

Foreign Policy Priorities of European Landlocked Microstates

Avrupa'daki Denize Kıyısı Olmayan Mikro Devletlerin Dış Politika Öncelikleri

Yeliz KULALI MARTİN* 

Abstract

A 'microstate' is defined in its simplest terms as a territory with a very small surface area and a low population ratio. On the other hand, a 'landlocked' country is a state that lacks direct access to the sea. When these two geographical characteristics are combined, they create natural disadvantages leading to the expectation that such states will experience lower levels of prosperity. However, the Principality of Andorra, the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Republic of San Marino – each possessing these characteristics in Europe – do not face these disadvantages in the same way. This study focuses on the foreign policy tendencies of these three states and analyzes how they overcome their geographical disadvantages. With strong neighboring countries, memberships in international organizations and special relations with the EU, these states do not encounter significant difficulties in trade, development or simply in their 'survival'. Within this framework, the study examines how these states leverage their geographical situation to mitigate the impacts of their unfavorable conditions.

Keywords: Small State, Microstate, Landlocked Countries, Europe, Regional Studies

Öz

'Mikro-devlet' genel olarak çok küçük bir yüzölçümüne ve çok az bir nüfusa sahip ülkeleri tanımlamak için kullanılmaktadır. 'Denize kıyısı olmayan ülke' ise okyanuslara ya da açık denizlere erişimi olmayan devletleri ifade etmektedir. Bu iki coğrafi özellik birleştiğinde bazı doğal olumsuz koşullar ortaya çıkmakta ve bu özelliklere sahip devletlerin de düşük bir refah seviyesine sahip olması beklenmektedir. Ancak Avrupa kıtasında yer alan ve bu özellikleri barındıran Andorra Prenslüğü, Liechtenstein Prenslüğü ve San Marino Cumhuriyeti bu olumsuz koşullarla aynı şekilde uğraşmamaktadır. Bu çalışma, bu üç Avrupa devletinin dış politika eğilimlerini inceleyerek mikro-devlet ve denize kıyısı olmayan ülke özelliklerinden kaynaklanan coğrafi olumsuzlukların nasıl üstesinden geldiklerine odaklanmaktadır. Güçlü komşulara sahip olan, uluslararası örgütlerde üyelikleri bulunan ve AB ile özel ilişkiler geliştiren bu devletler, günümüzde ticaret ve kalkınma gibi alanlarda ya da en temel olarak 'varlıklarını sürdürme'

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Galatasaray Üniversitesi, ykulali@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-1548-029X

How to cite this article/Atf için: Martin, Y.K. (2024). Foreign Policy Priorities Of European Landlocked Microstates. *Marmara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(2), 218-236. DOI: 10.14782/marmarasbd.1513568



konusunda herhangi bir sıkıntı yaşamamaktadır. Bu çerçevede bu çalışma, olumsuz coğrafi koşullara rağmen, içinde yer aldıkları bölge sayesinde bu devletlerin doğal olumsuz koşulların üstesinden nasıl gelebildiklerini açıklamaya çalışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Küçük Devlet, Mikro Devlet, Denize Kıyısı Olmayan Ülkeler, Avrupa, Bölge Çalışmaları

1. Introduction

Interest in the study of small states has increased in the field of International Relations (IR) as the number of such states has grown since the end of the Cold War. Even though contemporary studies still focus primarily on great powers, especially after 2010, more researchers are turning their attention to small states theory. One of the important reasons behind this rise of interest is, without a doubt, that the actual system is defined as ‘multipolar’ by many experts (Mearsheimer, 2019, p. 8). In a context where multiple actors – such as various international organizations, individuals, and corporations – can exert influence, small states also have a greater voice. According to the World Bank data, there are approximately 50 small states in the world today (The World Bank, 2024). Studies on small states typically focus on their definition and classification, foreign policy tendencies, and regional dynamics. In particular, research on island states, and more specifically small island states, has garnered significant attention.

