

RESEARCH ON EUROPEAN MICROSTATES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE. SELECTED METHODOLOGICAL AND DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS

^aMARCIN LUKASZEWSKI

Wydział Nauk Politycznych i Dziennikarstwa UAM, ul. Umultowska 89a, Poznań, Poland
e-mail: *marcin.lukaszewski@amu.edu.pl*

Abstract: In today's world we have about 200 subjects for which there is no doubt that they are sovereign countries. In the smallest of them live several thousand or even several hundred inhabitants. In modern social science there is no consensus as to what might be called the ministates, microstates, small states and finally dwarf states. Among researchers there is no universally accepted term for 4 microstates lying in Europe: Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino. Another problem is the Vatican City, which as a specific legal and political solution, according to some, can not be classified into microstates, and others believe is a full member "microstates community." This article aims to systematize terms which relate to small states in Europe.

Keywords: european microstates, ministates, dwarf states, very small states, tiny countries.

Preface

There are four: Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino. Or maybe even six: Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein, San Marino, Malta and Vatican City? Some even claim that the ministates include Luxembourg and Iceland as well. There is no consensus as to which countries should be included among the European microstates. Therefore let's look at the basic determinant - the size of the state. Therefore let's look at the basic determinant - the size of the state. The smallest 10 countries in Europe are in turn: the Vatican City (0.44 sq. km), Monaco (1.95 sq. km), San Marino (61.6 sq. km), Liechtenstein (160 sq. km), Malta (316 sq. km), Andorra (468 sq. km), Luxembourg (2586 sq. km), Montenegro (13812 sq. km), Slovenia (20273 sq. km) and FYR Macedonia (25713 sq. km). If you look at the population, we observe that only part of the previous list of countries recur: the Vatican City (824), San Marino (31,817), Monaco (32,796), Liechtenstein (34,761), Andorra (84,525), Iceland (306,694), Malta (403,532), Luxembourg (474,413), Montenegro (672,180) and Estonia (1,340,122)¹.

In modern political science there is no consensus as to what might be called the ministates, microstates, small states and finally dwarf states. Among researchers there is no universally accepted term for four microstates lying in Europe: Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino. Another problem is the Vatican City, which as a specific legal and political solution, according to some, can not be classified into microstates, and others believe is a full member "microstates community." This article aims to systematize terms which relate to small states in Europe.

1. Microstates, small states or dwarf states? Definitional problems in social science

In the literature there are many different definitions of small states which we have on the European continent. In English, the most popular are: ministates and microstates, although there are also such as: *village states* and (*very*) *small states*. Polish science theorists of international relations (Janusz Symonides and Dariusz Kondrakiewicz) take direct translation from English, they called *minipaństwa* (ministates) and *mikropaństwa* (microstates)².

¹ CIA The World Factbook, <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/k/goes/>.

² D. Kondrakiewicz, *Państwo*, in: *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, M. Pietras (ed.), (Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2006), p. 85; J. Symonides, *Członkostwo*, in: *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych. Bilans i perspektywy*, J. Symonides (ed.), (Fundacja Studiów Międzynarodowych, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa 2006), p. 31.

Such a term (ministate) was also adopted by Marta A. Sosnowska who analyzed the political system of Monaco. M. A. Sosnowska, *Minipaństwo Monako*, in: *Pierwsza pięćdziesiątka. Małe państwa Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w Unii Europejskiej*, R.

In the Polish political science literature exist: *państwa karłowate* (dwarf countries), *relikty feudalizmu* (remnants of feudalism), *państwa miniaturowe* (miniature states)³. The first term is probably a consequence of adopting the terminology used such as by Barbara Sikorska, who in her paper of 1971, states the term *dwarf* (państwa karłowate) identified the three entities in Europe: Monaco, San Marino and Liechtenstein, adding due to the nature of contemporary legal situation, including Andorra. The author thus omitted the smallest state in the world - the Vatican⁴. Behind her followed, among others such authors as Mark Śmigasiewicz⁵, Przemysław Osóbka⁶ and Anna Sroka⁷. In turn, Wojciech Jakubowski, Tomasz Słomka, Jacek Wojnicki⁸ and Tadeusz Jasudowicz⁹ argue that the term *państwa karłowate* (dwarf countries) is characterized pejoratively. However, it seems that the term is so deeply enrolled in Polish science that currently its use on the basis of science is free from any negative connotations¹⁰.

