Small States and the EU: Methods and Perception of Influence

Universiteit Leiden

Master's in International Relations

Thesis Paper

Jason Bullman S2483203

bullmanjason0@gmail.com

Supervisor: Dr. Matthew Broad

Second Reader: Dr. Brian Shaev

Wordcount: 15,013

Abstract:

Small states occupy a minor, yet important, aspect of the study of international relations. While large states and great powers are still accorded the lion's share of agency in international politics and negotiations, scholars have long recognised that small states are not passive actors and can influence developments on the international stage despite their limited resources. This is accomplished mainly through a variety of strategies that small states apply on the international stage. The effectiveness of these strategies are subject to conditions in the wider international or institutional context, but are still the major avenue through which small state governments exercise agency outside of their national borders. These strategies have been closely examined by scholars, particularly in the context of the European Union, where the highly formalised institutional environment offers both obstacles and opportunities for small states to pursue their agendas at the supranational level.

The case study of Ireland, a small state on the periphery of the EU, will be examined in order to determine how peripheral small state governments attempt to affect the development of EU policy. Irish attempts to influence EU foreign and security policy will be investigated, policies that have traditionally been dominated by analyses of large state actors. However, an increasing amount of scholarship argues that small states have the ability to affect the EU in this field as well. This thesis seeks to place the interaction between Ireland and the EU in the wider global context by examining the role a third party international organisation, the UN, has on Ireland's influence at the EU.

1. Introduction

Small states occupy a minor, yet significant, role in studies of international relations and global politics. Despite predictions in the late 1940's that the onset of the Cold War would lead to small states becoming powerless and irrelevant in the face of the emerging superpowers, history has shown that "weak" countries have preserved their agency in an increasingly complex international system[1]. This is not to claim that small states and large powers exist on an even playing field. Small states, being limited in military power, finances, personnel, and other important resources encounter barriers to expressing agency that larger states do not, from lack of access to expertise in a given negotiation issue to relatively acute deficits in material and military power[2]. Being thusly limited, small states employ various strategies and behaviours to overcome or bypass these barriers. Today, there is a large amount of literature examining these strategies and discussions on how small states interact with international systems in ways differentiated from large states are widespread. These differences between large and small states can be so pronounced that small states have been characterised as a unique category of actor[3]. While this claim of uniqueness is disputed[4] small states do encounter constraints and complications that large states either overcome much more easily or do not experience altogether.

The European Union (EU) holds a rather unique position among organisations in the global system. High levels of institutionalisation and democratic norms in the EU contribute to an environment in which small states can wield influence effectively through formal rules and informal acceptable behaviour that lessen the gap between large and small states[5]. While this does not eliminate asymmetry between small and large states, it does enable small states to more effectively utilise influencing strategies at the supranational level, for example through coalition-making or leveraging influential positions within the EU structure. There is much written on how small states operate within the structure of the European Union, such as empirical data on how

---

[1] Lindell & Persson, 1986, 79
[2] Deitelhoff & Wallbott, 2012, 345
[3] Thorhallsson, 2019, 16,17
[4] Lee & Smith, 2010, 2, 6, 7
[5] Weiss, 2020, 2, 3

various small state actors use different influencing strategies and theoretical analyses of how hypothetical small states could act in the EU.

This thesis seeks to contribute to the existing literature by examining the case of the Republic of Ireland, a small state on the periphery of the EU. Ireland is one of the oldest small state members of the EU, having joined its predecessor, the European Communities, in 1973 along with the large state the United Kingdom and fellow small state the Kingdom of Denmark. While there is extensive discussion and examinations of small states within the European Union, many of these primarily discuss abstracted theory and empirical data for multiple states rather than specific case-study analysis[6]. Case-studies are utilised in the literature[7], however Ireland-centric analyses are largely absent.

The EU's ambitions of building its position as a regional and global security actor[8] merits investigation of how small states interact with the foreign policy and security aspect of the EU, a particularly sensitive issue area for small states due to their material weakness and historical irrelevance in international policymaking[9]. Ireland, being a small member state of the EU as well as one of the five EU "neutral" states – that is, states that are not members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) or other military alliances - offers insights into how small states may pursue their national agendas in an environment where their smallness and foreign policy position should limit their ability to direct international policy. This is of particular relevance to the European Union where states with much more extensive military capabilities such as France would be expected to control the development of the Union's security policy. This expectation is complicated by the institutionalisation of the EU environment discussed above, inviting investigation into how this institutionalisation impacts the historical dominance of large states over security and foreign policies.

Ireland warrants investigation as a case study as despite its very minor military capability, it has been a leading contributor to the United Nations international security structure through peacekeeping and nuclear weapons disarmament, consistently contributing relatively large numbers of personnel to missions and regularly pushing for greater nuclear weapons disarmament

---

[6] For example, Panke, 2010, and Jackobsen, 2009
[7] Maes & Verdun, 2005, Kronsell 2002
[8] European Union Global Strategy, 19-50
[9] Weiss, 2019, 3, Maas, 2016, 1304

law at the UN level[10]. Ireland's experience in participating and influencing international security policy at the global level invites greater scrutiny of how its experience has affected it on the regional level within the European Union. One is compelled to ask how Ireland's activity at the global level affects its agenda on the regional stage.

1.1 Research Question

Following the above discussion, this thesis will attempt to answer the following research question:

How do small states influence the European Union?

To do so, the thesis will use the case-study of the Republic of Ireland and its attempts to influence EU foreign and security policy through transmitting influence accrued at the UN level. As noted above, Ireland is a long-time member of the EU with a small military, having a national agenda of neutrality that is shared by only four other member states. Despite its military weakness Ireland has a history of relative success of pursing its security agenda at the global level through the United Nations. Ireland is an interesting small state case due to its particularly vigorous participation in UN peacekeeping [11], and its correspondingly high activity level within the EU [12] invites investigation into how influence at the global level may transmit to the regional.

The thesis will identify and examine the methods Ireland uses to exert influence gained at the United Nations level to impact European Union policy, which will be further examined in the methodology chapter. Alongside the influencing methods and strategies Irish governments employ, how Irish officials perceive the effectiveness of these methods will also be examined, in order to determine whether these methods are deemed successful or effective by the officials and governments utilising them.

---

[10] Ishizuka, 2004, Sinnott, 1995
[11] Ishizuka, 2004, 14
[12] Quaglia, 2006, 364

1.2 Definitions

This section will briefly define key concepts utilised in this thesis.

Smallness:

"Smallness" as a categorising concept is a vague and disputed one[13]. Smallness has been defined by numerous measurements from population size to gross domestic product, however these measurements' empiricism is questionable and risks homogenising a very diverse group of states[14]. Thus, in line with the definition of "perceived influence" below this thesis will examine smallness in terms of perception, or, how actors both internal and external to the state perceive the size of the state in question[15]. Ireland's position as a small state within the international system is supported by this, where Ireland is perceived to be required to navigate "external…compulsion(s)" rather than being in a position to affect said external conditions[16]. Ireland is also overwhelmingly regarded as a small state within the European Union by scholars, as will be expanded upon in the literature review[17].

Influence:

"Influence," much like smallness, is a difficult concept to categorise. This thesis follows Risso's contention that empirically measuring actors' tangible influence over events is beyond reasonable reach. While measuring successful "actual" influence is challenging to the point of impossibility due to scarcity of sources and presence of other causal influencing factors, "perceived" influence is much more quantifiable through methods such as discourse analysis and examining which issues an actor prioritises[18]. Thus, this thesis will define "influence" as the perceived capability of a state actor to alter or deter events and processes beyond their national borders. For the case study of Ireland and EU policy, this will more specifically mean Ireland's ability to change, delay, prioritise, or otherwise alter supranational processes in the EU on foreign and security policy, specifically EU peacekeeping missions and nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Perception, in short, can be measured by the discourse and language utilised by actors and individuals when referring

---

[13] Dukelow & Considine, 2014, 414
[14] ibid, 414
[15] Lingevičius, 2018, 75,76
[16] Hay, Smith, 2010, 136, 137
[17] Panke, 2010, Torney & O'Gorman, 2019, Keohane, 2013, Meerts, 1997
[18] Risso, 2014, 9,10, 17, 253-255

to an issue, as well as the priority afforded the issue in government announcements, commissions, and white papers.

International Organisations and Institutionalisation:

This thesis will examine international organisations as entities that operate separately or independently from the governments of its member states, possessing sufficient autonomy to "provide multilateral processes of decision-making between states, along with the capacity to enforce the collective will of the member states.[19]"

Finally, this thesis will define "institutionalisation" as increasing levels of norm convergence among states, establishment of formal rules, regulations, expectations, and financial commitment, as well as the creation and empowerment of institutional actors independent from any one state, all occurring within the structure of an international organisation or polity. These separate definitions of international organisations and institutionalisation both encompass the EU and UN as international organisations, while recognizing the differing levels of institutionalisation between them.

1.3 Layout of the Thesis

The thesis will be divided into four chapters including a conclusion, following this introduction. The first section will describe the theoretical approach the thesis will utilise when examining the case study. The second will give an in-depth examination of literature relevant to small states in international systems, the European Union and small states with a section devoted specifically to Ireland, and small states' impact on international and EU security policy, again with a section that examines Ireland's efforts to influence European security policy. The third section will outline the methodology the thesis will employ to answer the aforementioned research question, discussing the research process, empirical data, and primary sources used to examine the question. The fourth section will then attempt to fully answer the research question using the methods and theories discussed in the prior research methodology section, examining primary and secondary sources to investigate the how Ireland has attempted to influence EU foreign and security policy and determining how Irish governments perceive the effectiveness of these efforts. This final section

---

[19] Volgy et. al., 2008, 839

will be followed by a conclusion chapter wrapping up the findings of the thesis and making concluding remarks based on the discoveries of the other chapters.

<u>Note on data and sources availability:</u>

The majority of this thesis was written during the period of restricted movement and closures of public spaces due to the global Covid-19 outbreak. While much data was gathered before the restrictions were put in place, availability of raw data, primary sources, and secondary sources was limited by library closures and limited movement. The thesis utilises what information was available, but certain sources, such as archival material, were extremely limited.

2. Theory

This chapter of the thesis will outline the theoretical approach to the research question **how do small states influence the European Union?** A predominantly institutionalist theoretical lens will be applied to the research question, accepting that international institutions occupy an important role in international relations and that these institutions are capable of operating independently of state governments and can substantially impact state behaviour[20]. This chapter will define the theoretical framework of the thesis through examining the conditions under which small states can influence international policymaking, and how they attempt to do so. The theoretical assumptions and methodology established in this chapter will inform the research of the following chapters.