The variety in definition and classification is the most problematic aspect of small states studies, but it also provides the greatest maneuvering possibilities. Small states are no longer regarded as ‘weak states’, which belong to a different literature within the international relations discipline. Instead, they are defined and classified according to various criteria. The foundation of these studies can be traced back to the ‘small and great powers’ classification established during the Vienna Congress in the 19th century (Neumann and Gstöhl, 2006, p. 5). This classification, which was originally centered around the concept of power, has since evolved into various other forms. When defining a small state today, quantitative criteria such as surface area and population typically come to mind first. Utilizing quantitative criteria simplifies categorization, and many theorists classify states based on these metrics, particularly in regional studies. While scholars like Tom Crowards, Maurice East and Harvey Armstrong emphasize quantitative criteria for classification, others, such as Olav Knudsen, Jeanne A. K. Hey, Robert Rothstein, and Hans Vogel, focus more on qualitative criteria. (Demir and Kulalı, 2019, p.120).

Tür and Salık (2017, p. 7) categorize the criteria for defining small states into “quantitative, qualitative and perceptual approaches”. The variety of definitions and classifications provides experts with the opportunity to maneuver because the concept of a small state lacks a ‘precise’ definition. In other words, the ambiguity in the small state literature allows researchers to analyze and comment more freely by selecting the criteria they wish to employ.

The most commonly used and objective method in small state studies relies on quantitative criteria. This method typically eliminates ambiguity regarding the categorization of states based on surface area or population. A small population or a limited surface area is sufficient for a

state to be defined as a 'small state'. In addition to statistics from international organizations, comprehensive studies utilizing quantitative criteria include the study by East (1973) comparing 32 countries and Crowards (2002) covering 190 states.

On the other hand, qualitative and perceptual criteria represent more subjective approaches that can vary depending on the actors involved. For instance, the concept of 'power' is no longer widely regarded as a criterion by many theorists due to its negative connotations. Instead, it has been supplanted by other criteria, such as a state's dependency on another actor or the role the state plays within the international system. In other words, dependency and a state's influence in the international arena can be considered qualitative criteria. Another important criterion relates to how a state defines itself and how it is perceived by other actors. 'Auto-identification' is a significant factor in micro – and small state theories and can serve strategic purposes, particularly for small states (Demir and Kulali, 2019, p. 121).

Simpson (2022, p. 1) argues that "in contemporary political science, there is no general consensus as to what defines a microstate. (...) The term 'micro' in microstates signifies an extreme smallness in size when referring to sovereign statehood." As mentioned earlier, there is ambiguity in the literature regarding the definition of microstates, particularly within the microstate subfield of small state studies. Consequently, microstates, as indicated in the above definition, are easier to define than small states based on quantitative criteria, as they possess significantly smaller surface areas and populations. In other words, even if there is no absolute consensus on the definition, the term microstate raises fewer questions. This applies both to the microstates themselves and to how other actors in the system perceive them. For example, while analyzing small states in the international system poses significant challenges for experts in the field, studying microstates tends to be more straightforward. Generally, experts categorize microstates solely based on quantitative criteria, with the use of qualitative criteria being rare. Additionally, the foreign policy tendencies of the states analyzed in small state studies provide insights into the foreign policy of microstates. From this perspective, the two bodies of literature should be examined together. While the present study focuses on microstates, it will heavily draw on small state theory to analyze their foreign policies.

Being a microstate brings its own set of challenges to the states in terms of geography. A small surface area means fewer resources, and a small population means a smaller workforce. However, being a landlocked state in addition to being a microstate brings even more difficulties. From the perspective of political geography experts, 'access to the sea' is always advantageous for states (Rosiere, 2007, p. 146). Studies on landlocked states in our time mostly focus on these states' economy or on maritime law. Economy-based studies analyze the costs of not having access to the sea. On the other hand, maritime law studies examine how these states find their place in the maritime law framework and the conventions they sign. Another area of study concerns the previously mentioned political geography. There are not many studies on landlocked states in the international relations literature.

“Despite the rapidly growing proliferation of landlocked states in recent decades, no major studies have been published on the influence of land-locked location on foreign policy. (...) The geography literature on landlocked states has focused on three aspects: (1) categorization of the geographic traits of landlocked states (2) the status of landlocked states under international law and (3) the influence of location vis-à-vis the sea on economic power. Economists have looked at the economic traits and development challenges of landlocked states” (Idan and Shaffer, 2011, p. 242).

The place of this type of state in the system is usually treated in regional studies. The regional studies in this area generally examine the regions of Africa and Asia. The present study also focuses on a region and analyses the foreign policy choices of this type of state, particularly in Europe.