Norbert Pap, a Hungarian researcher, uses similar definition: relict states. Anglo-Saxon terms researchers use terms: *tiny countries*¹¹ and *pocket states*¹². The United Nations has adopted different definitions. These countries are often described as a *small European states*¹³, or *very small states*¹⁴, but in the latter case in that category (except for Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino) also Nauru, Timor Leste and Tuvalu. In the same way Christian Frommelt and Sieglinde Gstöhl determine European ministates. Liechtenstein is a very small state according to them, though in the title of their report, they place *very* in brackets¹⁵.

2. Which states are micro- and which are 'normal' states?

How to distinguish the state "normal" on the subject of this article? It is very difficult, that there are no objective criteria to conceptualize this issue. The most common treatment is easy to adopt a certain number of the population as a miniature state border between the states 'normal'. Stanley A. De Smith suggested 150 thousand¹⁶, Patricia Wohlgenuth Blair and Dieter Ehrhardt - 300 thousand¹⁷. Markus René Seiler proposes that the

Zelichowski (ed.), (Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Warszawa 2010), p. 179.

³ W. Jakubowski, T. Słomka, J. Wojnicki, *Systemy polityczne państw Europy niebędących członkami Unii Europejskiej*, in: *Spółczesność i polityka. Podstawy nauk politycznych*, K. A. Wojtaszczyk, W. Jakubowski (ed.), (Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2007), p. 567.

⁴ B. Sikorska, *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa europejskich państw karłowatych*, (Sprawy Międzynarodowe, Warszawa 1971), p. 75.

⁵ M. Śmigasiewicz, *System polityczny Księstwa Liechtenstein*, (Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, Warszawa 1999), p. 9.

⁶ P. Osóbka, *Systemy konstytucyjne Andory, Liechtensteinu, Monako, San Marino*, (Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa 2008), p. 8.

⁷ A. Sroka, *Państwa karłowate a Unia Europejska - kasus Andory*, in: *Pierwsza pięćdziesiątka. Małe państwa Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w Unii Europejskiej*, R. Zelichowski (ed.), (Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Warszawa 2010), p. 205.

⁸ W. Jakubowski, T. Słomka, J. Wojnicki, *Systemy polityczne państw...*, op. cit., p. 567.

⁹ T. Jasudowicz, *Przeoczone narodziny państwa-podmiotu. O ewolucji prawnomiędzynarodowego statusu Andory*, (Zeszyty Naukowe WSP. Nauki Prawne, z.L. Olsztyn 1998), p. 155.

¹⁰ In a similar way Przemysław Osóbka expressed. P. Osóbka, *Systemy konstytucyjne Andory...*, op. cit., p. 8.

¹¹ T. M. Eccardt, *Secrets of the Seven Smallest States of Europe: Andorra, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, San Marino, and Vatican City*, (Hippocrene Books, New York 2005), p. 3.

¹² M. Sobczyński, *Państwa i terytoria zależne. Ujęcie geograficzno-polityczne*, (Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2006), p. 178.

¹³ United Nations, *International law as a language for international relations*, (United Nations, The Hague 1996), p. 427.

¹⁴ The United Nations Security Council, *Options for Small States Reykjavik*, (Iceland 16 June 2008, United Nations), p. 2.

¹⁵ Ch. Frommelt, S. Gstöhl, *Liechtenstein and the EEA: the Europeanization of a (very) small state*, (Utvalget for utredning av Norges avtaler med EU, september 2011).

¹⁶ S. A. De Smith, *Microstates and Micronesia: problems of America's Pacific islands and other minute territories*, (University Press, New York 1970), p. 5.

¹⁷ P. W. Blair, *The ministate dilemma*, (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York 1967), p. 3.; D. Ehrhardt, *Der Begriff des Mikrostaats im Völkerrecht und in der internationalen Ordnung*, (Scientia-Verl., Aalen 1970), p. 102.

term microstates were endowed states with a population of less than 0.5 million inhabitants¹⁸. Jacques Rapoport and William L. Harris set the number at 1 million¹⁹. Similarly, says Michael I. Handel²⁰. H. Armstrong, this criterion increases to 3 million²¹. In turn, Dariusz Kondrakiewicz defined population of ministates of several hundred to several thousand²². It seems that although there is no consensus as to what should be the limit, there is no dispute as to whether it should be based just on the criterion of population and / or size of the territory²³.