2.1 Conditions for Influence

In realist power-based analyses, small states have negligible power to influence international policy, being little more than "bystanders," whose singular role in international relations is to provide legitimacy to great powers' actions through accepting or otherwise endorsing them[21]. However, even in power-based analysis small states have the potential to exercise influence beyond their assumed capability, based on the systemic conditions of the international environment, such as the polarity among large states, and the "tightness" of said polarity[22]. Small states are argued to be most influential, for example, when the large states in a bipolar system are in close competition for power, and thus even minimal increases in power that small state allegiance can provide are highly sought after[23].

Small states are also particularly influential in highly-institutionalised environments with established rules-based negotiations that narrow the power gap between small and large actors[24]. As discussed in the introduction chapter, institutionalisation is defined, for the purposes of this thesis, as the level of convergence of norms, establishment of formal rules and obligations on member states, and the creation of institutional actors independent of any one state actor. Small states rarely have control over how these institutions are formed, thus limiting their interactions

---

[20] Ikenberry, 1998, p. 68
[21] Hopmann, 1996, 54
[22] Lindell & Persson, 1986
[23] ibid, 80-81
[24] Risse, 2000, 20

within frameworks originally intended to benefit large states[25]. However, it is possible for small states, through coalition building and other strategies, to be a driving force behind institution formation, as was the case with the formation of the International Criminal Court[26]. These same institutions can exercise independence from their creators after their formation, allowing the institution to ally with or otherwise assist small states to the detriment of larger states[27]. The European Commission is, as discussed in the literature review chapter below, a prominent example of this. Small states can exploit rules and obligations within international institutions to constrain large states' actions and punch above their weight[28]. A particularly strong example of institutional constraints on large powers is Ecuador's utilisation of World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules to abolish the EU's country-specific banana sales quotas and remain competitive in the international banana market[29]. This example also highlights how international institutions do not exist independent of each other. When the global system contains many overlapping institutions, small states may influence one institution, in which they hold little to no control, through another where they are more powerful. This point is particularly important for the research chapter of this thesis, which will examine how Ireland has attempted to influence EU policy on international peacekeeping and nuclear disarmament through its stronger position in the United Nations.

2.2 Legitimacy

Legitimacy also generates relevance and power for small states. Among institutions that rely on democratic norms for legitimacy, the "perception of legitimacy" among democratic publics is required for proper functioning of said institution[30]. Legitimacy affects institutions' ability to mobilise its members and prevent states from taking unilateral action outside the remit of the organisation. Low legitimacy also hinders institutions' norm generation and utilisation powers[31]. In institutions that rely on democratic norms for validity, international organisations attempt to gain legitimacy by encouraging representation of small states. The European Union, the association of states central to this thesis, occupies a complicated position in this framing as its

---

[25] Strand et.al, 2011
[26] Deitelhoff & Wallbott, 2012
[27] Menon, 2011, 86
[28] Zartman, 1985, 122
[29] Smith, 2006, 257-258
[30] Buchanan & Keohane, 2006, 216
[31] Tallberg & Zurn, 2019, 582

role as an international organisation or a federal-style polity in its own right has been the subject of intense debate among scholars[32]. However, whether it be a federalist polity or an international organisation à la the UN, discussions on the legitimacy of the EU tend to agree that the EU and its institutions derive much of their legitimacy from participation of member states and citizens in supranational initiatives[33]. This necessity for legitimacy allows space for small states to attempt to influence how the organisation they are members of works[34]. The EU's reliance on democratic representation for legitimacy provides a normative and legal environment that allows small states such as Ireland to leverage rules and legal obligations to affect the workings of the EU itself. The failed first Nice and Lisbon referendums are examples, albeit unintentional, of this requirement of democratic legitimacy.

2.3 Security

Security, the policy area this thesis is examining, is a particularly difficult for small states to exert influence, due to their marginalisation in military alliances such as NATO and growing informal cooperation between large states on security issues after the end of the Cold War, on top of the fundamental material asymmetry between large and small state actors[35]. The concept of security has, however, become increasingly complex over time. The increasing importance of peacekeeping and the institutional environment of the UN through which most peacekeeping missions are mandated has made contemporary security issues more multifaceted than conventional defence and warfare[36], allowing space for small states to exert influence over security policy through legal argumentation, norm entrepreneurship, and technical expertise[37].

2.4 Overview of Theory

To tie these strands of discussion closer together, small states have the potential to exert influence on international organisations and institutions in order to affect international policy, and are not solely "bystanders" in a large state dominated system. Small states utilise various strategies and behaviours to make up for structural disadvantages such as limited access to material resources.

---

[32] Pollack, 2005, Schmidt, 2004, 976
[33] Schmidt, 2013, Føllesdal, 1998, 35-36, Pérez de las Heras, 2016
[34] Corbett et.al., 2018, 198
[35] Thorhallsson & Wivel, 2006, 659
[36] Wivel et.al., 2014, 18
[37] Thorhallsson, 2012 152, Gashi, 2016, 153

The effectiveness of these strategies necessarily depends on the nature of the system the small state exists within, being least effective to the point of powerlessness in a unipolar hegemonic system[38]. Multipolar institutional systems with a highly developed array of legal rules and democratic norms are among the most beneficial to small state influence, the EU showing many of those characteristics across different policy areas[39]. Small states' power should not be overstated, however. Power asymmetry exists even in rules-heavy environments and the expression of small state influence is limited[40].

As discussed in the introduction chapter, empirically measuring influence is markedly difficult due to the scarcity of acceptable definitive sources. However, perceptions of influence among certain demographics affords researchers a compelling alternative, one much more qualitatively measurable through methods such as discourse and content analysis[41]. Due to the high-politics nature of security policy[42] and state-level theory being utilised, elite perceptions, particularly those of government representatives such as the Minister for Foreign Affairs, will be the primary unit of analysis in this thesis. This unit will provide a better picture of how the Irish government and state apparatus views its influence over the EU as it is primarily represented by these agents. Non-elite perceptions are also important, especially in regard to Irish neutrality and the principles gap between Irish elites and non-elites, but these are beyond the scope of this thesis.

The next chapter of the thesis will review the relevant literature to the research question at hand. Having demonstrated that small states are indeed capable of influencing international organisations, and that the EU provides a relatively favourable environment for small states to operate in, the literature review will examine how scholars have studied small states' attempts to influence the EU. In preparation for the research chapter, the review will devote explicit attention to Ireland, alongside the more general EU-wide analysis.

---

[38] Lindell & Persson, 1986, 81
[39] Weiss, 2020, 1, 2, Neyer, 2010, 905
[40] Corbett et.al., 2018, 199
[41] Risso, 2014, 9,10, 17, 253-255
[42] Larivé, 2014, 18

3. Literature Review

There is a large body of literature investigating how small states interact with the European Union in foreign and security policymaking, in particular examining how relevant small states are to international policy formation. Small states in the European Union, according to realist scholars, have little choice but to follow the wishes of the large member states due to their limited resources, similar to realist analyses of small states in the global environment[43]. However, other researchers have argued that small states can influence supranational policy under certain conditions through adopting strategies and behaviours than can overcome their structural weaknesses[44]. Ireland, being commonly categorised as a small state within the EU, suffers from these disadvantages while at the same time possessing avenues to influence the Union.

This chapter will review and discuss the state of the scholarship on small states within the European Union. The literature relevant to Ireland and its attempts to influence EU policy areas such as security will also be examined alongside the more general discussion. Initially, discussions on the role of small states within EU policymaking will be investigated, with a focus on the relevance or irrelevance of small states to European policy formation and implementation. The review will then examine the literature surrounding Ireland's role in the EU more specifically, and how scholars have characterised the expression of influence between Ireland and the Union. Finally, the findings from these sections will be compared to scholarship on Ireland's attempts to influence EU security policy specifically, linking the full breadth of the scholarship to the research question of this thesis. The passages below will outline the approach to each section of the review in more detail, and describe how the review will link the discussions together.

Small States and the European Union

The first section of the review will examine the debate between scholars on the relevance of small states to policymaking in the European Union. This section will establish scholars' expectations of small state performance and how effective they are at influencing EU policy. This section will focus on the debate over the relevance of small states within the EU, in particular examining how

---

[43] Nasra, 2011, 164, Hopmann, 1996, 54
[44] Panke, 2011, 125, 130, 135

scholars prove small states' relevance or irrelevance to EU policymaking. From this debate an "EU average" of how the small member states of the EU as a whole have performed apropos influencing the EU, can be constructed. This section will be looking in particular for specific methods small states use to influence the Union. Ireland's own experience within the EU can then be compared to this "average" in order to provide a context in which Ireland's interactions with the Union can examined more thoroughly. The "average" fashioned from the scholarly debate in this section will assist in determining whether Ireland's experience is similar to the rest of the EU small states or abnormal.

Ireland and the European Union

The second section of this review will take the "EU average" built from the scholarly debates of the previous section and examine scholars' evaluation of Ireland's experience in depth. This segment of the literature review will examine how scholars have assessed Ireland's interactions with the European Union, and how influence has flowed between the two actors. As with the previous section, specific methods of influence will be prioritised to remain relevant to the research question. Scholarly debates on Ireland's relevance to EU policy formation in general will be examined to gauge whether the Ireland-specific literature follows or diverges from the wider scholarship on small EU states. From this section of the review a picture of how scholars believe Ireland operates within the European Union in general can be constructed. This will then be utilised alongside the "EU average" in the final section to examine the differences and similarities between the three levels of analysis.

Ireland and EU Security Policy

The final section of the literature review will utilise the findings of the previous analyses to examine how scholars have written about Ireland's attempts to influence the European Union's security policy. This analysis is most relevant to the research question of this essay and examining the literature here will provide important information to the research chapter, for example which methods scholars have identified Ireland using in its attempts to influence EU security policy. The "EU average" and Ireland's overall experience with the EU as examined in the previous sections will remain relevant in this section. These will be assessed to determine whether appraisals of Ireland's experience with EU security policy formation and implementation matches with or

diverges from Ireland's typical interactions with the EU, as well as small states' influence with the EU in general.

From these three discussions, a comprehensive analysis of how scholars have discussed small state influence within the EU, and Ireland's case-specific involvement in EU policymaking, can be constructed. The conclusions found in this chapter will then inform the approach to later chapters, such as identifying certain influencing strategies that scholars highlight here as particularly common or effective. The findings of this chapter will also be discussed alongside the results of the research chapter to establish whether the case-study has diverged or matched expected outcomes found in this chapter in the final conclusion of the thesis.

