of multilateralism increasing the security both on regional and global levels. The methodology as a whole can be considered to be a modified scientific method of the subject. The review of the literature consulted is very much linked to the format of the methodology sought, and is presented within the same context in the following section.

# Literature Review

Is multilateralism engraved in countries' foreign policy to ensure their security? Can one successfully secure one's territory without looking outwards? Is collective security the new strategy? How does multilateralism work? These are all questions addressed by this study reflected in the sources consulted. Of course, the subject is very vast and there is endless literature on the said themes rendering the selection of well balanced and specific illustrations of the argument put forward by the dissertation quite a challenge. Another difficulty encountered was the limited literature that portrayed the United Nations in a positive light. Unfortunately, most of the literature encountered during research seemed to be critical and hold a general negative view towards the United Nations. Most of the positive literature were mostly official publications and the author wished to include more academic perspectives within the argument. Therefore, in order to overcome this challenge, the author with the help of the university managed to set up a meeting with a former ambassador for Malta to the United Nations – Ambassador Saviour Borg.

## Literature on Multilateralism, Security and its Development.

An understanding of the development and history of multilateralism is crucial in order to put together a valid, well read argument on the impact of multilateralism on diplomatic practices today. The first port of call was *Modern European History* by Stuart Miller (1997). Miller's style of writing makes it easy to understand the different developments in key periods of European History, and the format of the text book categorises these very well. He successfully illustrated a turbulent Europe between the period from the start of the French Revolution up until the end of the of the Cold War. Miller describes

a Europe which was unstable and ridden by violence and unpredictable political developments as well as reactions to events by the great powers at the time.

Miller also explores the idea of multilateralism and refers to it many times in his writings on the early organisation that attempted to create a new world order by using multilateral means to ensure collective security. His writings takes the reader from the early Congress System in post-Napoleon Europe to the formation of the United Nations in 1945. Each section is brief but detailed enough to illustrate the situation at the time. Miller's book provides a thorough understanding of the history of multilateralism and has influenced this dissertation. Miller ends by touching on the subject of European security through unity and cooperation. It is worth mentioning that Miller's intention was not to explain the development of multilateralism but rather the key points of European history. What emerges is the suggestion that key political figures pursuing the modern idea of multilateralism seem to have influenced and paved the way unintentionally for the new multilateral world order we have today.

Henry Kissinger was also used as an informative source. Kissinger has written multiple books on the history of diplomacy, however, in the context of the historical background of multilateralism he contributed to the publication of a journal titled 'World Politics'. In this article Kissinger analysed the impact of the Congress of Vienna on the states that were involved. He shares the same thought as Miller that the Congress system starting in Vienna was not designed to penalise France for her war mongering earlier in the century. He believed that there was a general feeling of cooperation and inclusion due to the sheer importance of France to the development of the continent. He recognised that without the inclusion of France as an equal within the future planning of the region, all efforts will be futile. This is a very dominant theme through both the writings of Miller and Kissinger. This is somewhat ironic as it this was definitely not the case after the end of the Great War, when Germany was harshly treated contributing to the rise of Nazism and the Second World War, showing that the lesson was not learnt. Kissinger highlights the weak points within the initial congress system, including

that despite France's inclusion within the continent's development, her inclusion complicated matters due to the different interests of the victors.

Multilateralism was therefore on the minds of forward thinking pioneers. The benefits were recognised and there seems to have been resistance to the traditional way of guaranteeing security. The next step to examine why states have chosen to pursue multilateralism. Two studies, Ronald A. Walker's *Multilateral conferences: Purposeful International Negotiation*, and *Enhancing global governance: Towards a new diplomacy?* Edited by Andrew F. Cooper, John English and Ramesh Thakur, stand out. It is important to note that the second book was an official publication by The United Nations University Press, yet the editors take a critical stance on the work of the United Nations whilst explaining why states should continue down the path of multilateralism.

Cooper begins his argument by illustrating a wide shared view amongst "like minded" states. This vision is one of global governance and through his chapter he acknowledges the challenges faced by such a system in the reality of today's diplomatic theatre, and the constraints by the transitioning, but still relatively stable, Westphalian state system and agenda setting by powerful and influential states. There is a striking difference between the objectives of "like minded" states and powerful ones and Cooper expresses frustration amongst "like-minded" states with the top-down leadership they have been showing. The use of "like minded" states, refers to those states that do not have enough power to contribute to the larger picture individually and therefore, they have decided to flock together to create more of an impact. "Like-minded" states are very much the corner-stone to the success of the type of multilateralism that this study advocates in future developments as it would ensure the maintenance of peace and security on a global level. It is the very reason why states have chosen to pursue multilateralism.

Ronald Walker's book is perhaps the most relevant source within this section as he lists a nine-point summary explaining why all states choose to conduct multilateral diplomacy. The list is as follows; information gathering and pooling, joint projects, managing the external environment, influencing behaviour, mutually beneficial deals, domestic agendas, reactivity, routine and idealism. It is

important to note that Walker's nine points apply to all states and not a select few, from the most powerful to the weakest of states. Walker also points out the complicity of multilateralism and compares it to bilateral diplomacy. He holds that the nine reasons why states choose to pursue multilateral diplomacy identical to the moves for also opting for into bilateral relations. This of course will be illustrated in more detail within its context in later chapters of this dissertation.

The definition of multilateralism was also explored. Edward Newman's, book titled *A Crisis of Global Institutions? Multilateralism and international security* and James A. Caporaso's paper titled 'International Relations Theory and Multilateralism: The Search for Foundations', were found to be particularly relevant. Caporaso introduces his definition linguistically and explains the word 'multilateralism' itself. He concludes that the term is not a practice but in fact an ideology which is contradictory to what Newman believes. Newman in fact refers to multilateralism as a practice and a principle. The contradiction is obvious but quite useful as it represents the dilemma and complexity of the multilateral situation. If we are unable to agree on a single definition of the term, then applying it will either be extremely difficult, or conducive to varying conclusions. Another approach is that there may be different types of multilateralism under the same heading.

Caporaso tackles the very definition of multilateralism in a practical sense. He highlights the importance of the term indivisibility and diffuse reciprocity within a functioning and secure multilateral system. Newman begins his definition by describing an anarchical model of international politics. This model will be the base of his theory where the state plays the lead role in an anarchical setting but not one lacking norms that could be stimulated to mould acceptable behaviour by states. Newman's approach is very institutionalist and there are striking differences between the two authors mentality on the subject which will be addressed within this dissertation.

Also discussed within this dissertation is the definition of security. Security is one of the most fundamental aspects of governing a state. If a government is unable to provide security for its citizens, the general feeling of both the indigenous population and the reputation of the government internationally will be that of a failed or failing government. Seeing as it is so important, governments



tend to dedicate a great deal of their resources to ensure the security and safety of its citizens and territory alike. However, in this day and age the very meaning of security has changed dramatically and this shall be explained later. Two main pieces of literature dealing with the definition of security are *Security Studies: an Introduction* by Paul D. Williams and *Global Security Governance: Competing perceptions of security in the 21st century* by Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling. Williams' definition of security is divided into two very different philosophies; the first defines security as a luxury directly related to the amount of power a state has possessed. This can be translated into physical possessions such as weapons and technology. The second philosophy is based on the theory of emancipation through justice and human rights and is directly related to the type of relationship certain actors have both within the state and in the context of this dissertation, internationally. Therefore, if there is a poor relationship internally, the state may be in danger of civil unrest. On the other hand, if the state has poor relationships externally, the state may face danger of war.

Interestingly enough both Kirchner and Sperling believe there are two types of security as does Williams. According to Kirchner and Sperling, the first type of security involves military action and conquest, meaning the traditional definition of security. The second definition is a little more complex, as it refers to a much broader definition of security that encompasses a wider range of threats to the indigenous population of a particular state. There is also reference to the state's involvement in today's security setting in which its role has been minimised and subsequently given to non-state actors due to the fact they have become more far-reaching than states. This point will be elaborated upon further in this dissertation as it is a crucial factor in today's changing security. Kirchner and Sperling list out five variables by which a state is able to measure a threat and therefore recognise its seriousness. These will be referred to in the first chapter. What Kirchner and Sperling wished to achieve by listing out these variables is to illustrate how just about anything that impinges on those variables may nowadays be considered a security threat. With reference to Thakur's work due to the situation shown by Kirchner and Sperling, we have seen more interference within the matter by security agency and providers, all which adapt their scope to specific types of threats.

The relation between the afore mentioned definitions was next examined with the help of Ramesh Thakur's final chapter in *Enhancing global governance: Towards a new diplomacy?* and the journal article by Abba Eban titled, 'Multilateral Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age'. Thakur recognises that the concept of territory does not have the relevance it once had and that borders and frontiers have less significance. This has been one of the main drives of multilateralism as states are seeking alternative ways to secure their survival and their way of life. Thakur's solution to this paradox is in fact global governance but he distinguishes between global governance and a world government in his chapter whilst presenting a perfect United Nations model as the most suitable example to undertake such a task. Thakur also addressed the changing nature of security and the different threats state in today's world have to confront in an ever globalising world. Globalisation itself in Thakur's mentality is the root cause for this changing security paradigm and states need to adapt to it in order to ensure survival. Thakur also briefly touches on historical aspects of the subject, describing the importance of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to the development of the very practice of multilateralism for the sake of security. He presents his readers with many hypothetical situations and resolutions to today's problems and hopes that his ideas would be the basis for a new world order as he views the world order of today as still developing and incomplete.

Eban takes a similar route. She too touches on history noting that in the past, unfolding events across the globe mattered little to distant states or even regional neighbours. She immediately struck a difference with the historical world to the world we live in today and stresses the importance of tackling issues on a global level. Writing on, she avers that states' reactions to the threat of nuclear weapons are or should be similar to the reactions they would when issues are addressed multilaterally and with the same level of urgency. Eban brilliantly describes today's age as being the first era of global history and that all issues must be addressed on the same scale in order to be resolved, indicating similarities to the work of Thakur.

The different schools of thought regarding multilateralism are discussed through the Liberal Internationalist Theory and the Realist Model, and the Neoliberal Institutional Theory, a sort of

fusion of the two, in an attempt to find common ground between two opposing theories. *A Crisis of Global Institutions? Multilateralism and international security* by Edward Newman, was consulted. As for a general illustration of the theory and a source used for specific references to the founding father of the theory, Immanuel Kant, Robert Jackson and Georg Sørensen's *Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches*, was found to be very helpful.

According to Newman, sovereign states are considered to be at the basis of the liberal theory and goes on that there is a fundamental belief that all humans are good natured and social beings which in turn can be expressed within an international relations context. According to Newman, the theory only needs to meet a couple of objectives in order to be functional, the basic standards of human rights, which if met will reflect a positive, peace-loving attitude within the local community and therefore result in positive international attitude. Newman stresses that the democratic process is key to the stability and peace of the world and democratic countries basically do not go to war with one another quoting Kant's theory of a "democratic peace". Change is also not understood as problematic and is in fact welcomed and encouraged so long as there is adherence to international norms and laws with the fundamental point being that war is seen as an avoidable consequence.

Jackson and Sørensen adopt a very similar position to that of Newman. Of course, since they both describe the same theory similarities are to be expected. However, whilst all three discuss the very nature of human behaviour. Jackson and Sørensen seem to delve into it a little deeper, giving their readers the impression that a liberal approach should be the natural approach and the most beneficial. This contrasts with the realist approach. Jackson and Sørensen correspondingly take note of the interconnectivity between democratic countries claiming, in line with Newman that peace and security is almost guaranteed between democracies. The authors present three reasons why this happens, which will be discussed later. Jackson and Sørensen also describe a checklist, or a formula based on five points, that states would need to follow to theoretically considered themselves to be liberal. This, too, will be discussed in the second chapter.