In a similar way to proceed Knut Ipsen, who arbitrarily determines that the boundary is to be the Luxembourg, that each country smaller than the Grand Duchy is a microstate. It remains questionable, however, is exactly why this state should be the limit²⁴.

The researchers also highlight the small states as a separate, different from the microstates category includes countries such as Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta²⁵. They are the smallest EU country, but despite the small population and small area great they deal of fulfillment of the obligations of membership in the EU.

It is obvious that the size of the state does not affect directly the wealth of the population living in that country. William Easterly and Aart Kraay give at this point Liechtenstein and Equatorial Guinea, which are excellent examples of countries very rich and very poor²⁶.

In conclusion, it should be strongly emphasized that the award of small states and microstates of the circle of the "normal" must be based primarily on the criterion of the size of the state, because the omission of this criterion may in effect lead to the classification of each state is smaller than Russia to the category of small states²⁷.

3. Whether microstates are the states?

In science there is no consensus as to which countries should be regarded as sovereign states, and which as such can no longer be considered. There is no doubt that there is incontrovertible and objective criteria which distinguish the state from others. If we believe that sovereign states are those that are members of the United Nations is thus exclude the Vatican, which has observer status and the status of a sovereign state can not be denied.

¹⁸ If we assume such a limit, then the mikropaństw would include: Malta, Iceland, Andorra, Liechtenstein, San Marino, Monaco, Vatican City. Luxembourg, because of population growth in the last few years, and exceeded 0.5 million border residents, would lose the status of microstate. CIA The World Factbook, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>; M.-R. Seiler, *Kleinstaaten im Europarat: Fallstudien zu Island, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Malta und San Marino*, (Difo-Druck, Bamberg 1995), p. 13.

¹⁹ J. Rapoport, *Small states & territories: status and problem*, (United Nations Institute for Training and Research, New York 1971), p. 30.; W. L. Harris, *Microstates in the United Nations: A Broader Purpose*, (Columbia Journal of Transnational Law 9, 1970), p. 23.

²⁰ M. I. Handel, *Weak states in the international system*, (Routledge, London 1990), p. 47.

²¹ H. Armstrong, R. De Kervenoael, X. Li, R. Read, *A Comparison of the Economic Performance of Different Micro-states and Between Micro-states and Larger Countries*, (World Development, 1998), 639-656.; Ch. Thomas, R. Craigwell, *Revisiting the Effect of Country Size on Taxation in Developing Countries*, (Research Department Central Bank of Barbados and Department of Economics University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus, 2010), p. 9.

²² D. Kondrakiewicz, *Państwo...*, op. cit., p. 85.

²³ Although one should not forget here the criticism of this approach, who argue that the state numbering 1 million people will be struggling with similar problems as one whose population is several times more, with the only difference that you will experience these problems appropriately intense. D. Vital, *The survival of small states: studies in small power / great power conflict*, (Oxford University Press, London 1971), p. 4-11.

²⁴ K. Ipsen, *Völkerrecht*, (C. H. Beck, München 2004), p. 244.; W. Jakubowski, T. Słomka, J. Wojnicki, *Systemy polityczne państw...*, op. cit., p. 569.

²⁵ G. Rydlowski, *Organizacja przestrzeni publicznej w najmniejszych państwach członkowskich UE*, in: *Małe państwa Europy. Specyfika systemu politycznego i aktywności międzynarodowej*, D. Popławski (ed.), (Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2009), p. 160.

²⁶ W. Easterly, A. Kraay, *Small States, Small Problems? Income, Growth, and Volatility in Small States*, (The World Bank, Washington 1999), p. 5.

²⁷ An example of such treatment may be even put Sweden (area 449 964 km², 9,415,295 inhabitants) and Finland (area of 338145 km², 5,313,026 inhabitants) as a subject of research in the collective work *Małe państwa Europy. Specyfika systemu politycznego i aktywności międzynarodowej*, D. Popławski (ed.), (Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, Warszawa 2009).

Furthermore, it should be noted that possession of UN member status does not automatically confirm the status of a sovereign state. A perfect example confirming this thesis is the adoption of India (subsidiary of the UK) as a member of this international organization²⁸.