3.1 Small States and the European Union

Following the EU enlargements of 1995 and 2004 there has been much written on how the European Union will develop in the future. The composition of the EU changed after 2004 to contain a majority of small states, with larger member states now outnumbered. Much of the discussion among scholars has been on the implications of this numerical imbalance for the EU institutions. These analyses primarily focus on the division of institutional power such as the changes to voting in the EU council of ministers after the Nice and Lisbon treaties[45]. However, the enlargements and subsequent treaties have also prompted renewed interest in small member states, which has produced a wide range of literature discussing and investigating how these states operate within the increasingly institutionalised framework of the EU.

A fundamental question linked to small states in international systems is whether these states possess the capabilities to influence developments beyond their borders. In the case of small states and the EU, much of the literature takes a tempered institutionalist view of this question, arguing that the EU's rules and shared norms provide small states with the opportunity to effectively affect supranational policy[46]. The small state majority after the enlargements has altered the behaviour of the EU to reflect small states' preferences, such as increasingly liberalised foreign

---

[45] Moberg, 2002, Kóczy, 2011, Kirsch & Langner, 2011
[46] Ingebritsen, 2002

trade policy[47], supporting the claim that the environment of the EU is beneficial to small states[48]. This matches other institutionalist conclusions on small states within international systems, where formal rules and norms allow small states to utilise legal and normative arguments to pursue their agendas[49] as well as narrowing the power gap between large and small states[50]. There is a small number of scholars who argue that small states have little to no impact on the European Union, arguing that large state coalitions such as the Quint[51] tend to dominate EU policy formation, particularly in the fields of security and foreign policy[52]. These more pessimistic conclusions have had a noticeable impact on the development of the field, as later scholars acknowledge the limitations of small state influence, as will be discussed below.

Claims that small states can influence EU policy are moderated by repeated references to structural disadvantages that small member states are subject to[53]. While these disadvantages are varied, from military weakness to economic vulnerability[54], two in particular stand out in the scholarship: lack of material resources such as funding for diplomatic initiatives, and limited availability of expert personnel to help form informed policy positions. The material resources disadvantage lies at the heart of the power asymmetry between small states and large states, and the institutionalised environment of the EU cannot fully erase it. Funding and military capacity limitations appear frequently in the scholarship on small states, cementing scholarship's view of its role as a principle constraint on small states[55]. Scholars also assert that small states are at a disadvantage when influencing policy due to limited numbers of negotiators and officials through which they can attempt to upload their agenda[56], leading them to rely on external sources of expertise such as the European Commission[57]. The EU policymaking environment privileges

---

[47] Lee, 2004, 27
[48] Ingebritsen, 2004, 372, 374
[49] Jargalsaikhan, 2018, 432, 433
[50] Urbelis, 2015, 62
[51] France, Germany, Britain, Italy, and outsider state the US
[52] Hill, 2004, 152, Gegout, 2002
[53] Thorhallsson, 2015, McIver, 2014, Panke, 2011, 135
[54] Thorhallsson et. al, 2018, 26-35
[55] Bailes & Thorhallsson, 2013, 104, Alesina & Spolaore, 2003, Grøn, 2014, 3
[56] Panke, 2012, 136
[57] Bunse et.al, 2005, 13

expertise and knowledge-based argumentation[58], meaning this disadvantage is particularly restrictive for small states.

Acknowledgement of these limitations is central to how the scholarship has approached the topic of small states in the European Union. Scholars closely examine behaviours and strategies exhibited by small state governments aimed at overcoming or bypassing the myriad disadvantages they suffer from. These strategies vary from building coalitions with like-minded allies[59] to prioritisation of key foreign policy issues[60]. Social and discursive strategies are employed by small states to surmount material disadvantages, such as leveraging "forerunner" reputation – reputation built through engagement with a particular issue over time or through norm entrepreneurship[61] - and strength of commitment to a particular policy[62]. These reputational strategies are strongly linked by scholars to the position of President of the Council of the European Union, which the literature identifies as a very important vector for small state influence[63]. Case-studies of small state influence tend to focus primarily on the rich Northern member-states and how they successfully utilise their expertise and reputation to upload national policy to the EU, such as Sweden[64] and Belgium[65]. Less affluent member-state case studies have more mixed conclusions, as in the case of the Czech Republic[66]. That being said, the differences between success and failure depend on criteria which may not be entirely consistent across scholars. The Czech Republic's "failure" is described by the author to be related more to the Czech government's employment of influencing strategies rather than any resource limitation unique to the Czech Republic[67]. This inefficient use of strategy contrasts with Sweden and Belgium's more proficient manoeuvres, possibly due to more familiarity with EU rules and norms.

Overall, scholars are confident that small states are very relevant in EU policy formation, despite structural disadvantages that complicate their influencing processes. The literature focuses

---

[58] Risse & Kleine, 2010, 712-714, Jakobsen, 2009, 86
[59] Hey, 2003, 5
[60] Panke, 2010, 803, Thorhallsson & Wivel, 2006, 659
[61] Jakobsen, 2009, 86-87
[62] Nasra, 2011, 167
[63] Thorhallsson & Wivel, 2006, 663, Panke 2010, 804, Magnúsdóttir & Thorhallsson 2011, 217
[64] Kronsell, 2002
[65] Nasra, 2011
[66] Weiss, 2016
[67] ibid, 72

heavily on identifying obstacles that lessen or hinder small states' impact on EU policy, and examining the methods these states use to overcome said obstacles. From this, the "EU average" established in the scholarship can be constructed as follows: Small states within the EU suffer from disadvantages in influencing EU policy. These disadvantages primarily stem from a lack of both material resources in the form of funding, and limited access to personnel and knowledgeable experts, limiting argumentation effectiveness. These disadvantages can be overcome through employment of strategies and such as coalition building, prioritisation and rationing of existing resources, as well as building reputations as an expert in a specific policy area or as an "honest broker" in multilateral negotiations. The Presidency of the European Council of Ministers features prominently as a fulcrum through which small states can exert influence. The next section will examine how scholars have written on Ireland's experience within the European Union, and determine whether this facet of the scholarship matches or contradicts the reference point of the average small EU member state above.

3.2 Ireland and the European Union

Ireland is firmly placed among the ranks of the small EU member states by supranational-level scholars, with the sole caveat attached to this categorisation being a hesitation to settle on a specific definition of "smallness," as discussed in the introduction chapter[68]. Ireland-specific literature tends to agree fully with this assessment[69]. Much of literature on Ireland's interaction with the European Union examines the flow of influence in a downwards trajectory, in which Irish policy is "Europeanised": a process through which national policy adapts to and converges with the supranational common policy of the EU[70]. Scholars discussing this primarily unidirectional flow of influence do acknowledge the potential for Ireland to influence the EU, noting manoeuvres from Irish civil society to lobby EU institutions in Brussels[71] and potential in Irish government's diplomatic capabilities to upload national policy to the Union[72], however these acknowledgements are brief and are secondary to the discussion on Europeanisation of Irish policy. Other scholars

---

[68] Mawdsley, 2008, Lee, 2004, Bailes & Thorhallsson, 2013, Panke, 2010 as a small selection of examples
[69] Rees, 2009, 168, Devine, 2009, Tonra, 2001, Laffan, 2014, again, a small selection among many other examples
[70] Bulmer & Radaelli, 2004, 4, McCall & Wilson, 2010
[71] Quinn & Connaughton 2009, 49, 50
[72] Adshead, 2013, 417

examine this flow of influence in more depth, attempting to identify how relevant Ireland is to European policy formation and how it pursues relevance.

The scholarship on Ireland characterises Irish influence on the international stage as pragmatic and centred around reputational soft-power, and heavily affected by perceptions of economic prosperity. Ireland's marginal status "on all dimensions relevant to geopolitics" in Europe is rather explicitly noted prior to the economic boom of the Celtic Tiger[73]. That said, even during this period of apparent irrelevance patterns of influence do begin to emerge, where membership in the European Communities is argued to "provide Ireland with a voice in the shaping of its external environment and in influencing policy in a way which took account of its interests" through an exchange of sovereignty for diplomatic influence within the supranational institutions of the EU[74]. After the boom the awareness of economic limits on Ireland's influence persisted, particularly after the 2008 financial crisis in which Ireland's reputation as a prosperous nation was damaged[75]. Reputation-building stands out as a particularly important method of influence in the literature. Ireland relies heavily on its image of being a "good European" committed to integration and fulfilling obligations to the EU, and being seen as an honest-broker in order to pursue its national agenda in the Union.

Ireland's commitment to multilateral structures such as the EU is one of the principle methods through which it attempts to influence those same structures[76]. Engagement with EU initiatives is pursued for pragmatic reputation building – and thus, influence building - reasons over any "political or ideological commitment" to the EU[77]. A pertinent example of Ireland pursuing influence through commitment to EU procedure is the Irish utilisation of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers. The Presidency, as discussed above, is a significant avenue through which small states can influence the Union, and officials assign great importance to Ireland's presidential terms as opportunities to punch above its weight[78]. Ireland's 2004 presidential term

---

[73] McSweeney, 1988, 49, Matthews, 1985, 141
[74] McAleese & Matthews, 1987, 44, Fogarty, 1986
[75] Laffan, 2014, 90
[76] Kevany & Brugha, 2015, 210
[77] Tonra, 2002, 201
[78] Kassim, 2003, 95

gained the state a large amount of good faith among its peers for its flexibility in negotiations[79]. Scholars qualify the Irish presidency as a success in comparison to its predecessor Italian presidency, which damaged Italy's reputation[80]. Thus, the importance of the presidency is closely linked to reputation in Ireland's case for influencing the EU. Other methods of influence are briefly examined in the literature, such as a long-term bilateral coalition with the UK in the council of ministers[81], argumentation and negotiation within EU institutions[82], as well as cultural influence through sport and the Irish diaspora in Europe[83]. These methods do not appear in the scholarship nearly as often as the reputational- and presidency-related methods discussed above, however.

The scholarship discussing Ireland's overall attempts to influence the EU matches closely to the "EU average" discussed in the previous section. Ireland is one of the primary examples of a small state utilised in EU-level literature and national-level scholars overwhelmingly agree with the categorisation, debates about the definition of "smallness" notwithstanding. Irish scholars do not explicitly mention the disadvantages that Ireland suffers from, however economic limitations as a limiting factor does appear often in the literature, matching one major aspect of the EU baseline in part. Ireland, like the EU average, employs different strategies to overcome the disadvantages it suffers from, however it overwhelmingly relies on leveraging its reputation as a neutral arbiter, with scholars identifying its 2004 tenure as president of the EU Council of Ministers as a particularly strong example of successful leverage.