As for the realist model, Newman was again cited. Newman states that the realist model is in direct opposition to the liberal view by stating that realists completely reject the fact that there even is an international community. Anything past the local regime's authority would be considered to be anarchy and there is and never will be any sort of leadership within the international sector. Newman describes the reality that states find themselves in a sort of "security dilemma", which will be explained later. There is also reference to multilateralism in Newman's writings. According to Newman, the realist way of conducting multilateralism is through selfish means as states only conduct multilateral diplomacy to benefit themselves. This completely changes the reason why multilateralism will be pursued by states.

Jackson and Sørensen claim that power plays a central role within the realist world and that the international scene is dominated by the balance of power not by an international community. The two authors also go on to quote Thomas Schelling and his theory on strategic realism which was found to be one of the most relevant strands of realism for this dissertation. Another realist who was quoted by Jackson and Sørensen is Kenneth Waltz. Kenneth Waltz considers himself to be a neorealist and his views contributed greatly to the interpretation of international security within the realist model examined in this dissertation. Apart from theoretically discussing how the world works in reality, he also applies science to his model in order to support his argument and make things easier to understand. For instance, Waltz states that a bipolar system should be considered to be the more stable out of all world systems as it achieves the perfect balance. It helps reduce great wars due to deterrence giving the Cold War as a practical example. However, it is noted that war itself may always be a possibility.

As for the neoliberal institutionalist theory, again Newman's book was cited along with a chapter of a book by Arthur A. Stein titled 'Neoliberal Institutionalism', published in, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. According to Stein, the theory itself emerged due to the chain of events that followed the end of the Second World War. There seems to have been a push for the international community to guarantee that a war as big as the last one will not happen again, and the neoliberal

institutionalist theory evolved. Stein describes how states nowadays prefer handling international affairs through an international institutional system as it presents a levelled playing field for all actors involved. The theory also contributes to the notion that the state itself is no longer the only player on the international scene and therefore institutions may be sought to bring all players involved to resolve any issues that may crop up. Newman, who also dates the emergence of the theory to the post-Second World War period describes it as evidence of constructivism. He posits that states will always seek to regulate international behaviour as it promotes regularity and stability. The theory itself is considered to be a mix of the two previous theories (liberalism and realist) and this will be elaborated upon when the theories presented are assessed.

The manner in which multilateralism works was next explored. There are many sources referring to the game theory but the most clearly explained and the most relevant being the journal article titled 'International Relations Theory and Multilateralism: The Search for Foundations' by James A. Caporaso. This article is an attempt to establish the very foundations of multilateralism. The questions Caporaso seeks to answer are; where does multilateralism come from? And how does it work? Caporaso explains that there are three possible routes to achieve multilateralism; the individualistic approach, the social communicative approach and the institutionalist approach. Caporaso presents these three approaches as problems, with the solution being his version of the game theory. Caporaso's theory is examined in a later chapter with details on each approach and solutions to each dilemma that the theory itself may create within the context of multilateralism. Caporaso's work suggests that multilateralism, that is cooperation seems to be instinctive and that the problems or contradictions faced when negotiating may be overcome by applying a tailored version of his solutions.

The dissertation looks at three case studies to offer the reader a broad general example of how multilateralism works in practice. The first case study is the European Union and as for literature, a report by the Council of Foreign Relations titled 'The European Union as a Model for Regional Integration' was cited. The report explains how the European Union is the best example of regional cooperation we have seen to date and describes how this came to be by presenting four principles that

influenced the success. The report illustrates how the success itself was not easily achieved due to rivalry between European states, especially after centuries of wars. Political willingness to cooperate and transform the continent from one plagued by violence and war, to one of peace and stability, is the key point within the report. It focuses on the European Union's acceptance of different morals, cultures, differences and opinions by being flexible in nature and introducing a multi-level approach to integration.

In contrast to the European Union's success, the second case study tackled is the Mediterranean region. For this section the journal article titled 'Multilateral Diplomacy in the Mediterranean: A Comparative Assessment' by Alberto Bin was referred to. Bin describes the region as being problematic with a rough history and very diverse cultural pool. It possesses aspects of a region full of frontiers between different civilisations, southern Europe, the Middle-East and North Africa. Bin notes that there have been many attempts by native states to stabilise the region and form a union to promote cooperation and peace. However, most attempts have failed or did not achieve enough to make a difference despite a certain number of successes. Bin separates these attempts into generational waves spanning from the 1970's till the late 1990's. There is a striking difference between the European example and the Mediterranean example of cooperation. The biggest difference between the two is the willingness to set differences aside and not to think about the region in terms of an 'us versus them' scenario. The case study in the light of cooperation and multilateralism, unfortunately, will be looked at as a failure. However, Bin goes to lengths to point out that there have been many attempts to form a successful union between all the states involved and also points out Malta as being quite an influential mediator and initiator, promoting cooperation within the region.

As for the final case study, the author chose the United Nations since both previous examples were of a regional character. The United Nations is the most successful global multilateral organisation the world has seen to date. However, the author struggled to find literature apart from official publications that praised its success. Most literature published seemed to be critical towards the United Nations, which highlights the differences in expectations the world has of the organisation. This created a gap

in credible sources and so, a meeting with Ambassador Saviour Borg from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malta was arranged to help develop ideas and the case study as a whole.

Most official publications cited presented the reader with what the United Nations has achieved, in the form of a 'before and after' presentation and also listed where the United Nations has failed; examples such as Rwanda and Somalia. This gives readers a balanced representation of the United Nation's work since its formation in 1945. An Academic source referred to was *Security Studies. An Introduction* by Paul D. Williams. Williams labels the United Nations as the experiment that followed the failure of the League of Nations. According to Williams the UN Charter can be considered to be the organisation's constitution and claims that its main purpose is its dedication to international peace and security. Williams acknowledges that the initial history of the organisation was uneven and illustrates how it manage to withstand the test of time.

# Chapter 1: Defining Multilateralism and Security.

What is meant by the term 'multilateralism'?

For one to understand the subject at hand and the ideas presented in this dissertation, it is important to define the term multilateralism in an attempt to assist the reader to grasp the very basis and foundations of the practice. Through the research conducted, many different definitions of multilateralism, schools of thoughts and theories were encountered. In order to anchor the ideas to a single one which has emerged as a sort of hybrid of all the definitions encountered. Commencing with an approach to the term through a linguistic background, whilst proceeding to more broad and academic definitions with reference to different academics and authors.

Caporaso (1992) illustrates that the term 'multilateralism' is found to be in the form of an 'ism', which suggests that the term itself represents a belief or even an ideology. It is also distinguishable through three defining properties; primarily indivisibility, generalized principles of conduct and diffuse reciprocity. All three properties are interconnected and should be assessed as a whole rather than individually. Whilst according to (Newman, 2007, p. 10) "Multilateralism is the practice and principle of three or more states committing to collective action, according to established rules, to address common problems and opportunities." There is a world of difference between an ideology and a practice. The two definitions I have presented already show a gap in the very idea of multilateralism between both authors. Caporaso suggests that multilateralism may actually be an ideology which enable the promotion of multilateralism, whilst Newman labels it as a practice.



Indivisibility with reference to Caporaso (1992) could be thought of as the process in which costs and benefits are spread, geographically and functionally, through an action which is initiated within an a number of component units. Now transpose states for component units, and you shall have the definition of indivisibility within the needed context. Generalised principles of conduct would normally be projected by international norms through universal modes of conduct, rather than individual case-by-case approaches. Diffuse reciprocity is very much linked to indivisibility. Rather than one action having benefits spread immediately, it represents the notion of actors benefiting over consecutive agreements and policies in the long run, rather than through every single issue.

Caporaso (1992) puts forward his argument by striking a distinction between two terms within multilateralism; 'multilateral institutions' and 'the institution of multilateralism'. Multilateral institutions are described as the formal organisational elements of the international stage, which are characterised by headquarters, representatives and secretariats. The institution of multilateralism appeals to the less formal habits and practices of the international community. Lisa Martin cited in Caporaso (1992) argues that the importance of distinguishing between the two is due to the fact that they do not always mirror one another, as they are very much relative to the structure of interests and one may be more present than the other. Nonetheless, both boil down to the notion or ideology of multilateralism.

(Newman, 2007, p. 10) presents his definition by referring to an anarchical model of international politics. In this model, the state is considered to be the primary actor with a dominant organizing principle. This system, although anarchical, is not lacking in any norms or rules. Evidently his angle on multilateralism is more focused on the state and how the practice of multilateralism develops regimes which in turn change the international environment.

To further his argument (Newman, 2007, p. 11) defines regimes, institutions and multilateralism within a single context and based on the scholarship of an institutionalist approach. Regimes can be defined as the sets of principles, norms, rules and decision making policies or procedures, through which actors can congregate in a specific area of international relations. Institutions can be defined as a set of

persistent rules that limit activity, shape expectations and assign roles to states within the system. Lastly, multilateralism can be defined as an institutional form within the context of international relations. This “form” may coordinate relations through the generalised principles of conduct, that may be seen or should be detached from the particular interests of the specific parties involved. This definition in the context of the international scene may be viewed as a little ambitious, however this section is dedicated to the theoretical definition of multilateralism, practical examples will follow later.

Whilst both definitions intertwine and share the same principle points, the basis of each one is fundamentally different. Now that the theoretical definition of multilateralism has been presented, the author will proceed to illustrate why it is needed and why it is constantly being sought by a number of states in international relations.

### [An introductory perspective into the pursuit of multilateralism.](#)

In today’s world, the threat of global war remains fresh in the memory of humanity. After the end of the Cold War, the world went through a major transformation, and a widely shared view amongst like-minded states has emerged. This vision is ultimately one of global governance or at the very least an effective multilateral body, designed to tackle the problems faced by the world today (Cooper, English and Thakur, 2002, p. 1). Whilst the process has faced many challenges, the biggest challenge met by the evolution of this system is indeed the constraints imposed by the already in place Westphalian state system and the agenda setting by powerful states.

The last sentence of the previous paragraph may discourage the pursuit of multilateralism, however research suggests numerous reasons why governments, including powerful ones engage in multilateralism.

Ronald Walker presents an interesting nine-point list to why governments engage in multilateral diplomacy: information gathering and pooling, joint projects, managing the external environment, influencing behaviour, mutually beneficial deals, domestic agendas, reactively, routine and idealism.

He believes these nine reasons are also precisely the same reasons governments tend to opt for bilateral relations, however carried out on a broader front. (Walker, 2004, p. 16).

In this next section one will find more of an elaboration on Walker's work. It is key in understanding the reason why states of all sizes pursue multilateralism. The first point listed is information gathering and pooling (Walker, 2004, p. 16). The pooling of information and also resources is useful, especially in the world of security, as it promotes the idea of collective security. Some states may find themselves suddenly in need of intelligence and resources that they may not have available. This is when other states may offer their assistance by providing the intelligence, offering resources and knowledge, to guarantee the security of the state under threat. In turn, making the region and the system more secure as a whole. In today's world many of the new threats emerge outside fixed borders. Therefore, by pooling information and alerting other states on developments or the emergence of new threats, the chances of preparing for or even eliminating a threat during its conception increase dramatically. Walker provides a practical example such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OCED), through this organisation, experts have their say on the management of member states' economy. This is found to be useful as it gives governments an external "peer-review" of their economy (Walker, 2004, p. 16). This point may apply to nearly all aspects of everyday state functions, ranging from social aspect to economic aspects and matters of security.