The most common definition of the state presented Georg Jellinek, who pointed out that the total experience must be three factors: population, territory and sovereign power. The Montevideo Convention (1933) pointed out that in addition to the criteria G. Jellinek, the state should have the ability to enter in international relations. So, Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino have all four characteristics?

- Andorra - has a permanent population, territory, the ability to enter in international relations (mainly via the authorities of the French and Spanish), and the sovereign authority (since 1993, when it adopted the first written in the history of the state constitution, which significantly limited the systemic position of head of state)²⁹;
- Monaco - was the population and territory, the ability to enter in international relations (independently and through the French authorities) and sovereign power;
- Liechtenstein - constant population and territory, the ability to enter in international relations (independently and through the Swiss authorities) and sovereign power;
- San Marino - has the population and territory, the ability to enter in international relations (alone) and the sovereign power.

Should there be there any other criteria expending sovereign state? Often in the literature pointing to the need for international recognition (recognition of any, received all four states) and the ability to enter into interstate relations. All four (Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco and San Marino) signed the relevant international agreements with their protectors, as a result of which is Spain, Switzerland, France and Italy have until recently been fully responsible for representing the European microstates in the international area³⁰. However, by appropriate changes in the treaties and the practice of the presence of representatives ministates alone it should be noted a tendency to gradually reduce the role of protectors for governments and diplomatic missions of these four microstates.

Barbara Sikorska in her article *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa europejskich państw karłowatych (1971) to the European microstates did not pass the Vatican*. Most of the researchers include the smallest country in the world to the group of European ministates. However, given the fact that the Vatican does not meet one of the microstate features which is part of the transfer of competence in the field of foreign policy (in fact exercise that competence alone with the institution of the Holy See, among others Nunciatures apostolic), it can not be regarded as a European ministate.

4. Micronations and quasi-states

So-called micronations are appearing more often in journalism than in political science, quasi-states that are not recognized internationally. The most frequently appearing in the literature examples include primarily:

²⁸ S. T. Stepnicki, *San Marino w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, (Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2010), p. 18.

²⁹ Head of state authority is exercised every time by the president of the French Republic *ex officio* and bishop of the diocese of Seo d'Urgell.

³⁰ Marek Sobczyński rightly points out that the same delegation to represent the European microstates for their patrons do not lose their state, because such a decision was taken voluntarily by the microstates. In a similar vein speaks B. Sikorska, who argues that the mere fact of international representation by another state does not affect the nature of the state of the represented entity. M. Sobczyński, *Państwa i terytoria...*, op. cit., p. 259.; B. Sikorska, *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa...*, op. cit., p. 81.

- Principality of Sealand - founded in 1967, when the abandoned military platform in the North Sea was occupied by Roy Bates, who proclaimed himself prince, Sealand is not recognized as a sovereign state³¹;
- Principality of Hutt River - founded in 1970, when inspired by the activities of Roy Bates, Leonard George Casley decided to announce the secession of 75 km² of land from the Commonwealth of Australia³²;
- Republic of Molossia - founded by Kevin Baugh (in 1999), who announced secession from the United States of America³³;
- Principality of Seborga - located in Italy, near the French border, and in sight of Monaco, founded by Giorgio Carbone.

These entities must be distinguished from a quasi-states in the strict sense. Because if the quasi-state (eg. Northern Cyprus, Somaliland, or even Transnistria) de facto rule over "their" territories, then micronations only declare their reign. Micronations, even after the announcement of their independence, are tolerated by the state in which they are located. Doubts about the existence of any independent micronations disappear when we find that entities are created almost exclusively for commercial and tourism³⁴. The quasi-states are the entities that de facto exercise full authority over "their" territory, but do not meet a single factor, that makes it states - international recognition³⁵.

Remigiusz Mielcarek introduces rare in the Polish scientific literature the term *mikrokraje* (microcountries). The European microcountries recognizes both Andorra and Liechtenstein, as well as micronations (Principality of Seborga) or dependent territories (Crown dependencies), the autonomous regions of sovereign states (Mount Athos), and even quasi-state (Transnistria)³⁶. Lack of both the classification and identification of individual entities vary between sovereign states (such as European microstates) and subsidiaries prevent correct perception of the problem of conceptualization of small states.

5. Relations with 'protectors'

In conclusion, the European ministates should be considered sovereign European states that meet two criteria including: a small territory (less than 500 km²) and a small population (less than 100 thousand.).