3.3 Ireland and EU Security Strategy

Discussions on Ireland's interaction with the European Union on security issues is dominated by Irish neutrality. Much of the relevant literature focuses on the effect of Europeanisation of security policy on the principle of Irish neutrality[84], with scholars arguing that the principle has been "whittled down" into near irrelevance through Ireland's engagement with EU security initiatives[85]. This "whittling down" of Irish neutrality is debated however, as others

---

[79] Gwiazda, 2006, 132-134
[80] Quaglia & Moxon-Browne, 2006, 364
[81] Rees & O'Brennan, 2019, 604
[82] Panke, 2011
[83] McCall & Wilson, 2010, 230
[84] Keohane, 2013, Menon, 2009
[85] Devine, 2011

argue that Irish elite's historically pragmatic interpretation of neutrality has remained consistent since the 1970's, while acknowledging the gap between elite's pragmatic interpretations and the more committed position of the general populace[86].

Ireland's engagement with EU security structures and pragmatic approach to neutrality, at least among elites, matches with the methods employed by Ireland discussed above, relying on building an image of being a good integrator and remaining at the centre of developing international institutions such as the CSDP[87]. Indeed, the Irish government has been criticised by scholars for its adoption of the "triple lock" system, in which Ireland may contribute personnel only to EU mission with UN mandates. This requirement risks Ireland getting "side-lined" in implementation of EU security policy through non-engagement [88]. Much of the literature examining specific influencing strategies utilised by Ireland are more general examinations of small states within the EU, in which Ireland is one part of a larger dataset[89]. There are some discussions of specific strategies such as coalition-making with other neutrals, particularly the Nordic countries, and the UK[90]. However, scholarship tends not to closely investigate how Ireland uses these strategies to influence the EU, preferring instead to discuss how Ireland attains influence rather than how it uses said influence.

Overall, there is little literature directly examining Irish attempts to influence EU security policy. The literature that does exist, however, matches closely with the conclusions of the other sections. Ireland's military weakness is not explicitly mentioned by scholars but its classification as a small state implies this disadvantage is common knowledge. Ireland relies on leveraging its reputation and the perception of expertise as well as deep engagement with integration, similar to the findings of the second section. The only major departure being that the Presidency rarely features in the literature in regard to Ireland's influence on EU security policy, with reputation as a "good European" being the primary avenue of influence available to Ireland. Irish influence on EU security policy still aligns with the "EU average" and Ireland's overall interaction with the EU.

---

[86] Beyer & Hofmann, 2011, 302, 303
[87] Oireachtas, 2008, 394
[88] Murphy, 2005, 123, 138
[89] Panke, 2010, Meerts, 1994
[90] Rees, 2009, 184, Finn, 2005, 459

The role of the Presidency is however more minor, with reputation being the primary vector of influence.

While the overall literature does investigate Ireland's impact on EU policy, the majority of the scholarship focuses on how Europeanisation affects Irish policy, from the top-down. There is some discussion on Ireland's attempts to influence EU policy, however much of it revolves around how Ireland acquires and maintains influence. Scholars concentrate on this accumulation of influence over how Ireland utilises it to achieve its foreign policy goals. From comparing the three levels of analysis it is clear that Ireland mostly follows expected patterns of behaviour established in the "EU average," aside from much less reliance on the position of the presidency when influencing security policy.

A major aspect missing from the scholarship is examinations placing the EU within the international institutional environment. As established in the theory chapter, the EU exists within a wider global context that small states can leverage to influence it. This is absent in the literature examined, however. The majority of the scholarship discusses the EU and small states in isolation from the wider global context, which neglects a major aspect of the interaction between small states and the Union. This context is especially important for Ireland due to its long term commitment to the United Nations international security structure. Ireland's global reputation built from contributing to many peacekeeping missions, as discussed in the introduction, alongside its increasing engagement with EU security initiatives such as the CSDP warrants investigation into how a small state like Ireland can exert influence on the EU through the UN, a major element of the international institutional environment.

With this limitation of the literature in mind, the research chapter of this thesis will place Ireland's efforts to influence EU security policy in the global context by including the United Nations in the flow of influence between the two actors. The next chapter will establish the methodology to be utilised in the research chapter, building on the findings of this literature review and the previous theory chapter.

4. Methodology

This chapter will outline the methodology utilised to examine the case study of the thesis, Irish influence on EU foreign and security policy. As noted in the literature review, Ireland is a small state within the European Union and thus suffers from structural and material disadvantages that limit its influence on the EU. Ireland employs strategies and behaviours designed to overcome these limits and exert influence on EU policy formation and implementation. To examine how Ireland influences the EU, the research chapter will employ small-n process tracing to investigate two of Ireland's primary foreign and security policies: international peacekeeping and nuclear disarmament. Ireland, being active at the UN and EU levels, provides a suitable example state through which to examine how small state influence can be transmitted between the two organisations, as discussed in the previous chapters.

This thesis will investigate a single country case study to answer the research question posed. Focusing on a single country will allow the investigation to employ process tracing more effectively through examining the case study in depth, as depth and nuance can be lost in large-N analyses studying multiple states and policies. Alongside this, available evidence is limited due to the travel restrictions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, thus a narrower, more in-depth examination of a single actor should bear more evidential fruit than a broad multi-state study.

4.1 Ireland as Case Study

Ireland is chosen as the thesis's subject due to consensus among scholars of its smallness, as discussed in the literature review, and its high level of activity at the EU[91] and UN levels[92]. The scholarly consensus on Ireland's categorisation as a small state, discussions on the definition of smallness aside, allows for the thesis to devote more time to answering the research question directly over demonstrating how Ireland fits said categorisation, as this has been proven by many other scholars already. Ireland's high activity levels at both the EU and UN levels will ensure large amounts of primary and secondary evidence with which to trace how Ireland has attempted to influence the EU. Ireland's close alignment with the average small state experience in the EU, as

---

[91] Panke, 2010, Quaglia, 2006
[92] Dorr, 1996, Brown, 2006

discussed in the literature review, also makes it a suitable example for studying how small states in general can influence the EU through other international organisations.

4.2 Policy Area Cases

The policy issues to be investigated in the research chapter are international peacekeeping and nuclear weapons disarmament and non-proliferation. Similar to the above rationale on examining Ireland alone, a small-n analysis of a limited number of policies allows for more depth in the investigation that would be lost if every facet of Irish policy were included. Both issues exist within highly institutionalised international environments. "Legitimate" peacekeeping remains primarily within the remit of the United Nations with regional organisations such as the EU seeking authorisation for missions from the UN Security Council[93]. The international nuclear non-proliferation regime, to which the EU subscribes, is similarly highly-institutionalised and set within a wide framework of treaties that impose obligations and restrictions on states, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and institutions like the International Atomic Energy Agency[94]. These environments, as discussed in the earlier chapters, are beneficial to small states and thus should frame noteworthy interactions between the small state Ireland and the EU. Alongside this, these issues feature prominently in Ireland's foreign and security policy, being major international diplomacy priorities for the Irish government[95].

4.3 Research Process

The research section will utilise process tracing to determine how Ireland has attempted to influence the EU through a step-by-step investigation, beginning with the history of Irish policy and concluding with how Irish attempts to influence the EU manifested in policy changes or implementation. Emphasis will be placed on clearly describing the phenomena present at each step of the sequence to provide greater clarity and understanding when examining how they intersect[96], namely the policy positions of Ireland and the EU, the expression of Irish influence at the UN and the EU, and the transmission of UN level influence to the EU level.

---

[93] Yamashita, 2012, 169, Petrov, 2007
[94] Malik, 2000, 445, 446, Goldschmidt, 2008
[95] Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2017, Costello, 2014, Ishizuka, 2013, 11-14, Department of Defence, 2015
[96] Mahoney, 2010, 125-131

The opening step of this process will explore how Irish policy developed over time and why it developed along the lines it did in order to trace the historical course Ireland took on the issue at hand. How Ireland pursued this policy at the United Nations level will then be discussed, investigating the influencing strategies Ireland employed at the UN and how this links to the historical course examined in the first step. Subsequently the progression of Irish policy will be placed alongside the EU context by examining how the European Union's own policy on the selected issues evolved over time. The chapter will then examine how the pursuit of Ireland's agenda at the UN level impacted EU policy formation and implementation.

The research chapter will utilise the process tracing methodology outlined above to examine the cases discussed. Through these, the research chapter will seek to determine how Irish policy on peacekeeping and nuclear non-proliferation has evolved, and how Ireland has influenced the EU through UN-level influence. What these findings can reveal about how small states in general influence the European Union in the institutionalised international environment will also be briefly discussed.

5. Research and Analysis

This chapter will utilise the theory and methodology discussed in the previous chapters to answer the question ***how do small states influence the European Union?***. This chapter will examine Ireland's attempts to influence the European Union's security policy formation and implementation. As the methodology chapter outlined, this will be achieved through small-n process tracing examination of a pair security issues the Irish government recognises as major foreign policy priorities. This chapter will examine each issue separately to determine the methods the Irish state employs to influence the EU's policy formation and implementation on these two issues. This chapter will first examine how Ireland has built a reputation for commitment to peacekeeping and how this reputation has allowed it to attain leadership positions for Irish citizens in EU missions. Following this, this chapter will then examine indirect Irish influence on EU nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament through UN-level negotiations. As outlined in the previous chapters, this analysis will examine the methods through which Ireland has attempted to influence the European Union as well as how Irish elites, particularly government ministers, have perceived the effectiveness of the Irish government's efforts.

5.1 EU Peacekeeping Missions

This first section will examine how Ireland's peacekeeping-related reputation at the UN allowed it to attain positions of leadership in relevant institutions and missions in the EU, and so allowed Ireland to influence the implementation of policy on the ground.

Ireland has a history of vulnerability to external invasion and existing in a negative security environment, being long regarded as a strategically important area to British officials for centuries[97]. This external risk fell significantly after the end of the Second World War as Ireland's strategic importance became negligible for the majority of the Cold War, accentuated by successive Irish governments' adherence to military neutrality and remaining out of military alliances such as NATO[98]. During the Cold War, Ireland generally enjoyed a relatively non-

---

[97] O'Grady, 1990, 7-9
[98] ibid, 10-13

threatening external security environment, with the primary security threat being the risk of terrorism during the Northern Irish Troubles. This trend continued after the Cold War, as today Ireland exists in a relatively low-risk external security environment with little threat of external attacks on the island itself, particularly after the end of the Troubles in Northern Ireland in the 1990s. The Irish Department of Defence's assessment of external security threats in 2000 stressed that there was "virtually no risk of externally instigated conflict in our immediate region"[99]. The department came to similar conclusions in an assessment fifteen years later[100].