Coordinating joint projects is often an effective way of achieving your own objectives, and states have recognised its advantages. States that have joined forces in order to embark on ambitious deals on security and also trade have seen very promising results. The eradication of small pox through the coordination of the World Health Organisation (WHO) is a prime example of this fact (Walker, 2004, p. 17). The world often presents states with issues that may be spread over various number of states, as for example, climate change. A coordinated, joint project is the obvious approach in order to tackle the issue. As for security, joint projects in defence, training and military strategies have always been practiced. A good example of this is the NATO alliance and its sister project Partnership for Peace. Both

projects have increased capabilities in the handling of external threats and have also developed the capabilities of members domestically.

Multilateralism as briefly touched upon in the previous point, gives states the opportunity to manage the external environment. As Walker explains, "A cooperative relationship with a neighbour can provide a political environment conducive to easing bilateral problems, multilateral arrangements can influence the regional or global environment your country experiences." (Walker, 2004, p. 17). As an example, if treaties are signed on an international level by countries of influence on such security issues as chemical and nuclear weapons, the world becomes relatively more secure against that particular threat. The same theory would apply to economic treaties and the opening up of new markets.

Issues that are effecting people across the globe but seem to have a single geographical source can be difficult to resolve if it is completely within the remit of a third state. This state may either be unwilling to cooperate or simply unable to tackle the issue rendering the effected states helpless. Through influencing behaviour, issues such as these may be addressed. For example, if one had to take the smog and pollution crisis in India and China, through bilateral and multilateral diplomatic tactics, awareness and propaganda, the effected states might prompt the 'culprit' to change its ways (Walker, 2004, p. 18).

Often the most effective way of influencing the behaviour of another state is through contractual agreements. This ties them to a commitment and also gives them the incentive to hold their end of the bargain if they are expecting rewards through the life of the agreement. Through this effective practice, we have seen the reduction of barriers to international trade. A highly complex number of bilateral agreements between each state has been superseded by global and regional agreements which provide a uniform layout, offer simplicity and create a base for future deals (Walker, 2004, p. 19).

There once was a time when domestic issues were brushed aside so that diplomats could focus on external relations. However, this practice has since disappeared. In today's diplomatic world, things are very different. Most governments and also many outside government see the international scene

as an extension of their domestic agenda (Walker, 2004, p. 19) therefore, encouraging states to engage in diplomacy and more importantly multilateral diplomacy in order to resolve domestic agendas.

A very good point listed in Walker's work is reactivity. By this Walker means that states who do not initiate interaction on a specific issue still feel compelled to respond if the interaction is initiated by a different party. The reason may be self-centred, such as ensuring that their interests are not overlooked or even effected during the negotiations or discussions (Walker, 2004, p. 19). However, it forces the state who may not be willing to discuss the matter to be present and as every diplomat knows, sometimes getting unwilling parties to sit at a table is at times the hardest part of a negotiation.

To elaborate on another listed point and to continue on the previous one, modern multilateralism has developed so much since its conception, that now, a significant amount of diplomatic activity no longer needs a stimulus or initiation. Many meetings are scheduled annually, or other intervals through terms which were agreed upon many years before. Issues are always addressed, however if this was not a matter of routine, the meetings might not even take place (Walker, 2004, p. 20).

Idealism may also be a driver for multilateral meetings to be initiated. For example, the Wilsonian pursuit of multilateralism. This may be doubted by cynics, however if there is an ideology that opposes multilateralism or at least the idea of it, there must also be an opposing view on the matter. The ideology does not need to be shared by all members of a particular government, it may simply be the stance of an influential member, such as the preservation of human rights and universal peace as Walker explains, and may be sought selflessly. Also, "the pursuit of international cooperation is often consistent with a strong commitment to the interests of one's own country." (Walker, 2004, p. 21). Which leads to multilateral ideas rooted in patriotism, the traditional 'enemy' so to speak of internationalists.

The foregoing explains Walker's nine-point approach to why states opt to use multilateralism to achieve their international and domestic objectives. As explained, multilateral means can be used to achieve a state's objectives both in a direct and indirect manner. For example, taking an issue to a multilateral institution or meeting would be a direct way of handling matters. Whilst the creation of

an international set of rules, norms and standards to reduce or even resolve persisting issues, may be seen as an indirect approach prompting states to act globally to benefit domestically (Walker, 2004, p. 21). It also increases their chances of getting the job done if they are not able to do so alone, through mobilising the power and influence of many nations in support of their goals and agendas (Walker, 2004, p. 22).

### The definition of security in a multilateral world.

“Security is most commonly associated with the alleviation of threats to cherished values; especially those which, if left unchecked, threaten the survival of a particular referent object in the near future” (Williams, 2008, p. 5)

Security has taken many shapes and forms throughout the ages and the capability of states to adapt to new emerging threats has been the most effective tactic in order to ensure the state’s survival. Whilst states may have been more secure or able to react to threats in the old-world system, the contemporary security context is very different. This section is dedicated to the definition of security in today’s world as recognising the contemporary threats is the first step to ensuring security.

According to Williams, the concept of security can be identified through two prevalent philosophies which seem to emerge from very different starting points. The first philosophy, sees security being directly relative to the amount of power a state possesses. Therefore, security is understood to be a result, or even a luxury, as in order to live in a secure society, the state must possess particular items such as armies and weapons. Therefore, power equals military strength and the more military power a state has the more secure it will be. Williams (2008, p. 6).

The second philosophy presented by Williams is very much tied to the subject of this dissertation. It challenges the idea that security relies only on the power status of the state. It bases its theory on emancipation through justice and the provision of human rights Williams (2008, p. 6). The key point of this argument is that Williams illustrates that through this perspective, security relies on the

relationship between different actors. Williams (2008, p. 5). This point may well be applied to the international stage and is very much in-line with the main thesis of this dissertation. If applied to a multilateral context, security involves confidence in relationships that are struck through the sharing of commitments. If confidence grows, a feeling of reassurance and predictability will be noted and a degree of security will emerge. This philosophy thrives on the concept of cooperation, therefore, cooperating to achieve security, without destabilising others or robbing others of it. Williams (2008, p. 6). As Swedish politician Olaf Palme claimed, protagonists in the world stage must “achieve security not against the adversary but together with him”, which is a vision of international security, as he believed there must be a commitment of joint survival, opposed to the threat of mutual destruction through the first philosophy. Williams (2008, p. 6).

There are two different types of security according to Kirchner and Sperling. There is the security which is restrictive to military action and conquest, and there is the security which consider a much wider range of threats to citizens. The latter is an enormously broad category as it may include political security, economic security, social and cultural security and lastly environmental security (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 5).

In today's security setting, states play a minor role. The task seems to be increasingly given to non-state actors that have managed to obtain the reach which goes beyond that of states or traditional policies. The reason being that nowadays there are more indirect threats rather than direct threats to the state. Threats now threaten society as a whole and the very norms of civilisation rather than threaten a state's ability to govern (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 5). It should be noted that the new security era does not discredit the traditional security mentality of dependence on military means. In fact, it can be claimed it is the most important part of ensuring security as it provides the basics for a state to then develop other means. However, a restriction in the mentality of a state relying purely on traditional security matters can prove to be very dangerous both to local communities and also to international ones (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 5).

In the light of the above point, international relations have now taken centre stage in the human enterprise, and therefore, we cannot afford to continue living in a world full of revolutionary science and more importantly conservative diplomacy. In the wake of the Second World War, traditional diplomacy has steadily declined in the face of new security threats and diplomatic habits (Eban, 1966). International scholars argue that 'security is about survival'. Logically speaking, as brushed upon in the previous paragraph, states are no longer the only players when responding to threats. This suggests that all possible actors who may have a hand in securing the survival of a state can range from an individual to even the international environment. "Security threats are not necessarily consigned strictly to military, that is interstate issues." (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 6).

The next section will be addressing the determinants of contemporary security with reference to Kirchner and Sperling's work. A threat may be measured through 5 variables; the specific threat, the vicinity of threat, the possibility of the threat becoming viable and the seriousness of the consequences (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 7). A good example of this is the way the state of Florida and the Federal Government of the United States handled the threat of Hurricane Matthew in 2016 (BBC News, 2016).

There has been a fundamental change to the relationships between European states and even between states and their societies. Due to the increased inter-connectivity and liberties enjoyed by the citizens (primarily freedom of movement), a re-examination of the sources of security threats is under way. The same observation can be made globally. These new threats seem to be a consequence of globalisation (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 8) and collective responses are the only means by which these threats can be addressed.

The great diversity of security threats and their increasing complexity bypass the capacities of states to continue responding unilaterally. For the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, states are now compelled to react multilaterally (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 9). International organisations, NGOs and even private companies are being drawn into the security issues more than they did before and



they are now recognised as partners in security policy making and also implementation (Kirchner and Sperling, 2007, p. 8).

The meaning and scope of security has become much more broader. There has been a sharp increase in the number of security providers due to different types of security. Whilst all sectors crossover in certain ways, they are still considered to be different types of threats. For example the threats of international terrorism and cyber terrorism (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 269).

### The reliance on multilateralism for a more secure world.

There has been a radical change in the world's way of conducting everyday business. Demands and expectations made on governments by the people and even by international organisations, can no longer be satisfied through isolated and self-contained efforts. The reason, as explained in the previous sections, is that both private and public non-state actors have tagged alongside national governments in setting and implementing new agendas. This interconnectivity is the reason why there is such a push for multilateralism (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 268).

Borders and national frontiers are increasingly becoming less relevant in determining the flow of ideas, with modern communication changing the world altogether as we are now well into the information age. However, this presents a challenge for security where terrorism, arms, disease and drugs may sieve through borders practically unchallenged. In order to find solutions for problems, there must be in all phases active participation of local governments, NGOs and the private sector. As stated in (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 270), alarm has been raised on the international scene as globalisation is considered to be a process of erosion to the legitimacy and effectiveness of national governments which has resulted in the decline of support for international organisation. The solution however, to many of the problems is indeed global governance. Thakur stresses that this is not the creation of a world government, but a level of international decision makers between governments and international organisation. He then presents the example of the UN being the most suitable candidate

for such a role. “The United Nations has both moral legitimacy, political credibility and administrative impartiality to mediate, moderate and reconcile the competing pulls and tensions associated with both the process and outcomes of globalisation.” (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 270).

The above paragraph very much represents the thesis statement of this work. The realisation that security has taken up very different forms compared to how it was traditionally perceived, has forced states to rethink their strategies and in doing so, also to redefine their definition of security. The reality of the situation is that most states in today’s world are at peace and long to remain so. However, despite peace, most are still ready to go to war if necessary (Cooper et al, 2002, p. 271). Cynics will insist that war is an inherently element of human nature, and any politician who wishes to abolish military means is normally labelled as weak. This point is very paradoxical but very accurate (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 272).

The 20<sup>th</sup> Century started off as a time to attempt to increase norms and legislations for global peace, however it proved to be the most murderous in human history. This situation does not need to continue, for in this day and age as explained by Thakur (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 272), we have the resources and knowledge to reduce conflict drastically. The missing link in order to achieve this objective is a programme and a worldwide coalition of interested individuals, civil society organisations and governments to carry out global actions and responses.

Throughout history, events unfolding in one part of the world did not necessarily set off alarm bells on the opposite side, nor even in neighbouring parts of a troublesome region. This concept has evidently changed as nothing is seen as being far off anymore and this ripple effect has become more obvious and stronger with interconnectivity as (Eban, 1966) explains. Seeing that the issue has now become global, it is only obvious to react to any global security threat with a global response.