In addition, due to the close ties between microstates with its neighbors, mainly for the benefit of transferring their skills in representing them in international forums. You may find that they speak for patrons to forgo the exercise of their sovereignty. Such protector-states for the Principality of Andorra are Spain and France. By 1993 the Principality remained under the authority of feudal co-estate President of France and bishop of Seo d'Urgell³⁷. Only after the adoption of the constitution in 1993, as a result of systemic position reduction of head of state, Andorra became a fully sovereign state. One of the few forms of the French head of state influence on the political life of the Principality is his right of veto over treaties concluded by Andorra.

In the case of Liechtenstein, the early patron was Austria, with which the Principality has concluded an agreement for a customs union in 1852, and since 1880 the Austrian diplomacy was to represent Liechtenstein in its relations with other states. After World War I returned to the Principality in the direction of its other neighbor - Switzerland. Upon termination of the treaty of 1852 by Landtag in 1919, came to an agreement with Switzerland. Since 1921 the representation of Liechtenstein took over the Swiss authorities. In subsequent years, signed the subsequent international agreements (Convention on post, the system of the conclusion of a customs union)³⁸. After World War II was signed Liechtenstein-Swiss agreements include on foreigners³⁹.

France is the protector of Monaco. Since 1865, Principality has a customs union with France, and since 1918 France obtained the right to station troops in Monaco⁴⁰ and approval by the state entered into international agreements (the agreement was later confirmed in 2002 and supplemented by the provisions of the Convention of 2005). Prior to joining the Council of Europe's legal obligation to determine the function of the Principality of the Minister of State (prime minister) of the French and in agreement with the French Government⁴¹. In addition, a change order provisions of the inheritance. Under the legislation before the change, if it came to empty the throne of the Principality, Monaco would become a French protectorate.

San Marino has a specific relationship with his only neighbor - Italian Republic. By the Treaty of 1862 ("Trattato d'Amicizia"), regulates the mutual relations between the neighbors⁴². This system includes a commitment to protect the independence of Italy, San Marino⁴³. After 10 years the system was renewed (1872), and then concluded an agreement for a somewhat different content in 1897. In all these treaties concluded was that the Italian-San Marino relations based on friendship protectionist. Currently, relations between states governed by many bilateral agreements, including the Convention on the friendship and good neighborhood of 31 March 1939. As a result of the discussion around the determination of a protective friendship, which was allegedly called into question the independence and sovereignty of the Republic of San Marino, 10 September 1971 has been changed the wording of Article. A system of 1939, which would lead to the elimination of differences in interpretation⁴⁴.

Protectors on behalf of the ministate's foreign policy and defense policy and also usually carry the right legation, (although it should be emphasized that the example of San Marino has its permanent representative to the Holy See)⁴⁵. This does not mean that microstates are compared to their larger neighbors in hierarchical relationships, because, as we must not forget, ultimately they have the right to terminate contracts with protectors, a right which is an inherent feature of a sovereign state.

Literature:

1. Żelichowski, R., (ed.), *Pierwsza pięćdziesiątka. Małe państwa Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w Unii Europejskiej*, Warszawa:

³⁸ Ibidem, p. 77.

³⁹ A. Jureczko, E. Wac, *Historia Liechtensteinu*, in: *Historia małych krajów Europy*, J. Laptos (ed.), (Ossolineum, Wrocław 2007), p. 136-137.

⁴⁰ This was confirmed by the Treaty of 2002. In accordance with Article. 4, the French Republic may, at the request or with the consent of the prince, to enter and stay on the territory of the Principality of Monaco necessary to the security forces of both countries. *Traité destiné à adapter et à confirmer les rapports d'amitié et de coopération entre la République française et la Principauté de Monaco*, art. 4.

⁴¹ At present monarch selects and approves the candidate for Minister of State from among the citizens of Monaco or France. *Convention destinée à adapter et à approfondir la coopération administrative entre la République française et la Principauté de Monaco* 8 novembre 2005, art. 6.

⁴² S. T. Stępnicki, *San Marino w stosunkach...*, op. cit., p. 36-46; The Treaty was subsequently supplemented and amended several times (1897, 1901, 1906, 1907, 1913, 1914, 1920, 1921, 1924).

⁴³ B. Sikorska, *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa...*, op. cit., p. 78.