This non-threatening security environment has prompted Ireland to focus its foreign and security policy on international peacekeeping through the United Nations, which has been a core tenet of Irish foreign policy since its accession to the UN[101]. The long-term engagement with UN peacekeeping missions has enabled Ireland to build a reputation of expertise in peacekeeping at the international level. Through this influence Ireland has influenced the UN by utilising its expertise and being called upon to lead UN peacekeeping operations[102]. The successful campaign for the non-permanent seat of the UN Security Council during the 2001-2002 term, for example, heavily referenced Ireland's track record in peacekeeping[103]. Alongside this, the Department of Defence asserts that the appointment of individual Irish officers to senior positions in UN missions can be an avenue through which Ireland can exert "influence [on] the conduct of a number of critical peace support missions"[104]. This assertion is supported by scholarly research that claims states, both large and small, can influence international organisations and institutions through appointment of individual citizens to leadership positions[105]. As will be discussed below, this reputation is not limited to the United Nations, as the emergence of a peacekeeping-centric EU security paradigm has enabled Ireland to employ its UN-built reputation in the European Union to attain similar leadership positions.

The current conceptualisation and implementation of EU security policy provides Ireland with many opportunities to draw on its UN reputation. EU security policy, while historically ad-

---

[99] Defence, 2000, 12, 13
[100] Defence, 2015, 17-19
[101] Murphy, 1998, 22
[102] Ishizuka, 2004, 42, 187, 189
[103] Gillisen, 2006, 31
[104] Defence, 2000, 61
[105] Kaarbo & Kenealy, 2017, 36, Tarp & Hansen, 2013, 21

hoc, has coalesced around peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and crisis response over traditional military priorities, taking a similar role to the UN rather than attempting to replace the more traditional NATO military alliance[106]. Thus, European security has, for the most part, evolved in a manner that benefits Ireland's own UN-based international peacekeeping foreign policy. The EU conducted 23 foreign operations in the period between 2003 and 2009, 15 of which took place in conjunction with United Nations missions[107]. The trend in UN approved operations is, according to Tánaiste Eamon Gilmore, "entirely consistent with Ireland's values and interests, including the primacy of the United Nations"[108]. This consistency has been perceived by Irish elites to allow Ireland to participate in UN-backed CSDP missions such as those in Mali[109] and Chad[110] without infringing on Ireland's neutrality[111]. The ESDP and later the CSDP have from the outset established their role in crisis management and international peacekeeping "within the principles of the United Nations Charter"[112], leaving traditional territorial defence within the purview of NATO and the individual member states[113].

Historically, non-membership of military alliances such as the Western European Union[114] and NATO[115] has been a major tenet of Irish foreign policy, dating back to the Second World War. The Irish government perceives this policy as intrinsically linked to its peacekeeping agenda by enhancing its honest-broker reputation and creating distance between it and Europe's colonial past[116]. Successive Irish governments have engaged with European security initiatives, particularly within the last 30 years and the development of common security positions through the ESDP and CSDP[117], arguing that these initiatives do not infringe upon Ireland's neutrality and are an "important element of Ireland's capacity to influence events."[118]. Foreign ministers consistently claim that Irish participation in EU security and foreign policy allows the government to "put

---

[106] Rees, 2009, 174

[107] Gowan, 2009, 117

[108] Gilmore, 2011

[109] Council Decision 2013/34/CFSP

[110] Council Decision 2008/101/CFSP

[111] Kehoe, 2017, Sherlock, 2015

[112] European Union, 2003a, European Union, 2008, article 42.1, 42.2

[113] Perruche, 2011, 1-2

[114] Devine, 2015 9, 10

[115]Keohane, 2013, 181, 182

[116] Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2017

[117] Devine, 2009, 486, 487

[118] White Paper on Defence, 2000, 20

emphasis on the primary role of the United Nations" in international security, one example being the negotiations over Cyprus in the 2000s[119].

This participatory approach to European security mirrors Ireland's reputation-building involved strategy at the United Nations discussed above. The primacy of UN authority in EU common security has allowed Ireland to leverage its UN peacekeeping reputation within the EU sphere and pursue methods of influencing implementation of EU policy, such as attaining leadership positions in EU peacekeeping missions. Irish military officers have held senior positions in major EU operations, with two officers holding key stations in the training mission to Somalia, EUTM Somalia[120], as well as a Defence Forces officer commanding the EU intervention in Chad and the Central African Republic, EUFOR Tchad/RCA[121]. Irish government officials perceive these appointments as a result of the reputation Ireland has built up within both the UN and the EU. Minister for Defence Shatter claimed in 2011 that the appointment of an Irish officer to lead EUTM Somalia was a "clear illustration of the high esteem with which the Defence Forces are held at the United Nations level"[122], while the appointed commander for EUFOR Tchad/RCA maintained his appointment was due to Ireland's reputation as an honest-broker alongside the country's history of peacekeeping[123].

This approach does have long-term implications for Ireland's ability to employ this strategy, however. The Irish government's policy of engagement with the development of EU security policy has produced a debate on the nature of Irish neutrality, creating tensions within Irish society that has had palpable effects on wider EU integration through the Nice and Lisbon referendums[124]. This form of neutrality may be damaging to Ireland's influence in the long term, with EU operations being vulnerable to the political interests of member states. Operation Artemis in the Congo is one case cited by scholars critical of Ireland's participatory strategy, as France, the primary diver of the mission, had geopolitical interests in encouraging an EU military operation independent from NATO in the region[125]. Ireland risks sabotaging its reputation as a neutral

---

[119] Cowen, 2003a, Ahern, 2007
[120] *MerrionStreet.ie,* 2011, EU, Council Decision 2013/44/CFSP
[121] EUFOR Tchad/RCA Factsheet, 2009
[122] Shatter, 2011
[123] RTE, 2007
[124] Tonra, 2006, 187, 191 & Brugha, 2008, 306, 307
[125] Ulriksen et.al, 2007, 513

arbitrator and peacekeeper, and thus its influence, on the global stage by participating in interests-motivated CSDP military missions[126].

Irish officials note the country's reputation at the UN and EU quite often[127]. Alongside these appointments the Irish government has sought out other high-level positions for Irish citizens in the CSDP structure, such as the Chair of the European Union Military Committee, in order to influence the EU by "reinforc[ing] the existing strategic relationship between the EU and the UN," according to Minister for State Paul Kehoe[128]. The resulting influence of these appointments primarily manifests in how EU missions are carried out, with Irish-trained officers in operational command on the ground. EUTM Somalia, initially commanded by two Irish officers in a row, has had a strong effect on the execution of EU missions, being utilised as a blueprint for future European training missions. According to the Secretary General of the Department of Defence this adoption was due to the mission's "outstanding success"[129]. Irish governments have applied the conclusions of the Department of Defence's in regard to leadership in UN missions allowing Ireland to influence the implementation and conduct of operations [130] to European Union peacekeeping efforts. Ireland pursues greater influence in these organisations through engaging with security initiatives in both and exploiting the overlapping reputation built through engagement, alongside encouraging greater alignment and cooperation between both organisations.

Ireland's attempts to influence the EU through leveraging its UN peacekeeping reputation reveals that these international organisations do not exist in isolation, and that a state's reputation in one can transmit to another. This can be particularly effective for small states such as Ireland through construction of a parallel "honest-broker" reputation which gives an image of impartiality[131], a reputation which large states such as France may struggle to build due to their relatively large influence on international affairs, especially in regard to Africa and the legacy of colonialism. The similarities between the EU and UN's international security agendas is beneficial to Ireland's own agenda and the above analysis shows Irish governments attempting to take advantage of this by leveraging Ireland's reputational overlap between the two, while at the same

---

[126] Devine, 2015, 12
[127] Coveney, 2007, Smith, 2001
[128] Kehoe, 2017
[129] Howard, 2013
[130] Defence, 2000, 61
[131] Quaglia & Moxon-Browne, 2006, 362

time pushing for closer alignment and cooperation. Ireland leveraged its presidency tenure of the Council of Ministers in 2004 to pursue greater cooperation between the EU and UN on peacekeeping issues, such as implementation of the EU-UN Joint Declaration on Co-operation in Crisis Management[132]. Institutional similarity thus also prompts small states to exert influence to further align organisations in order to maximise the transmissible reputational power they possess in both.

5.2 Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation

The European Union's common position on nuclear non-proliferation operates within the framework of the existing international non-proliferation structure, centred around the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This section will examine how Ireland, as a small state on both EU and UN levels, attempted to influence the EU from a "top-down" direction through pursuing adoption of stricter legislation on nuclear disarmament in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Ireland has a long history of pursuing nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation through the United Nations, beginning with the "Irish Resolutions" which formed the basis of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1961. Irish diplomacy was instrumental in the formation of the NPT throughout the 1960s[133]. Ireland maintained its position on nuclear disarmament separate from the emerging EU position through the 1980s, with all 27 of its diverging votes in the UN General Assembly being related to nuclear energy[134]. In more recent years, policies related to constraining nuclear energy and nuclear weapons through multilateral treaties such as a "comprehensive" nuclear test ban, appear in numerous Irish programmes for government, across different political parties[135]. Irish governments maintain this foreign policy stance due to a built up international reputation promoting disarmament as far back as the League of Nations[136], making a drastic alteration to its position difficult to orchestrate, as such a change would undermine Ireland's reputation and influence which are derived from this long-term commitment to disarmament.

---

[132] Cowen, 2004a, Cowen, 2004b
[133] O'Driscoll & Walsh, 2014, 6
[134] de Flers, 2012, 53, 54
[135] Government of Ireland, 1993, 23, Government of Ireland, 1994, 49, Government of Ireland, 2007, 78
[136] O'Driscoll & Walsh, 2014, 6, 7

Of particular importance to this analysis is Ireland's membership of the New Agenda Coalition (NAC)[137], a group of states that share policies on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and coordinate to upload these policies to international organisations such as the EU, primarily through demanding greater enforcement of anti-nuclear weapons treaties at the UN level[138]. The NAC was an Irish-led international coalition[139] that negotiated with nuclear weapons possessing states to develop the "13 Practical Steps" – a process through which nuclear weapons possessing states could disarm completely - prior to the NPT 2000 Review Conference[140], later successfully lobbying for their inclusion in the revised NPT[141]. The Irish government employed multilateral negotiation and argumentation alongside building a coalition of like-minded states to influence legislature on the UN level, and the inclusion of the 13 Steps is regarded by Irish officials as a significant milestone in the state's disarmament agenda[142].