We are now living in the first era of global history and the main security issues that are affecting the human race cannot be discussed, still less solved, except on a planetary scale which pushes the argument for multilateralism. Unfortunately, whilst there have been promising results and developments, human welfare as a whole is lagging far behind the potential of where it should be if multilateralism was utilised by all states perfectly. The fault according to (Eban, 1966), is the inadequate intensity of cooperation. All research and viable points of expression on this subject point to the meaningfulness of the role of multilateralism towards a more secure world.

For a state to achieve security successfully, bearing in mind interconnectivity and the ripple effect of conflict, it must divert its attention to the planet as a whole rather than focus only on its internal problems. A state is unable to unilaterally achieve global security and therefore, multilateralism is the only viable option through which a state can to push forward its own security goals which, in turn, helps to secure the globe's. Increased cooperation is slowly becoming the norm as various international organisations, civilian and military have been formed in recent years in order to increase, and most importantly promote cooperation between states. Cooperation through multilateral institutions with the use of multilateral diplomacy projects the idea of 'live together or die divided'. War has changed and the world is facing many new threats such as climate change and health epidemics and in order to face these threats, the world must work together multilaterally.

# Chapter 2: Historical Development of Multilateralism and its Theories.

## The Development of Multilateralism – From the Congress of Vienna to the United Nations.

The idea of multilateralism is not a recent one. We have seen many attempts by major powers to sew together a long-term peace plan by stimulating negotiations with rival sides. In this section, the development of the practice of multilateralism from the late modern period to contemporary times shall be tackled. Through this historical approach, the main efforts the international community has taken in the past to minimise international conflict shall be listed. Therefore, the following organisations and agreements will be briefly addressed in chronological order; the Congress of Vienna, The Concert of Europe, The League of Nations and the United Nations (Date range 1814 – present).

In the context of this dissertation, the Congress of Vienna would be the first attempt the international community took to formalise a long-term peace treaty in Europe. It technically was not a congress, but merely a preliminary meeting of super powers to discuss a future peaceful route for the continent. The main objective was peace, and this was to be achieved through the settlement of key issues that cropped up in the aftermath of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars. It was an attempt to maintain the status quo and not let the continent slide into an irreversible era of revolution through what we call the balance of power.

It is important to note that the main objective was not to penalise France for its aggressiveness as Kissinger (1956, p. 266) explains. In fact, there was a general feeling of cooperation and inclusion, as the great powers, despite being victorious, still recognised the importance of France and its

compatibility within the general peace of Europe. However, despite the well-intentioned efforts to include France, her inclusion sharpened disagreements amongst the victorious coalition. The congress agreement sought to balance power between the states and increase cooperation against a common enemy; revolution, but conflicting interests and disagreements led to a diplomatic stalemate Kissinger (1956, p. 267). By 1814 powers such as Britain and Austria had achieved their special objectives either during or with the end of the wars leaving very few bargaining points for Russia and Prussia to use in order to negotiate terms that would meet their interests. Alas, in hindsight, the agreement did somewhat fail as the continent eventually slid back onto a war path within the same century, but the effort had paved the way for successor organisations and treaties. It could be considered to be the very first attempt of super powers getting together to discuss mutual issues in an attempt to seek a mutual agreement and resolution on a continental scale. This attempt, despite its failures did pave the way for future congresses and agreements under the umbrella of the Concert of Europe till the outbreak of the Great War in 1914.

The era of the Concert of Europe was plagued by revolution and social reform, which according to the ruling powers, threatened the status quo of the continent. The ruling classes considered change as being an unstoppable force once it started. This mutual feeling amongst the great powers, created a base for cooperation. According to Miller (1997, p. 42), the war against Napoleonic aggression was won through cooperation, and therefore it was only considered to be natural to continue this cooperation to secure peace and work against revolution. The war-time cooperation was formalised through two alliances; The Quadruple Alliance and Article VI of the Treaty of Paris (November 1815) and The Act of the Holy Alliance by Tsar Alexander (May 1815).

Between 1815 and 1822 as Miller (1997, p. 43) explains, there were a number of conferences called by the European powers, in order to discuss matters of common interest. The first one was the Congress of Aix La Chapelle in 1818, and during this congress France was included as an equal. Tsar Alexander wished to convert this congress system into yet another formal alliance against revolution. As claimed by Miller (1997, p. 43), he even proposed a notion to send troops to South America to crush

the revolutions happening in the Spanish colonies and even went on to propose an international army. These points are very much in line with the issues we face today, despite Tsar Alexander's proposals not formalising then, the very thought of such a notion was ahead of its time.

The second was the Congress of Troppau, Silesia in 1820. This was called in the wake of revolutions breaking out in Spain, Portugal and the Kingdom of Two Sicilies. Despite opposing views, the Troppau Protocol was agreed and Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed to intervene in the affairs of any state to crush any attempts at revolution. The third was the Congress of Laibach in 1821, which was a continuation of Troppau. The Kingdom of Two Sicilies had asked for assistance from the international community and it was agreed on the basis of the Troppau Protocol that Austria should intervene. The last Congress to be held under this umbrella was the Congress of Verona in 1822. During this congress the disagreements between the powers on intervention were very clear. Britain maintained its isolationist attitude and preferred to ride the tiger by offering moderate reforms at home rather than crush revolutions with military intervention. The British opposed French intervention with 100,000 troops to crush Spanish revolutions. However, the intervention went ahead anyway in 1823 which was approved by Congress. Miller (1997, p. 45).

Through this congress system, the continent saw a very noticeable increase in cooperation and European powers did not declare war on each other until 1854. This was very much the result of the "Forty Year Peace" as Miller (1997, p. 41) describes it. The reasons being; the Vienna Settlement at the end of the war left barely any grievances unaddressed. There was also the work of so called "internationalists" such as Chancellor Metternich of Austria and Tsar Alexander of Russia who pushed for cooperation rather than aggression. The powers were also very distracted in tackling the numerous outbreaks of revolution and they realised that the only way to prevent them was to work together.

Although the 19<sup>th</sup> Century saw its fair share of wars, they were mostly revolutionary and internal, with only a handful being conducted between the major European powers. This can be seen as a sign of progress and hopeful news for those who believed in the peaceful effects of cooperation. However,

despite the Crimean war of 1854 and the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, the world met again on the battlefield during the Great War of 1914. This was the first time modern weapons were used on the battlefield, and combined with traditional standing army tactics, the result was brutal and deadly with millions of people left dead on both sides. It was, without a doubt the most crippling war of known history up till then. In its wake the Great War left the international scene was in chaos and Europe in shambles. A call for a new international order was therefore heard, the birth of the League of Nations.

The League according to Miller (1997, p. 311) was an attempt by the international community at tackling the 'international anarchy' of the pre-war days which contributed to the outbreak of world war early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It was the first attempt at achieving collective security in history and theoretically allowed sanctions both military and economic on any aggressors that threatened global security. The world saw its first permanent physical presence of an international organisations within the city of Geneva as a permanent assembly. Together with the International Court of Justice set up at the Hague the two institutions were considered to be the main pillars for peace and its preservation, as Miller (1997, p. 311) explains.

The League seems to have been successful in dealing with small disputes. Miller (1997, p. 311) states "Of the 66 international disputes it dealt with, 20 were transferred to other channels, 35 were successfully resolved, but the 11 most serious were not overcome." The League was lacking in many sectors and these issues taken together can be blamed for its failure to preserve collective peace and security. Miller (1997, p. 311) presents his readers with two reasons for the League's failure; The first is "The absence of any independent power source" – The League was heavily dependent on its support by member states and lacked any powers of its own. Sanctions and military intervention were all sanctioned by the League and actioned by member states. This led to major states ignoring the League's orders or wishes entirely, if it suited them. The second was "An incomplete membership", The League was also seen as a tool of the Victors of the First World War as initially both Russia and Germany were excluded from scheme and perhaps most importantly, the scheme was rejected by the US in 1920.

Nonetheless, despite its shortcomings the League of Nations did have success stories such as the Geneva Protocol which prohibited the use of gas and chemical weapons in warfare and the Locarno treaties which helped reduce the border tensions between Germany, France and Belgium and which was overseen by Britain, Italy, France, Germany and Belgium. However, grievances were still left unaddressed such as Germany's eastern frontiers and ambitions, which ultimately would lead to the Second World War.

At best the League of Nations can be considered to have been a great effort. It failed miserably in preventing major conflicts, which was President Wilson's main objective for the project. Sadly, in 1939, the world once again slid towards a war path. This time, the war would be more widespread and involve the whole world. Still, the League of Nations successes cannot be ignored. Smaller states did benefit from such an organisation and small disputes were resolved or avoided altogether whilst lessons were learned for the United Nations to pick up on after the end of the Second World War in 1945 through the introduction of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The successful formation of the United Nations will be discussed in a later chapter. As for now, the different academic theories of international relations and multilateral relations shall be presented.

### The Liberal Internationalist Theory

Liberal internationalists, who's founding father is Immanuel Kant and his everlasting legacy on the studies of international relations, argue that cooperation, progress, communities and even shared values are possible in international relations. Most importantly, they can be mutually beneficial if applied correctly. Sovereign states are considered to be the main players in an international society within this school of thought as Newman (2007, p. 22) explains; "Human beings are basically "good" and potentially "social", and therefore states can also be so, as a collective expression of human nature in a free society."

That being said, if all human rights and basic standards of human welfare are the norm, the state itself according to the theory, will be fundamentally peace loving, in turn projecting that attitude to the



international forum as is presented by Newman (2007, p. 22). The Kantian perspective which is very much reflected in this theory is heavily dependent on economic cooperation between democratic societies. This results in international peace and stability, a so called “democratic peace”. Changes within the internal policy of the system may still occur peacefully with adherence to international law being maintained. The most prevalent point within this dissertation is to illustrate how war may be seen as avoidable. Whilst also illustrating the consequences of such a drastic event disrupting peace and the multilateral system as a whole, on top of the ethical and moral factors. This shall be elaborated on a little later whilst exploring Kant’s work.

There is a general positive feeling towards people and human nature in this theory. Whilst liberals recognise selfishness and competition between individuals, they also believe that individuals share many interests. Therefore, through these interests, they may engage in cooperative and collaborative behaviour, both locally and internationally. The results of this collaboration may benefit everyone at home and abroad and as highlighted previously, avoid conflicts all together (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010). The mentality in place here is that “Liberal theorists believe that human reason can triumph over human fear and lust for power” (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010).

Peace and security are based on collective security, which echoes the founding principle of the United Nations. However, the issue with this idealistic approach is that all states must adhere to rules and believe in collective responsibility. The issue lies with those who may choose to change the rules by force or even reject them altogether as is stated by Newman (2007, p. 23). Interdependence is a key player within this theory. For a group of states to thrive together, it is imperative that they cooperate as unilateralism is not a long-term solution. Consequently, the process of modernisation has led to an increase in interdependence but then again only for a certain type of government.

That being said, it is also important to note that interdependence and security seems to work smoothly between democratic countries which is a belief that the liberalist theory strongly supports. This point is very much emphasised by Kant and later addressed by Michael Doyle (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010). There are three reasons for this happening; The first is that democracy itself always encourages

peaceful negotiations and relations with other states, as through democracy, the citizens control the states and thus are less likely to embark on a war path with other democratic countries. The second point is that democratic countries hold the same core moral values within their constitutions, and this has led to the view that peaceful alternatives or solutions of disputes are morally superior to resorting to violence, and ultimately more responsible. This is what Kant called a 'pacific union' (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010). The third element has an economic dimension. Through the peace that results from the previously cited examples, democracies are able to strengthen economic cooperation and increase the amount of interdependence. This is again labelled as the 'spirit of commerce' through the pacific union by Kant and the end results are; mutual and reciprocal gains for all involved (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010).