⁴⁴ This was accomplished by signing the Additional Protocol by the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs (Aldo Moro) and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of San Marino (Federico Bigi). S. T. Stępnicki, *San Marino w stosunkach...*, op. cit., p. 54.

⁴⁵ J. Sutor, *Prawo dyplomatyczne i konsularne*, (LexisNexis Polska, Warszawa 2000), p. 99-100.

³¹ J. Ryan, G. Dunford, S. Sellars, *Micronations: The Lonely Planet Guide to Home-Made Nations*, (Lonely Planet, 2006), p. 9-11.; E. Kofman, G. Youngs, *Globalization: theory and practice*, (Continuum International Publishing Group, 1996), p. 284-285.

³² N. Onishi, *Rewards for Rebellion: Tiny Nation and Crown for Life*, The New York Times, February 1, 2011.

³³ J. Ryan, G. Dunford, S. Sellars, *Micronations: The Lonely...*, op. cit., p. 61.

³⁴ Residents of Seborga, like other citizens of Italy, they pay taxes that go to Rome.

³⁵ It is noteworthy that almost the norm is that these quasi-states are unable to or provide social benefits and economic welfare or even protect human rights. R. H. Jackson, *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations And The Third World*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1993) p. 21.

³⁶ R. Mielcarek, *Mikrokraje Europy*, (Sorus SC, Poznań 2005), p. 15-17.

³⁷ B. Sikorska, *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa...*, op. cit., p. 88.

Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2010, ISBN 978-83-60580-54-7.

2. Wojtaszczyk, K. A., Jakubowski, W., (ed.), *Spoleczeństwo i polityka. Podstawy nauk politycznych*, Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, 2007. ISBN 9788375450125.

3. Sikorska, B., *Sytuacja prawnomiędzynarodowa europejskich państw karlowatych*, Warszawa: Sprawy Międzynarodowe, 1971. ISSN 0038-853X.

4. Śmigasiewicz, M., *System polityczny Księstwa Liechtenstein*, Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, 1999. ISBN 83-7151-332-1.

5. Osóbka, P., *Systemy konstytucyjne Andory, Liechtensteinu, Monako, San Marino*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2008. ISBN 978-83-7059-855-6.

6. Eccardt, T. M., *Secrets of the Seven Smallest States of Europe: Andorra, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, San Marino, and Vatican City*, New York: Hippocrene Books, 2005. ISBN 978-0781810326.

7. Sobczyński, M., *Państwa i terytoria zależne. Ujęcie geograficzno-polityczne*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2006. ISBN 978-83-7441-530-9.

8. De Smith, S. A., *Microstates and Micronesia: problems of America's Pacific islands and other minute territories*, New York: University Press, 1970. ISBN 978-0814701188.

9. Ehrhardt, D., *Der Begriff des Mikrostaats im Völkerrecht und in der internationalen Ordnung*, Aalen: Scientia-Verl., 1970, ISBN 9783511006877.

10. Handel, M. I., *Weak states in the international system*, London: Routledge, 1990. ISBN 9780714633855.

11. Vital, D., *The survival of small states: studies in small power/great power conflict*, London: Oxford University Press, 1971, ISBN 9780192153456.

12. Ipsen, K., *Völkerrecht*, München: C. H. Beck, 2004. ISBN 3-40-649636-9

13. Popławski, D., (ed.), *Małe państwa Europy - specyfika systemu politycznego i aktywności międzynarodowej*, Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, 2009. ISBN 978-83-7545-189-4.

14. Stępnicki, S. T., *San Marino w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, 2010. ISBN 978-83-7644-039-2.

15. Ryan, J., Dunford, G., Sellars, S., *Micronations: The Lonely Planet Guide to Home-Made Nations*, London: Lonely Planet, 2006. ISBN 9781741047301.

16. Kofman, E., Youngs, G., *Globalization: theory and practice*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1996. ISBN 9781855673472.

17. Jackson, R. H., *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations And The Third World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. ISBN 978-0521447836.

18. Mielcarek, R., *Mikrokraje Europy*, Poznań: Sorus SC, 2005. ISBN 8389949024.

19. Łaptos, J. (ed.), *Historia małych krajów Europy*, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 2007. ISBN 978-83-04-04937-6.

20. Sutor, J., *Prawo dyplomatyczne i konsularne*, Warszawa: LexisNexis Polska, 2000. ISBN 978-83-7620-440-6.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AD