Non-proliferation emerged as a common EU policy as early as the 1960s through the European Political Cooperation programme[143], and was further cemented prior to the 1995 NPT Review Conference, where the EU supported extending the treaty and called for member states to support extension[144]. The EU later adopted the NAC's 13 Steps initiative following the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT[145], after the UN lobbying by NAC members discussed above. The NPT, and by extension the 13 Steps process, has remained the "cornerstone" of the EU nuclear weapons policy throughout the 2000s[146]. That said, the implementation of the NPT stalled prior to the 2005 Review Conference due to opposition from large states in the form of France and the United States[147], a pertinent reminder that small state influence is limited when directly opposed by a large state. Irish officials' perception of the above efforts is coloured by the mired implementation of the Treaty obligations. While stressing Ireland's role at "the forefront" of the

---

[137] Formed of Ireland, Egypt, New Zealand, Brazil, Sweden, Mexico, and South Africa.
[138] Robson, 2000, 13
[139] Birchard, 1998
[140] Dhanapala & Rydell, 2005, 90-91
[141] Green, 2000, United Nations, 1998, A/RES/53/77, 31, United Nations, 2000, NTI, 2020
[142] Cowen, 2003b, Gilmore, 2012
[143] Grand, 2000, 6
[144] European Union, 1994
[145] Wouters, et.al, 2010, 181, 182
[146] European Union, 2003b, 6, European Union, 2010
[147] Wouters, et.al., 2010, 182

NAC in negotiations[148] the failure to implement much of the treaty requirements is a clear point of disappointment among elites[149].

The EU's adoption of the reviewed NPT containing the 13 steps further shows that the EU exists within an international institutional structure that allows small states to influence it from the "top-down." In this case Ireland's coalition forming and UN lobbying through the NAC led to the EU adopting the 13 steps after manoeuvres by the NAC on the UN level, and was successful in influencing EU policy as the EU had based its non-proliferation position on "downloading" policy from the UN through the NPT. This reveals, like the previous case, that the European Union does not exist in isolation in the international environment. Small states can exert influence over EU policy indirectly through other international organisations when the EU bases its position on developments in other organisations.

The final chapter will discuss the findings of the literature review and the research chapters in relation to the theory employed, summarising the results of the research and presenting conclusions in relation to the thesis's research question.

---

[148] Cowen, 2003c, Ahern, 2005
[149] Cowen, 2003d, Ahern, 2006, Higgins, 2008

6. Conclusions

This thesis sought to answer the research question ***how do small states influence the EU?*** To do so, it investigated how the Republic of Ireland attempted to influence the European Union's foreign and security policies, specifically peacekeeping and nuclear non-proliferation. The literature review chapter discovered that despite differing individual contexts, small states in the EU tend to experience similar structural disadvantages when attempting to influence EU policy, and that they adopt comparable behaviours to overcome these disadvantages. Ireland's experience matched closely with the overall EU "average," suffering from the same disadvantages as other small states and adopting similar behaviours to overcome them, with a heavy reliance on reputation as an avenue to influence the Union. An aspect found to have been overlooked, however, was the effect of other international organisations on the interaction between small states and the EU. The theory section supported the existence of this effect through the example of Ecuador influencing EU trade policy through the WTO. The research method and case study research chapters further revealed that Ireland has been capable of influencing the EU through the UN, a third party international organisation with strong links to both Ireland and the Union.

The research conducted above does have limitations. The narrow focus on Ireland and security policy provides analytical depth and nuance, however it loses the breadth offered by multistate and multipolicy investigations. The results attained from studying Ireland alone may not translate to other small EU states, particularly those not as active at the EU and UN. However, it does present a seldom explored avenue through which small states may attempt to influence the EU, and proves that this avenue is viable through Ireland's experience. As mentioned throughout the thesis, the global situation heavily restricted movement and access to evidence, particularly archival evidence. Thus, the research section relies more heavily on secondary sources than otherwise planned. Despite the restricted access to primary sources, a significant number of these sources were utilised in the research.

The research conducted in this thesis reveals that international organisations do not exist in isolation; they are present in a global context that includes other organisations. Existing scholarship understates this fact, examining small states in the EU in a vacuum. Ireland's influence on EU peacekeeping policy, as examined in this thesis, cannot be understood without looking at

its global level policy at the UN. Similar to Sweden and EU environmental policy[150], Ireland's exertion of influence over the implementation of EU peacekeeping operations depends entirely on its previous actions outside the EU. Reputation and expertise built in one international organisation pays dividends in another. Participation and commitment to security initiatives also contribute to building an EU level reputation, amassing in conjunction with standing at the UN level. Ireland's impact on EU disarmament policy also depended heavily on its actions "above" the EU, as well as the similarities in policy between the two organisations, as the EU adopted the UN-negotiated Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as the basis of its non-proliferation policy. Ireland was thus able to transmit the effects of its influence at the UN level, amassed through strategies such as coalition forming and argumentation, down to the EU. Thus, it is again evident that the Union doesn't exist in a vacuum, it is affected by developments in other organisations which small states can affect as seen in this case, another example being Ecuador impacting EU trade policy through the WTO.

Small states within – and outside of – the EU can exert influence over it through other organisations. How this is achieved matches with the rest of the literature through strategies and behaviours adopted to overcome material limitations, the effectiveness of which are dependent on the structure of the institutional environment. Ireland's influence on EU security is entirely soft-power based, its reputation and expertise as a peacekeeping contributor leading to Irish citizens being appointed to leadership positions in implementing EU policy through command of military operations. Argumentation and negotiation, alongside a strong reputation expertise in such matters, were the basis of Ireland's contribution to the EU's adoption of the 13 Practical Steps through the NPT. Ireland's material and hard-power weakness endemic among small states forces it to rely on these soft-power vectors of influence.

Thus, the thesis provides an answer for the research question ***how do small states influence the EU?*** Small states can influence the European Union despite suffering from structural disadvantages that constrain and limit their efforts. Small states primarily exert influence through soft-power means such as argumentation and negotiation, attaining leadership positions within the EU, and building a reputation for expertise on a given issue. An overlooked aspect of the interaction between small states and the EU is the multiplier effect other international organisations such as the United Nations can have on small state influence. In areas where EU and UN policy

---

[150] Kronsell, 2002

aligns or where the EU has accepted the primacy of UN authority, such as in peacekeeping and nuclear non-proliferation, small states can exert "top-down" influence on the EU through transmitting UN-level reputation and more active efforts such as arguing a position in multilateral negotiations. As demonstrated in the case study of Ireland, this multi-level expression of influence can have tangible impacts on the formation and implementation of EU policy, such as the adoption of the 13 Practical Steps on nuclear disarmament and directing the carrying out of EU foreign peacekeeping missions. These methods do have limitations and shortcomings, however. The soft-power nature of small state influence means it is vulnerable to large state interference, as evidenced by the stalled implementation of the NPT due to opposition from the United States and France. Exerting influence over the implementation of policy is likewise no protection from changes in the policy itself, as Ireland's strategy of full engagement with the CSDP leaves it vulnerable to violating its neutrality, particularly if the CSDP moves towards forming a traditional military alliance along the lines of NATO.

Bibliography

Irish Government Sources and Publications

-Ahern, D. (2005). Written Answers – Nuclear Non-Proliferation. *Dáil Éireann Debate 599(2) 8 March 2005.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2005-03-08/30/#s95 accessed 20th May 2020.

-Ahern, D. (2006). Written Answers – Nuclear Programmes. *Dáil Éireann Debate 615(2) 22 February 2006.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2006-02-22/49/#s66 accessed 19th May 2020.

-Ahern, D. (2007). Written Answers – Foreign Conflicts. *Dáil Éireann Debate 642(3), 27 November 2007.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2007-11-27/speech/677/ accessed 3rd June 2020.

-Costello, J., TD. (2014). Opening Address at the Symposium on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 25*, 9-12.

-Cowen, B. (2003a). Written Answers – European Security and Defence Policy. *Dáil Éireann Debate 563(1), 11 March 2003.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2003-03-11/speech/742/ accessed 3rd June 2020.

-Cowen, B. (2003b). Written Answers – Nuclear Disarmament Initiative. *Dáil Éireann Debate 574(3), 13 November 2003.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2003-11-13/speech/320/ accessed 7th June 2020.

-Cowen, B. (2003c) Written Answers – Nuclear Weapons. *Dail Eireann Debate 562(5) 5 March 2003.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2003-03-05/61/ Accessed 20th May 2020.

-Cowen, B. (2003d). Written Answers – Nuclear Disarmament Initiative. *Dail Eireann Debate 574(3) 13 November 2003.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2003-11-13/85/ accessed 18th May 2020.

-Cowen, B. (2004a). Written Answers – European Defence and Security, *Dáil Éireann Debate 585(6), 19 May 2004.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2004-05-19/speech/588/ accessed 3rd June 2020.

-Cowen, B. (2004b). Written Answers – UN Reform, *Dáil Éireann Debate 588(1), 24 June 2004.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2004-06-24/speech/419/ accessed 5th June 2020.

-Coveney, S. (2007). Proposed EU Military Operation – Motion, *Dáil Éireann Debate 639(1), 9 October 2007.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2007-10-09/speech/177/ accessed 25th 2020.

-Defence, Department of, 2000, *White Paper on Defence.*

-Defence, Department of, 2015, *White Paper on Defence*.

-Foreign Affairs and Trade, Department of. (2017). International Priorities: Peace and Security. https://www.dfa.ie/our-role-policies/international-priorities/peace-and-security/ accessed June 12th, 2020.

-Gilmore, E. (2011). Written Answers – Military Neutrality. *Dáil Éireann Debate 730(5) 21 April 2011.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2011-04-21/speech/309/ accessed 6th June 2020.

-Gilmore, E. (2012). Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues: Statements. *Dáil Éireann Debate 769(3) 21 June 2012.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2012-06-21/speech/116/ accessed 7th June 2020.

-Government of Ireland, (1993). *Fianna Fail & Labour Programme for a Partnership Government 1993-1997.* http://michaelpidgeon.com/manifestos/docs/pfgs/PfG%201993%20-%201994%20-%20FF-Lab.pdf accessed 8th June 2020.

-Government of Ireland, (1994). *A Government of Renewal: A Policy Agreement between Fine Gael, The Labour Party, Democratic Left.* http://michaelpidgeon.com/manifestos/docs/pfgs/PfG%201994%20-%201997%20-%20FG-Lab-DL.pdf accessed 8th June 2020.

-Government of Ireland, (2007). *Programme for Government 2007-2012.* http://michaelpidgeon.com/manifestos/docs/pfgs/PfG%202007%20-%202009%20-%20FF-Green-PD.pdf accessed 8th June 2020.