This whole theory is very much against the notion of self-help which is portrayed by international realists. It relies on the collective effort of all states and also the ingraining of norms within international culture, norms which determine state behaviour. Norms and diplomacy go hand in hand as they set the standards and pre-set procedures on how to resolve issues and they discourage any behaviour which is not up to standard. The failure to follow norms leads to abnormality and international disappointment as is described by Walker (2004, p. 26).

As a concluding remark, the author intends to present the five elements that international liberalism requires for the theory to meet expectations (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010); Firstly, security should be addressed in a collective manner and be co-binding. Secondly, it requires reciprocal leadership which is able to adapt to the needs of the citizens, which in turn can and should be pursued by the international body. Thirdly, states should consider themselves to be semi-sovereign, meaning they should limit their own freedom in order to ensure the freedom of others, therefore, in turn making it possible for all to be free. Fourthly, economic openness and interdependence is a necessity and some may argue a result of a functioning liberal model. Lastly, an understanding of civic identity and duty both locally and internationally is needed to ensure the development of both is continuous.

## The Realist Model

The realist point of view is in direct opposition to the liberal one. The realist model of international relations is very much one determined by the effects of anarchy, the very natural state that Kant wishes to cure with liberalism. It is based on state-centricity, hierarchy based on power and the traditional balance of power. Power politics, defence of national interests and ultimately survival is what rules the world as international relations are only forged through conflict which results from the clash of interests and struggles to acquire power. Realists, as Newman (2007, p. 23) explains, do not even consider an international society in the liberal sense. They view everything past the sovereignty of the state as anarchy. Meaning that the only form of authority is that of the local regimes, there is no authority or regulating body in international politics and states do as they please. Whilst there are many different strands of realism, just like liberalism, the key arguments are universal throughout.

This insecure environment that states exist in, leads to a “security dilemma” and this, as Newman demonstrates (2007, p. 23), forces states to resort to defensive and aggressive behaviour. However, realists do believe in the management of conflict which may result in its decrease. It is important to keep in mind that management does not mean elimination altogether and that peace can only exist in a proper balance of power and deterrence situation.

As for the main subject of this dissertation, multilateralism and cooperation according to realists are only conducted to gain an advantage as Newman (2007, p. 23) comments: “They participate in the UN agencies not for the collective good of mankind but to benefit themselves”. The collective good he is referring to is reference to the liberal view of multilateralism and that ultimately people seek to dominate in international politics. As a result, international organisations therefore become a tool or resource for states to achieve their objectives. Newman (2007, p. 24) coins this as “power politics in disguise”. Power is very much the central argument for the realist point of view. In other words, the balance of power should be viewed as a good thing to strive for as it is considered to be a desirable institution, as it prevents the world domination of one great power and if the correct balance is

attained, it may even uphold the basic values of international peace and security (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010).

One of the most relevant strands of realism to the subject of this dissertation is strategic realism which was coined by Thomas Schelling. Strategic realism focuses on foreign policy and decision making, and the main objective is to ensure that the state in its foreign dealings comes out successful. He claims that foreign policy is of a technical nature and instrumental, thus it is free from moral choices. There is no good or bad within the decisions as the main concern is the success of the policy (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010).

Kenneth Waltz, a neorealist, has presented many interesting ideas on the notion of international security and international politics and applies science to his theory. His theory focuses mostly on the international structure and does not credit actors within the system, the reason being that the structure itself determines how actors would act (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010); "State leaders are prisoners of the structure of the state system and its deterministic logic which dictates what they must do in theory conduct of foreign policy". What he means by this is, a state is more likely to act aggressively in a hostile international environment, and act more peacefully in periods of stability, however it will always be subject to the changes in the environment.

Waltz strongly believes that a bipolar power system is much more stable and can provide a great feeling of peace and security on the world stage. However, war is always a possibility within an anarchical system as the fundamental concern of states is their security and survival (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010), which brings us back to the security dilemma illustrated earlier. In a bipolar system, the possibility of great-power wars is reduced and it also creates the basis for an effective deterrence system such as the system in place during the Cold War.

There is disagreement with the realist school on whether the focus should be on the international system or the human nature of its citizens. Nevertheless, they all agree that the system itself is very much anarchical and that violence and destruction is a very real possibility, therefore, one must always prepare for war. In an anarchist system, states form alliances in order to defend themselves and are

constantly shifting their attention and strategy to react to the type of threats they perceive which is coined as the 'balance of threat' theory by Waltz and presented by Williams (2008).

To conclude, the basic principles of this theory are as follows. All realists have a pessimistic view of human nature, the belief that international relations are conflictual and that conflicts are ultimately resolved completely by violence. They also hold a high regard for national security and state survival, whilst sceptical of any progress brought about by international politics as they only see states reacting to an anarchical system, a system with no grand authority or world government (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010), rendering international politics simply a tool added to their inventory of survival.

### Neoliberal Institutionalism

After the end of the Second World War, the world of international relations took a drastic turn and underwent significant changes. This led to a push for international organisations to establish a physical presence on the international stage. Plano and Olton describe this process as "a formal arrangement transcending national boundaries that provides for the establishment of institutional machinery to facilitate cooperation among members in the security, economic and social field" (Stein, 2008, p. 203). Therefore, the neoliberal institutionalist theory evolved through such developments.

The theory in itself appears to be very much a hybrid of both the realist and liberal point of views. The concept that an increase of coordination and cooperation between states on an international level relies on the formation of such institutions is the very essence of this theory. This school of thought is where author personally feels he stands within the different schools of international relations.

Neoliberalism accepts anarchy amongst states and power politics as a key factor in understanding international politics. However, it also argues that shared values and needs can emerge between states and this can then be utilised to form a system of institutionalism as Newman (2007, p. 24) describes. It relies heavily on the notion of constructivism, which dictates that identities, relationships between states and actors are all socially constructed. This leads to the obvious conclusion that interests

themselves are not pre-determined but revolve around interaction with others. Therefore all are relative to the specific socially constructed relationships, as is illustrated by Newman (2007, p. 25). This point is very much an attack on realism's state of anarchy, as through this lens, anarchy can be perceived as socially constructed, therefore subject to change, that opens the door for stability and institutionalism.

All the cooperation which has emerged in Europe as a whole after the end of the Second World War has defied the realist's theory of anarchy and this in the view of Newman (2007, p. 26) is concrete evidence of constructivism. Norms reflecting shared values, evolving friendships and relationships are all results of successful cooperation. This last point is very much the main argument of this dissertation.

Institutionalism has now been taken up as a form of solution to the notion of self-help or self-interest. Many problems arise through the process of self-help as the state focuses primarily on itself and disregards the effects of its decisions on others. As a result modern states tend to prefer dealing with general concerns within an international institutional system (Stein, 2008, p. 208). Ultimately, power is always going to be the ultimate decider of international politics. States are principle actors but not the only actors, emphasis being placed on international organisations. States according to Newman (2007, p. 26) will always have an interest in maintaining rules and regularity, collectively tackling problems which cannot be resolved unilaterally whilst maintaining international norms. All this can be achieved through the application of multilateralism and its many advantages. Institutions have also been sought due to the simple reason that they in themselves reduce governance costs associated with international policy making.

The world has become full of international institutions. Therefore, this theory may actually be more of a reality than anything else. Whilst there are a fair number of critics of the actual impact international institutions have, the practice continues to grow because they contribute to the taming of international anarchy, the increase of global cooperation to an increase in supranational governance whilst accepting the fact that the state itself is no longer the only player in the international field (Stein,

2008, p. 217). This opens the door open for non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international cooperate businesses to participate within the international debates effecting our world today.

### An Assessment of the Three Theories

The three theories all hold their own beliefs on the international system. The most obvious contrast is between the liberal and realist models, as they seem to be direct confrontations of each other. However, the middle ground could be found within the neoliberal institutionalist theory and this is in fact where the author stands. The liberal model is found to be too optimistic and relies too much on certain variables such as a democratic peace in order to be functional. Whilst this does not deny that a democratic peace may work in theory, it relies heavily on all variables falling into place and the reality of the international scene is very different. As for the realist model, whilst also moulded by relevant points, it seems to be a little too harsh and leaves no room for development or improvement for international politics. It gives one the impression that there is nothing one can do to change the current anarchical, power politics system realists claim the world to be in.

It may be important to note that the author before conducting research on the subject considered himself to be amongst the realist school of thought. However, researching the subject along with aspirations to be a future diplomat has heavily influenced this stance. Through this research and the analysis of case studies, the neoliberal institutionalist theory seems to be more appealing to the theme of this dissertation, which in turn reflects the opinion of the author. The theory manages to merge the best aspects of both the liberal and realist theories to formulate a more tangible theory in the multilateral world we live in today. The neoliberal model leaves room for the world to develop multilaterally and mutually due to its recognition of common grounds and shared values that may emerge between states. This point is crucial in the building of relationships.

The theory also recognises that the international stage is masterless and that states do exist in a state of anarchy, which is history has proven. However, it also presents itself as a solution to the reality of the situation, rather than an opposing view of different theory, as one would find in both the liberal

and realist models. It is also the only theory which has concrete, physical examples of its success through the formation and spread of international institutions, as is explained in the last paragraph of that section on the theory.

### Non-Governmental Organisations – A New Player

Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) have blossomed tremendously since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1909, there were 176 registered NGOs and by 1993, this had increased to 28,900. The rate is still increasing well into the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, which depicts a change within the major components of modern diplomacy as Zarrati (2013) explains. This development helped grow a new norm within the international system, especially within the United Nations. NGOs are now considered to be an important element within state-society relationships and most of these emerged during times of conflict as Zarrati (2013) states, and diplomacy through and with NGOs is considered to be “track II diplomacy”.

NGOs are found in virtually every part of the globe and seem to tackle every conceivable issue. There was a time when NGOs were referred to as “pressure groups” or “lobby groups” but these terms have since been revised. The reason being that, they did not do them justice as Paul (2000) illustrates. Paul (2000) also explains how at times, scholars have noted that NGOs can command great legitimacy, which momentarily may even surpass that of the state or local authorities. As an example, according to Paul (2000), after conducting a survey in Germany, it was discovered that people trusted the NGO Greenpeace more than the German Federal Government. A reason why trust is found to be so strong between the local population and NGOs is because of the non-profit work ethic they represent. They create “public goods” which are needed by citizens outside of the usual for-profit market. NGOs are also sought in today’s diplomatic practices for their level of expertise and their capacity to mobilise support in such a way that is not possible by national governments (Zarrati, 2013).

Governments at times may be too rigid and also too complex to spend the needed time to address certain issues, therefore, in cases such as these it is within a government’s interest to sanction work



by NGOs on their behalf. There are many advantages to this. Firstly NGOs, especially within a conflict zone are looked at with less suspicious eyes. Secondly, they actually cut costs for the government willing to operate in the area. Thirdly, they would be able to spend a large amount of time improving and understanding the situation in the field (Zarrati, 2013).

It would be best to look at more tangible examples listed by Paul (2000) on the success of NGOs in recent history. NGOs have successfully promoted the threats our environment is facing and all that pressure has led states to act on issues such as climate change. The recent *Paris Agreement* of 2015 is the result of such pressures working their magic, as for the first time countries vowed to take real action to tackle the issue. According to the official records of the *Paris Agreement* (UN, 2015), as of November 2016, 192 states and the European Union have signed this Agreement and 109 of those parties have ratified or acceded to the Agreement. Perhaps it is important to mention the fact that the US, China and India have also signed the agreement. NGOs also strengthened the rights of women, children, disabled people, the poor and the indigenous, whilst also participating in crucial arms control and disarmament measures. According to Paul (2000), some scholars believe this happened due to the increasing amount of globalisation in recent years, topped by the pressure of ordinary citizens to attempt to control and regulate the world beyond their borders.