Almost three-quarters of Europe consists of small states according to both quantitative and qualitative criteria. This article uses the study by Pierre Alexis Blevin (2017, p. 31) as basis for the definition of microstates in Europe. According to the study, the criteria for a microstate in Europe is having a surface area of less than 500 km² and a population of less than 100,000 people. There are five states in Europe that match these criteria: Vatican, Andorra, Monaco, Liechtenstein and San Marino. Among these states Vatican, Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino are geographically landlocked states. Vatican is excluded from the present study because of its religious status. Within this framework Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino will be examined as both micro – and landlocked state examples.

The foreign policy choices and foreign relations of these three European landlocked microstates constitute the main focus of the study. In this context, the literature on landlocked states and microstates will be featured. After defining the general foreign policy tendencies of this type of state, the three landlocked microstates will be examined in the specific context of Europe. Another important question of the present study concerns the place of these European examples in the general microstates and landlocked states studies. A key question that needs to be answered is whether these states fit into the generalizations of the area or if they have a *sui generis* structure. The present study also intends to contribute to the areas of small states theory, regional studies and political geography. As a method, focusing on case studies after a theoretical framework has been deemed suitable.

2. Theorizing Landlocked States: Foreign Policy Tendencies

In the literature, a landlocked country is defined in various ways. Some scholars argue that a landlocked country is “entirely or nearly entirely enclosed by land, meaning they have no shoreline on open seas, as opposed to closed seas or freshwater bodies” (Arvis et al., 2011, p. 1). Other definitions indicate that a landlocked country is “an independent sovereign state that does not have direct access to an ocean, such as the Atlantic, or to a sea that is not landlocked, such as the Mediterranean” (Britannica, 2024). Additionally, “the commonly accepted and

used definition of a 'landlocked country' describes it as a nation that is entirely enclosed by the landmass of neighboring states or inland seas and lakes" (Kassen, 2018, p. 315). Some scholars also define a landlocked state as states with no seacoast. "Thus, states with that are surrounded by the land of other states are called land-locked states. Land-locked states are distinct from other states in one decisive fact: they lack access to and from the sea" (Buchanan, 2023, p. 211).

The most important element that all the above-mentioned descriptions have in common is that the lands of landlocked states have no access to the sea. This geographical situation gives rise to economic, commercial or transportation problems, making research on maritime law and potential for the development of societies in these areas the main subjects of interest. As indicated by Lahiri and Masjidi, "while approximately 20% of the countries in the world are landlocked, they are distributed as approximately 40% of the world's low-income economies and less than 10% in the world's high-income countries" (Lahiri and Masjidi, 2012, p. 506). According to the statistics, the landlocked microstates in Europe fall within the mentioned 10% of high-income states (Çamyamaç, 2010, p. 1258). Specifically, Liechtenstein, San Marino, and Andorra are considered exceptions in this regard. Therefore, one of the aims of the present study is to investigate the reasons behind this exceptional outcome. In short, the lack of access to the sea experienced by landlocked states leads to various challenges, particularly in the realms of economics, commerce, and transportation. Understanding the unique circumstances of high-income landlocked microstates in Europe, such as Liechtenstein, San Marino, and Andorra, is a key focus of the current study.

High-income or low-income, all landlocked countries rely on their neighboring countries due to being enclosed within their own lands. This dependence typically falls into four categories: "dependence on neighbors' infrastructure; dependence on sound cross-border political relations; dependence on neighbors' peace and stability; and dependence on neighbors' administrative practices" (Faye, McArthur, Sach and Snow, 2024, p. 31). For example, neighboring countries with good infrastructure facilitate transportation, while positive cross-border political relations contribute to border transparency. Essentially, stronger political relations with neighbors lead to higher border permeability.

The third point can be explained by the political, economic and juridical stability of the neighbor. If the surrounding states have fewer problems, they are more likely to provide assistance. For example, in some economically and politically unstable African countries undergoing post-war transitional justice process, the ability to assist landlocked states is very limited as they prioritize their own survival.

Finally, the levels and forms of government influence bilateral agreements and the ability to access water resources, creating a dependence for landlocked states. This dependence has two main difficulties: "coastal countries may have political and economic intensives to impose costs on landlocked countries, [and] infrastructure development across national borders is more difficult to arrange than similar investment within a country" (Arvis, Raballand and Marteau, 2010, p. 1).