-Higgins, M. D. (2008). Priority Questions – International Agreements. *Dail Eireann Debate 663(2) 9 October 2008.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2008-10-09/9/#s10 accessed 20th May 2020.

-Houses of the Oireachtas Sub-Committee on Ireland's Future in the European Union (2008), Ireland's future in the European Union: Challenges, Issues and Options, Allain, J., & Mullally, S. (2011). *The Irish yearbook of international law. Volume 3, 2008* Hart Publishing, 381-430.

-Howard, M. (2013). EU Scrutiny Reports – Discussion with Department of Defence, *Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality Debate, 8th May 2013.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2017-11-21/speech/424/ accessed 11th June 2020.

-Kehoe, P. (2017). Defence Forces Operations, *Dáil Éireann Debate 960(5), 18 October 2017.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2017-10-18/speech/343/ accessed 1st June 2020.

-Kehoe, P. (2017). Topical Issue Debate, *Dáil Éireann Debate 961(7), 21 November 2017.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2017-11-21/speech/424/ accessed 1st June.

-Lt. Gen. Nash, P. (2007), *Raidió Teilifís Éireann interview.* https://www.rte.ie/news/special-reports/2007/1016/94805-nashp/ accessed 5th June 2020.

-MerrionStreet.ie, (2011), *Ireland to take on the Role of Mission Commander in EU Training Mission in Somalia.* https://merrionstreet.ie/en/News-Room/Releases/ireland-to-take-on-the-role-of-mission-commander-in-eu-training-mission-in-somalia.html accessed 3rd June 2020.

-Shatter, A. (2011). Other Questions, *Dáil Éireann Debate 741(1), 21 September 2011.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2011-09-21/speech/303/ accessed 4th June 2020.

-Sherlock, S. (2015). Thirty-fourth Amendment of the Constitution (Peace and Neutrality) Bill 2014: Second Stage [Private Members], *Dáil Éireann Debate 872(4), 27 March 2015.* https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2015-03-27/speech/43/ accessed 4th June 2020.

-Smith, M. (2001). Written Answers – Treaty of Nice, *Dáil Éireann Debate 546(3), 11 December 2001*. https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/dail/2001-12-11/speech/745/ accessed 25th May 2020.

European Union and United Nations Sources and Publications

-European Union, (2008). Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union - TITLE V: GENERAL PROVISIONS ON THE UNION'S EXTERNAL ACTION AND SPECIFIC PROVISIONS ON THE COMMON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY - Chapter 2: Specific provisions on the common foreign and security policy - Section 2: Provisions on the common security and defence policy - Article 42 (ex Article 17 TEU) *Official Journal C115.* 38-39.

-European Union, Council of the European Union (1994), Projet d'orientations pour une action commune en matiere de non-proliferation nucleaire. ST 7577/94. https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/175913 accessed 8th June 2020.

-European Union, Council of the European Union (2003a), 2552th Council meeting - General Affairs 15535/03 (Presse 356). http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-15535-2003-INIT/en/pdf accessed 15th May 2020.

-European Union, Council of the European Union (2003b), EU Strategy against proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=ST%2015708%202003%20INIT accessed 16th May 2020.

-European Union, Council of the European Union (2010), Council Decision 2010/212/CFSP of 29 March 2010 relating to the position of the European Union for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. *Official Journal L90.* 8-14.

-European Union, Council of the European Union, (2013). Council Decision 2013/44/CFSP of 22 January 2013 amending and extending Decision 2010/96/CFSP on a European Union military mission to contribute to the training of Somali security forces. *Official Journal L20(23),* 218-220.

-European Union, Council of Europe (2008) Decision 2008/101/CFSP of 28 January 2008 on the launching of the European Union military operation in the Republic of Chad and in the Central African Republic (Operation EUFOR Tchad/RCA). *Official Journal L34.* 39.

-European Union, Council of Europe (2013), Decision 2013/34/CFSP of 17 January 2013 on a European Union military mission to contribute to the training of the Malian Armed Forces (EUTM Mali) *Official Journal L332.* 18.

-European Union, European External Action Service, (2009). EUFOR Tchad/RCA Factsheet. https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/csdp/missions-and-operations/eufor-tchad-rca/pdf/01032009_factsheet_eufor-tchad-rca_en.pdf accessed 19th May 2020.

-United Nations, General Assembly. (1999). A/RES/53/77 X – Nuclear Disarmament. 35-39.

-United Nations, (2000). Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Final Document. https://undocs.org/NPT/CONF.2000/28(PartsIandII) accessed 8th June 2020.

Secondary Literature

-Adshead, M. (2014). EU cohesion policy and multi-level governance outcomes in Ireland: How sustainable is Europeanization? *European Urban and Regional Studies, 21*(4), 416-431.

-Alesina, A., & Spolaore, E. (2003). *The size of nations*. MIT Press.

-Bailes, A., & Thorhallsson, B. (2013). Instrumentalizing the European Union in Small State Strategies. *Journal of European Integration, 35*(2), 99-115.

-Birchard, K. (1998). Ireland Launches Nuclear-Disarmament Initiative. *The Lancet, 351(9119).* 1870.

-Brown, M. (2006). The Future of the United Nations in the Aftermath of 11 September 2001. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 17*, 23-29.

-Brugha, C. (2008). Why Ireland rejected the Lisbon Treaty. *Journal of Public Affairs, 8*(4), 303-308.

-Buchanan, A., Keohane, R. (2010). The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions. *World Governance: Do We Need It, 1*(1), 214-246.

-Bulmer S., Radaelli, C. (2004). The Europeanization of national policy? *Queen's Papers on Europeanization 1.* 1–22.

-Bunse, S., Magnette, P., Nicolaïdis, K. (2005). *Is the Commission the small member states' best friend?* Report 9/2005. Stockholm: SIEPS.

-Corbett, J., Yi-Chong, X., & Weller, P. (2018). Small states and the 'throughput' legitimacy of international organizations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 31*(2), 183-202.

-De Flers, N. (2012), *EU Foreign Policy and the Europeanization of neutral states: comparing Irish and Austrian foreign Policy.* Routledge.

-Deitelhoff, N., & Wallbott, L. (2012). Beyond soft balancing: Small states and coalition-building in the ICC and climate negotiations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 25*(3), 345-366.

-Devine, K. (2009). Irish Neutrality and the Lisbon Treaty. *Neutrality: Irish Experience, European Experience.* Irish School of Ecumenics, Trinity College.

-Devine, K. (2011). Neutrality and the development of the European Union's common security and defence policy: Compatible or competing? *Cooperation and Conflict, 46*(3), 334-369.

-Devine, K. (2015). Review of Ireland's Foreign Policy and External Relations. http://www.dochas.ie/Shared/Files/2/Review_of_Irish_Foreign_Policy_Submission_Karen_Devine.pdf accessed 6th June 2020.

-Dhanapala, J. & Rydell, R. (2005), Multilateral Diplomacy and the NPT – An Insider's Account. *United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).*

-Dorr, N. (1996). Ireland at the United Nations: 40 Years On. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 7*, 41-62.

-Føllesdal, A. (1998) The double duty of 'democracy'. In Nentwich, M. & Weale, A. *Political Theory and the European Union: Legitimacy, Constitutional Choice and Citizenship* (pp. 47-61). Routledge.

- Fogarty C. P. (1985). European Union: Implications for Ireland. *Administration*, *33(4).* 590-606.

-Gashi, B. (2016). The role and impact of the small states' diplomacy on regional and international security. *ILIRIA International Review, 6*(1), 145-156.

-Gegout, C. (2002). The quint: Acknowledging the existence of a big four - US Directoire at the heart of the European Union's foreign policy decision-making process. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(2), 331-344.

-Gillissen, C. (2006). The Back to the Future? Ireland at the UN Security Council, 2001-2002. *Nordic Irish Studies, 5*, 23-40.

-Goldschmidt, P. (2008). The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime: Avoiding the Void, in Sokolski, H., *Falling Behind: International Scrutiny of the Peaceful Atom* Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. 293-310.

-Gowan, R. (2009). ESDP and the United Nations. In Grevi, G., Helly, D., & Keohane, D. (2009). *European security and defense: The first ten years (1999-2009).* ISS.

-Grand, C. (2000). The European Union and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. *European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS),* 6-20.

-Green, R. (2000) *Statement on behalf of the delegations of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden.* https://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/npt/revcon2000/statements/NAC.pdf accessed 8th June 2020.

-Grøn, C. (2014). Small States Seeking Influence in the European Commission: Opportunities and Constraints. *University of Iceland, Centre for Small State Studies, Small State Briefs.*

-Gwiazda, A. (2006), Ireland: Pragmatism and the EU Constitution, in König, Thomas, & Hug, Simon. (2006). *Policy-Making Processes and the European Constitution: A Comparative Study of Member States and Accession Countries*, 128-135. Routledge.

-Hill, C. (2004). Renationalizing or Regrouping? EU Foreign Policy Since 11 September 2001. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 42*(1), 143-163.

-Hopmann, P. (1996) *The negotiation process and the resolution of international conflicts* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

-Ikenberry, G. (1998). Institutions, strategic restraint, and the persistence of American postwar order. *International Security, 23*(3), 43-78.

-Ingebritsen, C. (2002). Norm Entrepreneurs: Scandinavia's Role in World Politics. *Cooperation and Conflict*, *37*(1), 11–23.

-Ingebritsen, C. (2004). Learning from Lilliput: Small States and EU Expansion. *Scandinavian Studies, 76*(3), 369-384.

Ishizuka, K. (2004). *Ireland and International Peacekeeping Operations 1960-2000.* Routledge.

-Jakobsen, P. (2009). Small States, Big Influence: The Overlooked Nordic Influence on the Civilian ESDP. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 47*(1), 81-102.

-Jargalsaikhan, E. (2018). The Role of Small States in Promoting International Security: The Case of Mongolia. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 1*(2), 404-435.

-Kaarbo, J., & Kenealy, D. (2017). Perspectives on Small State Security in the Scottish Independence Debate. In Neal A. (Ed.), *Security in a Small Nation: Scotland, Democracy, Politics* (pp. 21-48). Open Book.

-Kassim, H. (2003). Meeting the Demands of EU Membership: The Europeanization of National Administrative Systems in Radaelli, C., Featherstone, K., 2003. *The Politics of Europeanization.* 84-111.

-Keohane, D. (2013). Ireland, in Biehl, H., Giegerich, B., & Jonas, A. *Strategic cultures in Europe: Security and defence policies across the continent*. Springer VS. 171-181.