We are also living in a time when transparency is increasingly becoming a norm. However, due to the lack of transparency and even basic democratic rights such as elections within the international system, we are left with a system made up of non-elected representatives. At least in the case of the United Nations. This may lead to the perception, or even the reality of ineffective bureaucracies. According to Newman (2007, p. 19) NGOs are increasingly being viewed as the alternative. Despite the non-democratic nature of NGOs, they do not seem to be tied down by political or bureaucratic constraints and basically get the job done, with a high level of transparency. This argument is very much in line with Zarrati's. Also, governments and officials tend to seek out advice from NGOs so as to give their policy and public decisions greater credibility than if they had to go ahead unilaterally. This according to Paul (2000), is done despite governments at times finding NGOs a nuisance or even a

threat to their interests. This goes to show just how important and effective NGOs have become on the international stage and international policy building.

There is also the concept of policy building initiatives from below. In a world dominated by super powers and a top-down leadership in the international arena, NGOs represent a way out of the traditional system. According to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who describes them as “essential partners of the United Nations” and appreciated their efforts in “not only mobilizing public opinion, but also in the process of deliberation and policy formation and -even more important- in the execution of policies, in work on the ground” (Cooper et al., 2002, p. 6)

To conclude, it has become increasingly evident that NGOs now play not just any role but a major if not a vital role in global policy making. Globalisation as Paul (2000) depicts, has created a borderless world so to speak along with a fresh list of issues. NGOs seem to be the perfect solution to address issues that are considered to be cross-border. Governments cannot effectively and even legitimately do their work without the involvement of an NGO, and this vital role is only increasing.

Now that the main themes of the subject have been covered through the first two chapters. The way has been paved for the introduction of practical examples of multilateralism and an illustration on how the notion works in practice. These points will be covered within the following third and final chapter, the chapter which may be considered to be the cornerstone of the dissertation.

## Chapter 3 – Multilateralism: How it works.

Whilst in the previous chapter the historical background and theories of multilateralism were discussed this chapter attempts to explain the effectiveness of multilateralism within a general and security context. The chapter starts from a theoretical background such as the game theory and works towards real and practical case studies using examples as the European Union and Mediterranean co-operation as regional examples. The United Nations and its success will be utilised as the global example which is the main thrust of this dissertation.

### [The Game Theory and different approaches to Multilateralism.](#)

The Game Theory applies mathematical logic to the very concept of cooperation and as Caporaso (1992) explains there are three routes to multilateralism. The first route is when states enter into contractual relations with other states in a rational but self-interested way, which can be labelled as the individualistic approach. The second route is the social-communicative approach; while still focused on individual states, the addition is communication, persuasion, deliberation and self-reflection. Therefore, a focus on the social interaction between states. The third route is the institutionalist approach; this approach does not recognise or understand social relations in the second route and is purely individualistic.

The key question posed by Caporaso (1992) within the context of the individualism approach is the method by which a state achieves its objectives in the light of other states' preferences and capabilities. The obvious answer is cooperation but as Caporaso (1992) notes: "The problem of cooperation is a problem precisely because states interests are independently given, often in conflict with one another, and pursued within an environment of anarchy". Caporaso's solution to the N-

Person Game Theory is by adding a secondary group called the K-Group which represents cooperation. Also, instead of looking at the Game Theory as a singular event he looks at it as part of a repetitive cycle. Therefore, adding cooperation (K-Group) to the equation, side payments and repetition of the game, enhances the value of reputation and makes it more attractive for the members or participants to think about long term benefits, whilst side payments would help bring any defectors back in line.

Caporaso (1992) illustrates, as a counter argument, that, if the game is only played once, the incentive to defect or even dominate becomes obvious or more inviting. So, if the game is repeated an infinite number of times, the incentive to remain involved and benefit from long term results becomes more appealing. This opens the doors to so called “dynamic cooperation” which means that a strategy will be put together over the course of the game rather than through a single move at a time. Quoted in Caporaso's (1992) work, Robert Axelrod proposes a mixed strategy within the game. A mixed strategy of selective cooperation and defection – which according to him may easily result in a winning strategy. The reason being that, in a system where an individual can pick out the defectors and co-operators whilst bringing in sanctions and rewards respectively may prove to be positive in the long run. This is very much the system we have in place today. However, as most people have noticed, it has its flaws. The more the international community grows, the harder it becomes to continue to cooperate. The reason being “Cooperation amongst a relatively large number of players is ‘less likely’ to occur than cooperation amongst a small number” as Taylor demonstrates in the writings of Caporaso (1992). The reason is very obvious, the more players involved in the game, the more interests are present and the only way to ensure that cooperation thrives is to constantly monitor the actions of others.

The social-communicative approach is the second route. This approach rather than throwing out the individualistic approach, broadens it. The point here as Caporaso (1992) explains is to focus on the purely social aspects of the states. Here States focus on the choices they make as well as reflect, discuss and show trust by using social actions to identify and solve problems. If applied to the game theory, the Nash equilibrium would need to be achieved. The Nash equilibrium is a solution to the renowned game theory explained in brief previously. If state A is making a decision based on state B and C's

decision whilst they remain unchanged, and State B and C are making their own decision taking into consideration state A's decision which also remains unchanged – the Nash equilibrium will be reached. Whilst the traditional individualist game theory claims that it is always best for players within the game to decide on their own, this creates a paradox or contradiction for the very existence or progression of a group of individuals. However, likewise, if a group of players are in Nash equilibrium each individual would be making the best decision possible, taking into account the decision of others within the game as long as the decisions remain unchanged. This formula leads to the best cooperative relationships, especially within a multilateral context.

As Caporaso (1992) explains, if a Nash equilibrium is reached, it would create a reliance on the coordination of policies and the best way to achieve this is through communication. The appliance of social interactions and psychology has been proven to increase greatly the amount of cooperation. However, there is always the risk of deadlock, and Caporaso (1992) presents a solution through discussion, and more importantly persuasion, in order to entice the other side to see things in a different light. Discussions alone will help alter preferences and create a feeling of shared identity to solutions. In turn, it may even encourage norms and facilitate promising behaviour.

The third route is an institutionalist approach which places importance on structures and patterns of rule. This point of view considers pluralist and individualist approaches to be inadequate for understanding multilateral cooperation and there is an extreme emphasis on norms and belief. As Caporaso (1992) explains, "Institutions are thought to be important with respect to preferences, beliefs, and norms in numerous ways. They help shape preferences by changing the payoff matrix (for example, making it easier to punish free riders and defectors within an institutional context) and by offering an environment in which socialization and learning an occur".

Apart from altering preferences Caporaso (1992) has observed that institutions may also provide the basis for information sharing, increase in trust and most importantly remove the uncertainty of the actions of others. In turn, they may also improve cooperation and the capacity of the institution as a whole. Institutionalists also observe complex patterns of cooperation already within the state and

interstate system. States share the notion of international society, diplomatic rules, and rules on the concept of society.

### The European Union – An Example of Regionalism

Regionalism was not a successful practice until halfway through the 20<sup>th</sup> century with the only exception according to Ethier (1998) being that of Western Europe. Almost all, if not all the regional initiatives failed within the 1950s and 1960s. However, progress was observed under the European Community initiative in the late 1980s. Through this initiative and the successful completion of the internal market in 1992, the world seemed to have entered a new era of regional integration, with many regions coming up with agreements of their own. Since then, there have been over 100 regional agreements which account for well over half the world trade today.

The question is: How did the European Union manage to come together and create such a solid, unified example of successful regionalism? Firstly, the continent of Europe is no stranger to conflict and destructive wars. In fact, its history is very bloody and unstable, however, after the devastation of two World Wars the continent looked at multilateralism and cooperation as a means to end conflict. A report by the Council of Foreign Relations (CFR 2010) presents the reasons why the European Union has been so successful in achieving its number one goal of security and peace.

The first principle is the introduction of a new form of politics which is based on a supranational “community method”. This was introduced to replace the traditional, yet problematic (as history has proven) balance-of-power method. This new style of governance was heavily supported by a key player, the US, which proved to be crucial in its early years. The second principle is the leadership of both France and Germany. This turned out to be fruitful, despite the two countries’ history of conflict. The Franco-German alliance has become the bedrock of the European Union. The third principle is the political willingness to share sovereignty along with the formation of common institutions to safeguard and watch-over the integration process. Lastly, the fourth principle is tolerance and solidarity which have shown to be dynamic within the European Union. The approach adopted here is not based on

isolation should a member state finds itself in difficulty. The Greek crisis can be taken as an example. There is also a willingness to invest in poorer states in order to improve the infrastructure of the Union as a whole, whilst also allowing everyone to adopt and practice the same norms. “The core tenet of the EU is readiness to share sovereignty and operate through strong institutions” (CFR 2010).

The European Union also caters for euro-sceptic countries by adopting a more flexible approach over multiple levels of integration. A good example would be that of the Eurozone and Schengen agreement to ensure that even those sceptical members would still be integrated within the union such as the pre-Brexit United Kingdom. No other international or regional body is anywhere close to the level of integration the European Union has reached, however that does not mean there have not been attempts. ASEAN is a good example of a regional agreement aspiring to learn from the European Union, however sharing sovereignty and a common market do not seem likely in its present state (CFR 2010).

One of the biggest achievements of the European Union, which as mentioned earlier is key to the whole project, is the relationship between France and Germany. This was achieved through huge political efforts by both sides to ensure future generations live in a secure continent through a peaceful partnership and not risk the outbreak of devastating war. In comparison, there has never been such an effort in any part of the world, where two previously opposing states have come together in an ambitious regional integration agreement. Many parts of the world such as Asia (example: China and Japan, India and Pakistan) remain hostile to one another, therefore undermining the prospects of similar success stories to that enjoyed by the European Union. “Compared to most other regions in the world, the EU is a haven of peace, prosperity and security” (CFR 2010).

There have not been any outbreaks of violence between traditional enemies within the union since its conception. There may be various reasons for this, such as the continent being too tired to fight another intra-European war, or the success of a highly functional union that demonstrates that there are more benefits through cooperation within a region than through violence. The European Union has also adopted the notion of collective security, meaning an attack on one member state will be

considered as an attack on all members. Thankfully this has not so far formally put to the test with the exception of terrorist attacks.

Taking terrorism as an example of a security threat, the region has braced itself for more attacks and has stopped many in their tracks before they were carried out. This is all due to the very close working relationship between all states, as attacks in Brussels and Paris have been felt throughout the region as a whole, bearing in mind all member states and their citizens enjoy freedom of movement. Multilateralism within the region is being used as a means of defence outside the traditional borders of the states and by ensuring the security of one member, the other members are ensuring the security of their own territory.

To conclude, it is very apparent that the European Union has managed to lock the European continent into a very secure and peaceful state. The European Union also offers security to those state that may be vulnerable on their own. Malta is a good example of this point, as Malta is incapable of securing its own borders and requires military and other assistance from fellow member states. There is also the issue of immigration which has been flagged as a security threat in recent times, due to the possibility of terrorists using immigration routes to infiltrate European borders. The Frontex mission which is sanctioned by the European Union, is a mission that many states with a naval capacity have joined, in order to secure the maritime borders of the European Union from incoming migrants from North Africa and the Middle-East. There are many examples of such missions that have proven to be effective. The organisation as a whole at least on a regional level is the perfect example of the importance of multilateralism as a means to ensure security. This does not mean it does not suffer from flaws and existential crises, however the positive facts are undeniable.



## Multilateralism in the Mediterranean.

Bin (2000) argued that the change in the European security climate over the previous decade or so had a tremendous impact on the Mediterranean. His comments could not be more accurate today as the situation is more desperate than 16 years ago. Various events have taken their toll on security in the region, from the Arab Spring, to the Gaza question, to the Syrian civil war. Bin (2000) highlights the importance of security in the region by stating that “The increasing strategic importance of the region stems from the growing realization that security in Europe is closely linked with security and stability in the Mediterranean”. The geo-political and socio-cultural context of the region have given it a very complex security dilemma. Very much on the same point as this work, Bin (2000) describes that there is clear overlapping and inter-relation between states in the region. Therefore, there has been a call, especially nowadays, for more cooperation and multilateralism over the last few decades and in fact attempts at dialogue to tackle issues in the modern context date back to the 1970’s.

One of the most prevalent issues of the region is the lack of political, economic, social and cultural cohesion. Most issues branch out from this context and it has been difficult to secure a regional security arrangement. Bin (2000) lists a few examples of cooperative undertakings in the region since the end of the Cold War: the EU’s Barcelona Process, the Middle East Peace Process and local Mediterranean initiatives such as the Western European Union (WEU), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and NATO. All these different organisations and initiatives have one thing in common, namely their objective to reach a climate of peace and stability within the region. It is clear, however, that the region needs actors to assist the various states in achieving this objective and Bin (2000) highlights the fact that the EU cannot cope with the breadth of the situation alone.

In an earlier piece of work Alberto Bin divided the evolution of multilateralism in the Mediterranean into two generations. He highlighted the climate of instability, which increased interest on the part of states for the development of international organisations, security institutions and non-governmental bodies within the region (Bin, 1997, p. 57). The first generation of initiatives span from 1972 to 1989

and it is defined by two initiatives. The first important initiative was the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) later became the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). This was later followed by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, which included a special section titled “Questions Relating to Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean”, which actively promoted the intention of the development or maintenance of good neighbourly relations (Bin, 1997, p. 59).

Something that is worth mentioning, is the development of Malta’s reputation during this period. Malta always pushed for multilateral cooperation within the Mediterranean. An initiative of the Maltese government in 1972 was the meeting of ministers of foreign affairs of the four central Mediterranean countries, Italy, Malta, Libya and Tunisia. During this meeting, explicit recognition was given to the “the existence of particular interests of the four Mediterranean countries”. The sectors they discussed were as follows: communications, tourism, fishing, agriculture, sea pollution, the seabed, economic and trade cooperation (Bin, 1997, p. 60). This push by Malta within the first generation of initiatives fortifies the argument of how multilateralism is considered to be a high priority by smaller states and like-minded states. Lacking the super strength of larger powers, less powerful countries tend to flock together in multilateral hubs in order to increase the security and stability of the region and, in turn, of their own territories.

The second-generation spanned within the decade 1990 to 2000. Within this generation, the transition phase as Bin calls it, a global approach to regional problems in the Mediterranean were promoted heavily by the Italian government. This approach was based on the premise that the process of development must be a joint effort that did not ignore certain countries in the search for balance (Bin, 1997, p. 63). Within this decade the region saw initiatives which are of note.

The first was the formation of the 5+5 Group between the European Community and the Arab Maghreb Union (France, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Malta + Libya, Algeria, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia). There was the Egyptian proposal of a Forum of Dialogue and Cooperation in the Mediterranean proposed by President Mubarak in 1991. This proposal was received quite favourably by foreign ministries and it was brought forward through an informal meeting in Alexandria in 1994. In this

meeting a number of ways to develop regional cooperation were discussed (Bin, 1997, p. 66). During the meeting in Alexandria governments recognised the importance of creating an organ of cooperation which would ideally be flexible and would permit dialogue. The importance to promote collaboration between governmental and non-governmental organisations was also recognised (Bin, 1997, p. 67).

One of the most important initiatives within this generation is that of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. This partnership had three main objectives; the first being to create a zone of peace and security, the second to develop economic cooperation; and the third to intensify dialogue among the cultures of the Mediterranean region which is seen to be the cause of all instability (Bin, 1997, p. 68).

It is interesting to note that this increase in Mediterranean stability is not restricted to regional interest. In fact a number of actors outside the region showed a significant amount of interest such as international organisations, governments, security institutions and businessmen (Bin, 1997, p. 72). This last point strengthens the idea that global security and stability is becoming more reliant on multilateral diplomacy and international cooperation. "What counts, in the end is that the high degree of interdependence now existing in the Mediterranean be governed by a frame work of dialogue and cooperation capable of taking into account the different interests, needs and perceptions of all parties in the region" (Bin, 1997, p. 75). Only through such a broad framework will it be possible to rise up to the challenges faced by the region in the years to come. If that is taken into the context of the present time, one would notice just how important cooperation is with all that is happening in the North Africa and the Middle-East today, states seem to be much more willing to come to the aid of troubled countries today, as opposed to 40 years ago.

The Mediterranean still has challenges to overcome and this point is obvious. However, it does seem as though cooperation has contained crises from boiling over, resulting in a level of instability that produced all-out chaos. The Arab Spring in 2010 pulled the region into a very hostile and dangerous part of its history and were it not for the cooperation of all states effected, it may have snowballed into something much bigger and catastrophic, despite its huge impact on the Arab world. The intervention in Libya by the international community and now in Syria proves the point.

## The United Nations and Its Challenges.

While the European Union is considered to be the almost perfect example of regional harmony in a not so perfect world, the United Nations is the best example of global multilateralism we have seen to date. Whilst it still has its flaws, it is seen as a work in progress, as managing the entire world is no easy task. This section is dedicated to the success of the United Nations and its promotion of multilateralism on the international stage. The United Nations is the so called second experiment after the failure of the League of Nations and it represents the latest attempt at international cooperation “to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war” as is described by Williams (2008, p. 325).

The UN Charter can be taken as the constitution of the world’s organisation. Its main purpose is dedicated to the assurance of international peace and security, and the outlawing of any use of force except in self-defence. Other tasks include ensuring respect for human rights and pushing economic development. Both goals are considered to be instrumental towards the achievement of the UN’s primary function, securing global peace and security as is stated by Williams (2008, p. 326). The initial history of the United Nations is an uneven one. As it rose from the ashes of the Second World War, the United Nations was side-lined due to the US-Soviet rivalry. However, after the fall of the Soviet Union, the United Nations managed to assume a vital role in international security (Williams (2008, p. 326).

The United Nations has managed to work to maintain international peace and security in a very complex reality. What threatens global security nowadays are non-traditional security threats whilst the United Nations lists many successes it admits to catastrophic failures too (United Nations, No Date). The complexity of the security situation is only increasing and therefore the United Nations has been forced to strengthen relationships with regional and sub-regional organisations, which play a dynamic role in the prevention of conflict and offer the United Nations the means of rapid responses in times of crises. In turn, member states have continued to see the value of the organisation and requests for assistance within almost all sectors related to governance has been noted (United Nations,

No Date). This is a fundamental challenge for the United Nations, as if the organisation is not able to adapt, it will face an existential crisis.

It is now in the centre of the multilateral world order and plays a vital role in global diplomacy and mediation. It is committed to moving the world from a culture of “reaction” to that of “prevention” (United Nations, 2014). What this means is that the United Nations is very much interested in replacing diplomacy with action in times of rising tension. It presents itself as a forum where a network of diplomats may be dispatched to encourage dialogue, compromise and peaceful resolutions. The Security Council is the organ which is held to be responsible for the maintenance of global security and peace and in recent years there has been an increase in Council engagement, addressing threats that seem to be emerging, bypassing the Council’s formal agenda. This increase in Council activity is done to discourage any sort of violence and open the floor for preventive diplomacy with the full support of the United Nations and its institutions as is stated on the website of the (United Nations, 2014). However, despite the United Nations’ best efforts there are problems that appear to defy a multilateral solution such as the conflict in Syria and North Korean aggressiveness.

For many states that have been through the destruction and trauma of war, the United Nations experiment has been a very successful one. Over the course of the project, since its foundation many parts of the world have been enjoying peace, security and collaboration and differences between former enemies have been put aside as a United Nations report (2005) indicates. The United Nations in its first 30 years, underwent drastic changes. The main reason was the introduction of multiple new states emerging from the decolonisation sending membership soaring from the 51 member states of 1945 to today’s 193. The majority of these states are developing countries that have gained a voice in international politics through the organisation.

There have been fewer wars in the post-1945 world. To put things into perspective one must take into consideration that the number of states increased almost fourfold and naturally one would expect more wars (United Nations (2005). The UN is a direct contributor to this fact achieved through

peacekeeping missions, diplomacy and the adoption of norms against the very notion of violence and war.

The signing of the Charter allowed states to benefit from the advantages and privileges of sovereignty, whilst at the same time accepting the responsibility of it. The Westphalian state system, which is always linked to the traditional power politics, the anarchical system of the past, gave rise to the idea of a sovereign state responsible for the protection of its citizens. In today's day and age, through a new multilateral world order, the welfare of citizens now requires the state to meet the same obligations on a wider international scale, through multilateral diplomacy, as security knows no boundaries. The United Nations is a perfect opportunity for states to address cross border security threats, ranging from terrorism to nuclear weapons and crime, in an international forum with an equally heard voice.

The organisation has many positive attributes and has contributed to global development very broadly. In the security sector, through multilateral diplomacy and contribution by member states, the United Nations has sent over 69 peacekeeping and observer missions across the globe which has helped countries restore order and calm as is reported by the *United Nations (2015)*. Many of the conflicts post 1990 have been brought to an end by United Nations mediation or action by third parties with its support. The *United Nations (2015)* gives some examples such as; Sierra Leone, Liberia, Sudan, Burundi and Nepal. International research has also credited the United Nations and its peacekeeping, conflict prevention and peace-making missions as vital factors in the decline in conflict around the world, and this decline sits at a figure of 40%. All this is done by multilateral diplomacy within the organisation, promoting the norms of the international community.

A very important agency within the United Nations is the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This agency has served as the international nuclear inspector and its main task is to ensure that all nuclear material being developed is only done so for peaceful purposes and so far, more than 180 states have reached an agreement with the agency as is stated by the *United Nations (2015)*. Under the same umbrella is its support of global disarmament. As the world has witnessed what modern weaponry and warfare could do to whole generations, the United Nations is dedicated in its pursuit of

global disarmament, primarily of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons and biological weapons. This is all done through treaties which have been signed by member states on different levels. As the *United Nations* (2015) states, the Chemical Weapons Convention has been ratified by 190 states, the Mine-Ban Convention has been ratified by 162 and the Arms Trade Treaty by 69. These three treaties are what provide the legal backbone to the work of the United Nations

The United Nations has also implemented a counter-terrorism strategy in 2006. It has helped countries put into practice a global strategy and a universal condemnation of terrorism by providing legal assistance and promoting international cooperation against terrorism as a whole. The *United Nations* (2015) has also put together legal framework to combat the threat of terrorism through 14 agreements. These include treaties against; hostage-taking, aircraft hijacking, terrorist bombings, terrorism financing and nuclear terrorism. On the same note, the United Nations has also worked hard, though not always successfully, to prevent genocide. Failure in Rwanda and in the former Yugoslavia are cases in point. However, the United Nations has been working hard ever since to redeem itself noteworthy interventions in the ex-Yugoslavia and in Libya noted.