-Kevany, S., Brugha, R. (2015). Irish Aid and Diplomacy in the Twenty-First Century: Optimising Enlightened Self-Interest, Supranational Priorities, and Foreign Policy Impact. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 26.* 207-225.

-Kirsch, W., & Langner, J. (2011). Invariably Suboptimal: An Attempt to Improve the Voting Rules of the Treaties of Nice and Lisbon. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 49*(6), 1317-1338.

-Kóczy, L. (2012). Beyond Lisbon: Demographic trends and voting power in the European Union Council of Ministers. *Mathematical Social Sciences, 63*(2), 152-158.

-Kronsell, A. (2002). Can small states influence EU norms? Insights from Sweden's participation in the field of environmental politics. *Scandinavian Studies, 74*(3), 287-304.

-Laffan, B. (2014). In the Shadow of Austerity: Ireland's Seventh Presidency of the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 52*(S1), 90-98.

-Larivé, M. (2014). *Debating European security and defense policy: Understanding the complexity* (Global interdisciplinary studies series).

-Laursen, F. (2005). *The Treaty of Nice: Actor Preferences, Bargaining and Institutional Choice.* 1st ed., Constitutional Law Library.

-Lee, M. S. (2004). The European Union beyond 2004: Small States and Trade Policy. *International Area Studies Review, 7*(1), 19-35.

-Lindell, U., & Persson, S. (1986). The paradox of weak state power: A research and literature overview. *Cooperation and Conflict, 21*, 79-97.

Maas, M. (2016). Small Enough to Fail: The Structural Irrelevance of the Small State as cause of its Elimination and Proliferation since Westphalia. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 29(4).* 1303-1323.

-Mahoney, J. (2010). After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research. *World Politics 62 (1)*, 120–47

-Malik, J. (2000). China and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime. *Contemporary Southeast Asia, 22*(3), 445-478.

-Magnusdottir, G., & Thorhallsson, B. (2011). The Nordic States and Agenda-setting in the European Union: How Do Small States Score? *Icelandic Review Of Politics And Administration/Stjornmal Og Stjornsysla, 7*(1), 205-225.

-Matthews, A. (1985). European Union: The Economic Implications for Ireland. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 2(1).* 131-141.

-Mawdsley, J. (2008). European Union Armaments Policy: Options for Small States? *European Security, 17*(2-3), 367-385.

- McAleese, D., & Matthews, A. (1987). The Single European Act and Ireland: Implications for a small member state. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 26*(Sep 87), 39-60.

-McCall, C., Wilson, T., (2010). Europeanisation and Hibernicisation: An Introduction, in McCall, C., & Wilson, T. (2010). *Europeanisation and Hibernicisation: Ireland and Europe*, *European Studies 28,* 11-39.

-McIver, I. (2014). The Role of Small States in the European Union, *Scottish Parliament Information Centre,* Scottish Parliament.

-McSweeney, B. (1988). Irish Defence in the Context of Irish Foreign Policy. *An Irish Quarterly Review, 77(305).* 48-54.

-Menon, A. (2009). Empowering Paradise? The ESDP at Ten. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs) 85(2).* 227-246.

-Menon, A. (2011). Power, institutions and the CSDP: The promise of institutionalist theory. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 49*(1), 83-100.

-Meerts, P. (1997). Negotiating in the European Union: Comparing Perceptions of Eu Negotiators in Small Member States. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 6*(5), 463-482.

-Moberg, A. (2002). The Nice Treaty and Voting Rules in the Council. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(2), 259-282.

-Murphy, R. (1998). Ireland, the United Nations and peacekeeping operations. *International Peacekeeping, 5*(1), 22-45.

-Murphy, R. (2005). Ireland Withdraws from Participation in EU Peacekeeping Mission to Macedonia. *Journal of International Peacekeeping, 9*(1), 123-138.

-Nasra, S. (2011). Governance in EU foreign policy: Exploring small state influence. *Journal of European Public Policy, 18*(2), 164-180.

-Neyer, J. (2010). Justice, Not Democracy: Legitimacy in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 48*(4), 903-921.

-Nuclear Threat Initiative, (2020). *New Agenda Coalition.* https://www.nti.org/learn/treaties-and-regimes/new-agenda-coalition/ accessed 7th June 2020.

-O'Driscoll, M. & Walsh, J. (2014). Introduction: 'Disarmament and Non-Proliferation: Historical Perspectives, Future Objectives'. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 25*, 5-8.

-O'Grady, J. (1990). The Strategic Value of Ireland after the Cold War. *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies, 16*(2), 7-20.

-Panke, D. (2010). Small states in the European Union: Structural disadvantages in EU policymaking and counterstrategies. *Journal of European Public Policy, 17*(6), 799-817.

-Panke, D. (2011). Small states in EU negotiations; political dwarfs or powerbrokers? *Cooperation and Conflict, 46*, 123-143.

-Panke, D. (2012). Lobbying Institutional Key Players: How States Seek to Influence the European Commission, the Council Presidency and the European Parliament. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 50*(1), 129-150.

-Pérez de las Heras, B. (2017). *Democratic legitimacy in the European Union and global governance: Building a European demos*. Palgrave Macmillan.

-Perruche, J. (2011). Which Strategy for CSDP? *Security Policy Brief (26),*1-3. Egmont Institute.

-Petrov, P. (2007). The ESDP in motion: Opportunities and constraints for the application and constraint of an integrated civil-military operational scenario. *Studia Diplomatica, 60*(3), 157-182.

-Pollack, M. (2005). Theorizing the European Union: International organization, domestic polity, or experiment in new governance? *Annual Review Of Political Science, 8*(1), 357-398.

-Quaglia, L., & Moxon-Browne, E. (2006). What Makes a Good EU Presidency? Italy and Ireland Compared. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 44*(2), 349-368.

Quinn, B., & Connaughton, B. (2009). Chapter 3: Mediating Forces and the Domestic Polity, Rees, N., Connaughton, B., & Quinn, B. *Europeanisation and New Patterns of Governance in Ireland*. Manchester University Press. 34-52.

-Rees, N. (2009) Ireland's Foreign Relations. In Rees, N., Connaughton, B., & Quinn, B. (2009). *Europeanisation and new patterns of governance in Ireland.* Manchester University Press. 167-195.

-Rees, N., & O'Brennan, J. (2019). The dual crisis in Irish foreign policy: The economic crash and Brexit in a volatile European landscape. *Irish Political Studies, 34*(4), 595-614.

-Risse, T. (2000). "Let's Argue!": Communicative Action in World Politics. *International Organization, 54*(1), 1-39.

-Risse, T., & Kleine, M. (2010). Deliberation in negotiations. *Journal of European Public Policy: Negotiation Theory and the EU: The State of the Art, 17*(5), 708-726.

-Robson, M. (2000). Nuclear Disarmament: Two initiatives. *New Zealand International Review, 25*(6), 13-15.

-Schmidt, V. (2004). The European Union: Democratic Legitimacy in a Regional State?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 42*(5), 975-997.

- Schmidt, V. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. *Political Studies, 61*(1), 2-22.

Sinnott, R. (1995). Ireland and the Diplomacy of Nuclear Non-Proliferation: The Politics of Incrementalism. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 6.* 59-78.

-Smith, J. M. (2006). Compliance bargaining in the WTO: Ecuador and the bananas dispute. In *Negotiating trade: Developing countries in the WTO and NAFTA,* 257-288.

-Strand, J., Rapkin, D., Boyer, M. (2011). "Weighted Voting in the United Nations Security Council: A Simulation." *Simulation & Gaming 42*(6) 772-802.

-Tallberg, J., & Zürn, M. (2019). The legitimacy and legitimation of international organizations: Introduction and framework. *The Review of International Organizations, 14*(4), 581-606.

-Tarp, M. & Hansen, J. (2013). Size and Influence: How Small States Influence Policy Making in Multilateral Arenas. *Danish Institute For International Studies Working Paper 2013 (11).*

-Thorhallsson, B., & Wivel, A. (2006). Small States in the European Union: What Do We Know and What Would We Like to Know? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 19*(4), 651-668.

-Thorhallsson, B., (2012). Small States in the UN Security Council: Means of Influence?, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 7*(2), 135-160.

-Thorhallsson, B., (2015). How Do Little Frogs Fly? Small States in the European Union. *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs Policy Brief.*

-Thorhallsson, B., Steinsson, S., & Kristinsson, T. (2019). The small state in international relations. In *Small States and Shelter Theory: Iceland's External Affairs* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 13-23). Routledge.

-Tonra, B. (2001). *The Europeanisation of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union.* Ashgate.

-Tonra, B. (2002) "Ireland: The Politics of Pragmatism?" in F. Laursen (ed.) *The Amsterdam Treaty: National Preference Formation, Interstate Bargaining and Outcome*, Odense University Press.

-Tonra, B. (2006). Chapter 9. Ireland: A Tale of Two Referenda. In Martinus, F. (2006). *The Treaty of Nice: Actor Preferences, Bargaining and Institutional Choice, Vol. 1*, Constitutional Law Library, 179-196.

-Ulriksen, S., Gourlay, C. & Mace, C. (2004). Operation Artemis: The shape of things to come? *International Peacekeeping: The EU, Crisis Management and Peace Support Operations, 11*(3), 508-525.

-Urbelis, V. (2015). The Relevance and Influence of Small States in NATO and the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy. *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review, 13*(1), 61-78.

-Volgy, T., Fausett, E., Grant, K., & Rodgers, S. (2008). Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations. *Journal of Peace Research, 45*(6), 837-850.

-Weiss, T. (2016). Too Limited, Too Late: Evaluating the Czech Republic's Performance as a Small-State Lobbyist in EU External Policy. *New Perspectives, 24*(1), 53-78.

-Weiss, T. (2020). A small state's anticipation of institutional change: Effects of the looming Brexit in the areas of the CSDP and internal market. *European Security, 29*(1), 1-15.

-Wivel, A., Bailes, A., Archer, C. (2014), Setting The Scene: Small States and International Security, *Small States and International Security: Europe and Beyond*, Routledge, 3-25.

-Wouters, J., de Jong, S., De Man, P. (2010). The EU's Commitment to Effective Multilateralism in the Field of Security: Theory and Practice. *Yearbook of European Law, 2010 (29).* 164-189.

-Yamashita, H. (2012). Peacekeeping cooperation between the United Nations and regional organisations. *Review of International Studies, 38*(1), 165-186.

-Zartman, I. (1985). Negotiating from Asymmetry: The North-South Stalemate. *Negotiation Journal, 1*(2), 121-138.