To conclude, this section has presented tangible examples of multilateralism and its benefits. The reason why these three case studies were chosen is due to their successes in reality or the realisation that the only way to solve regional and global problems is through cooperation. The European Union and the United Nations have adopted this approach in practice and have shown, time and time again, that cooperation is always beneficial and the better option. Furthermore, the world had never seen such a multilateral organisation, despite a previous attempt. The Mediterranean case however requires further work as there are very wide gaps between the different factions. Nonetheless, as mentioned, earlier the benefits of cooperation have been noticed by the key players within the region and attempts at making cooperation a reality have not been absent and perhaps one day they will become a reality.

# Conclusion

The objective of this dissertation is to argue that the world would be more secure and peaceful if there was more cooperation. Cooperation promotes interconnectivity and mutual development and these two traits together normally discourage the use of violence as this disrupts any beneficial system. War itself is unpredictable and there will always be the risk of defeat and a guarantee of destruction and casualties, negatively affecting all sides. Therefore, the bottom line is that through increased cooperation by the use of multilateralism one would achieve interconnectivity, interdependence, mutual development and a collective security. The dissertation was planned and written in a way to illustrate this truism. It was written to collate evidence that pushes forward the idea of multilateralism and its benefits.

As a simplified general reason, states appear to pursue multilateralism for its mutual beneficial results. However, each state has its own story and may create its own reasons as to why it chooses to conduct multilateral diplomacy. We now live in a world where the powerful states with the absence of empires and a colonial system rely heavily on others for their development. Ronald Walker's nine-point illustration explaining why states pursue the practice, which was introduced in the first chapter, is very informative. There is also the case of smaller states playing a more central role within the international scene who have very different reasons to pursue multilateralism. Smaller states who were once alienated within international politics have today found a voice through the institutionalisation of multilateralism. The United Nations being the most prevalent example of this.

The changing nature of security and the urgent need for states to adapt to the newly emerging threats the modern world is presenting to them has stimulated an increased interest in multilateralism. They



now recognise that a threat may originate from outside their borders and not be in the form that traditional enemy states in the past are used to take. This shows that powerful states not only need other states to ensure their development, but they need them to also ensure their own security. Working together to confront threats such as modern terrorism, cyber-attacks, and environmental threats such as climate change, is crucial.

Apart from reliance on other states, there is also the need to recognise the importance of NGOs and their expertise. The influence of NGOs in recent times has been great, and as explained, the United Nations has encouraged states to improve their relationships with them, as they have proven to be very helpful for the organisation itself. As described by Sarra Zarrati, the amount of registered NGOs has increased to almost 30,000 and this in itself suggests a shift in modern politics and proves that NGOs are sought by governments to assist them with certain issues they may face. This means that the practice of multilateralism includes diplomatic ties with certain NGOs along with other states and that they also contribute towards the maintenance of state security.

The research presented in this work points to an obvious conclusion that although multilateralism in itself may be considered to be, or may give the appearance of being a modern practice the term in itself is not modern at all and history is peppered with instances where the forward-thinking pioneers have introduced the idea of cooperation on a global or regional scale. The modern version of multilateralism however consists of newer elements such as the introduction of NGOs.

The more one researches the subject, the more one comes to realise that the subject is very broad. Multilateralism may be interpreted in many different ways and there contains different forms. Nevertheless, the end result is always the same; mutual development or benefits for all parties concerned. The world today seems to be well within a neoliberal institutionalist system and as explained in the second chapter, this system has taken characteristics from both the liberal and realist model to form a different school of thought, one that accepts the reality of the international system but also provides its players with room for development and progress. We now live in a multilateral world and it would be hard for new generations to imagine a world where interconnectivity is not the

norm. Advancements in technology, especially communication technology such as the internet and the mobile phone have created a culture of instant expectation or reaction and also a strong call for information and knowledge. This very fact has pushed forward the notion of transparency and states have been forced to react to this emerging culture and all its expectations. This in turn has resulted in smaller states and like-minded states pushing for transparency on the international stage. This can be traced back to the reaction of the global population after the two world wars when trust in governmental authorities in providing security and keeping citizens safe was at an all-time low.

There has been more of an effort by states to include multilateralism within their foreign policy and there are three reasons for this. The first being recognition of the benefits multilateralism offers. The second is the expectation by citizens, that the government will be open to discussion and collaboration with other parties when an issue arises. The third is the international norm slowly being formed within international politics. Things have come to the point where states are not only expected to act in a multilateral manner and initiate or participate in multilateral diplomacy by their own people but also by other states as well. The introduction of this norm has been absolutely crucial in the development of multilateralism. This example can be put into context by analysing the most recent US invasion of Iraq in 2003 when the US pushed for a multilateral approach through to the United Nations.

The case studies presented to the reader were purposely selected to prove, with concrete evidence that multilateralism does indeed increase stability and peace. In fact, security now relies heavily on the international status of a country and many of the non-traditional security threats are only reduced through the use of multilateralism and cooperation. A state securing its own borders and attempting to face these new threats alone stands little or no chance at all. We rely on each other now more than ever recorded in history and the more globalisation spreads the more we will need to rely on diplomacy in order to secure our development as a planet. Global history has always been a term, however it meant something completely different. Formerly it was a term used to study the history of the world as a whole, in a scattered, and some-what non-related timeline. Studying the history of the world today has become a new task entirely as regional problems may escalate to global ones and repercussions

may be felt in all corners of the world. Also, solving global problems unilaterally is a strategy that will fail before it has even started and is virtually ineffective, especially in the terms of security. Global stability ultimately means maximum security, and global security requires collective security which in turn is formulated and agreed upon through the use of multilateralism. Multilateralism thankfully has been on the increase since the end of the Second World War and improvements have been noted and elaborated on through this work. Hopefully the world will continue to recognise the endless benefits of such a practice and change the traditional security world order for good. If this is achieved world peace may actually become a reality.

# Reference List

BBC News (2016) Hurricane Matthew: “Big bad beast” storm batters Florida, 8 October. Available at <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-37571685> [accessed 24 October 2016].

Bin A (1997) Multilateral Diplomacy in the Mediterranean: A Comparative Assessment. *Mediterranean quarterly* 6(3), p.pp. 57–78. Available at [https://www.um.edu.mt/library/sfx?frbrVersion=4&ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\\_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&ctx\\_tim=2016-09-01T12%3A27%3A52IST&url\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&url\\_ctx\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:ctx&rft\\_id=info:sid/primo.exlibrisgroup.com:primo3-Article-proquest&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Multilateral%20Diplomacy%20in%20the%20Mediterranean:%20A%20Comparative%20Assessment&rft.jtitle=Mediterranean%20Quarterly&rft.btitle=&rft.aulast=Bin&rft.auinit=&rft.auinit1=&rft.auinitm=&rft.ausuffix=&rft.au=Bin%2C%20Alberto&rft.aucorp=&rft.date=19970701&rft.volume=8&rft.issue=3&rft.part=&rft.quarter=&rft.ssn=&rft.spage=57&rft.epage=57&rft.pages=57&rft.artnum=&rft.issn=1047-4552&rft.eissn=&rft.isbn=&rft.sici=&rft.coden=&rft\\_id=info:doi/&rft.object\\_id=&svc\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:sch\\_svc&rft\\_dat=%3Cproquest%3E60912442%3C/proquest%3E&rft.eisbn=&rft\\_id=info:oai/](https://www.um.edu.mt/library/sfx?frbrVersion=4&ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&ctx_tim=2016-09-01T12%3A27%3A52IST&url_ver=Z39.88-2004&url_ctx_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:ctx&rft_id=info:sid/primo.exlibrisgroup.com:primo3-Article-proquest&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Multilateral%20Diplomacy%20in%20the%20Mediterranean:%20A%20Comparative%20Assessment&rft.jtitle=Mediterranean%20Quarterly&rft.btitle=&rft.aulast=Bin&rft.auinit=&rft.auinit1=&rft.auinitm=&rft.ausuffix=&rft.au=Bin%2C%20Alberto&rft.aucorp=&rft.date=19970701&rft.volume=8&rft.issue=3&rft.part=&rft.quarter=&rft.ssn=&rft.spage=57&rft.epage=57&rft.pages=57&rft.artnum=&rft.issn=1047-4552&rft.eissn=&rft.isbn=&rft.sici=&rft.coden=&rft_id=info:doi/&rft.object_id=&svc_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:sch_svc&rft_dat=%3Cproquest%3E60912442%3C/proquest%3E&rft.eisbn=&rft_id=info:oai/) [accessed 27 November 2016].

Bin A (2000) The Security Dialogue Towards the Mediterranean. *Revista CIDOB d’Afers Internacionals* 49(1), p.pp. 77–87. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40585803> [accessed 25 November 2016].

Caporaso JA (1992) International Relations Theory and Multilateralism: The Search for Foundations. *International Studies Quarterly* 46(3), p.pp. 599–632. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706990> [accessed 18 October 2016].

Cooper AF et al. [eds] (2002) *Enhancing global governance: Towards a new diplomacy?* Tokyo: The United Nations University Press.

Council of Foreign Relations (2010) *The European Union as a Model for Regional Integration*. Available at <http://www.cfr.org/world/european-union-model-regional-integration/p22935> [accessed 23 November 2016].

Eban A (1966) Multilateral Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 114(7), p.pp. 984–996. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3310846> [accessed 16 September 2016].

Ethier WJ (1998) Regionalism in a Multilateral World. *Journal of Political Economy* 106(6), p.pp. 1214–1245. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/250045> [accessed 23 November 2016].

Franceschet A (2001) Sovereignty and Freedom: Immanuel Kant’s Liberal Internationalist “Legacy.” *Review of International Studies* 27(2), p.pp. 209–228. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20097728> [accessed 1 November 2016].

- J.A P (2000) NGOs and Global Policy-Making. Global Policy Forum. Available at <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/177/31611.html> [accessed 14 November 2016].
- Jackson R and Sørensen G (2010) *Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirchner EJ and Sperling J (2007) *Global Security Governance: Competing perceptions of security in the 21st century*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Kissinger H (1956) The Congress of Vienna A Reappraisal. *World Politics* 8(2), p.pp. 264–280. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2008974>.
- Miller S (1997) *Modern European History*. Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Newman E (2007) *A Crisis of Global Institutions? Multilateralism and international security*. New York: Routledge.
- No author (2015) 70 Ways the UN Makes A Difference. United Nations. Available at <http://www.un.org/un70/en/content/70ways#peace> [accessed 12 May 2016].
- Office of the Historian (no date) *Wilson's Fourteen Points, 1918*. Available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1914-1920/fourteen-points>.
- Stein AA (2008) Neoliberal Institutionalism. In Reus-Smith C and Snidal D [eds] *The Oxford Handbook on International Relations*. Oxford University press, pp. 201–221.
- Thakur R *The United Nations in Global Governance: Rebalancing Organized Multilateralism for Current and Future Challenges*.
- Tucker RW (1994) The Triumph of Wilsonianism. *World Policy Journal* 10(4), p.pp. 83–99. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40209339> [accessed 12 April 2016].
- United Nations (No Date) *International Peace and Security*. Available at <http://www.un.org/en/sections/priorities/international-peace-and-security/> [accessed 27 November 2016].
- United Nations (2005) *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*.
- United Nations (2014) *Prevention and Mediation*. Available at <http://www.un.org/undpa/en/diplomacy-mediation> [accessed 29 November 2016].
- United Nations (2015) *Paris Agreement*. Available at <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09.pdf> [accessed 14 November 2016].
- Walker RA (2004) *Multilateral Conferences Purposeful International Negotiation*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Williams PD [ed] (2008) *Security Studies An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Zarrati S (2013) NGOs as protagonists in 21st century diplomacy. Available at <http://www.thinkir.co.uk/ngos-as-protagonists-in-21st-century-diplomacy/> [accessed 11 December 2016].