It is important to note that neighboring countries can hinder the arrival of even the most basic materials into the landlocked state. This situation becomes even more critical if the landlocked state is also a microstate with limited resources as it may struggle to provide essential items like water, cereals and bread. In such conditions, landlocked states with multiple neighbors are more advantageous, as having multiple neighbors increases the chances of negotiation (Lahiri, 2012, p. 518).

Economic experts explain the disadvantages of being landlocked through various economic theories including the new trade theory, new economic geography, neo-classical theory and growth theories. According to these theories, landlocked states trade less than coastal states, experience weaker growth than maritime countries and have recourse to International Monetary Fund (IMF) assistance for longer periods than coastal states (Arvis, Raballand and Marteau, 2010, p. 2). However, some economists do not believe that there is a direct link between trade and being landlocked, as “there is no evidence in cross-country data of a systematic relationship between the landlocked status of a country and its share of trade in GDP” (Carmignani, 2015, p.1594).

Maritime law holds great significance for landlocked states, as it governs the agreements that can be signed between landlocked and coastal as well as the rules regulating this situation. The most important foreign policy priority of a landlocked state is to guarantee its access to the sea. The study by Çamyamaç (2010, pp. 1258-1259) provides detailed insights into the international agreements in which landlocked states generally participate and the entire doctrine concerning this subject. The 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea is a focal point in the doctrine, as it not only regulates maritime law, but also frames the access of the landlocked states to the sea (UN Treaty Collection, 2024). However, “although there is a legal basis for rights of landlocked transit as outlined in Article 125(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (United Nations, 1982), in practice, this right of access must be agreed upon with the transit neighbor (Article 125(2) and (3) and is determined by the relationship between the countries” (Faye et al., 2024, p. 45). International organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), UN Development Program (UNDP) or the World Bank also play an active role in the development of landlocked states (Peyrony, 2015, p. 13). Despite the legal framework, what truly protects these states are the bilateral or multilateral agreements they sign.

A strong transportation infrastructure, freight services and cross-border transparency are crucial for landlocked states (Kashiha, Thill and Depken, 2016, p. 1). Solutions to address the challenges faced by landlocked states include economic and political unions, the removal of borders – as exemplified by the European microstates examined in the present study – and the right to use the ports of neighboring countries as their own or the creation of free zones in ports (Çamyamaç, 2010, pp. 1262-1263). Other solutions involve developing raw material importation, establishing a strong presence in international trade despite being landlocked – similar to Switzerland’s approach – and seeking membership in international organizations (Peyrony, 2015, p. 13). Additionally, “for landlocked countries, connectivity should be improved to promote freer movement and trade” (Miyawaki, 2018, p. 53).

Except for the landlocked states situated in Europe, such states are generally considered to be disadvantaged and the aforementioned solutions are particularly relevant to them. However, Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino, which constitute the case study of the present study, are exceptions to the landlocked states theory. In the final section, it will be analyzed how these states, which are also exceptions to the microstates theories, managed to reach such positions.

3. Theorizing Microstates: Foreign Policy Tendencies

A microstate is simply defined as “a very small state” (Richards, 1990, p. 40) or “the smallest of the small states” (Neemia, 1995, p. 4). “Microstates are semblance of states” (Duranton, 2012, p. 785) and “entities with exceptionally small territories and populations” (Duursma, 1996, p. 2). Similar to their use in the terminology of small states, quantitative, qualitative and perception criteria can also be applied to the microstates. The primary criterion for these diminutive lands is typically their status as a sovereign state, with the current standard being legally based on the 1933 Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States. Additional factors include surface area and population size, which may vary across different regions. Membership in the UN, the international organization with the highest number of member states globally, is also considered a significant criterion (Simpson, 2022, p. 2).

Simpson (2022, p. 2) classifies modern microstates based on three criteria: “being a state according to the 1993 Montevideo Convention, being a member of UN, [and] having a population of less than one million.” In contrast, war theorist Laurent Adam’s definition of microstates is considerably broad, encompassing criteria such as “having a population of less than one million, a surface area of less than 6,000 km², being a landlocked state or an island state, having a GNP of less than 0.5 billion dollars, being independent after 1963, not being a member of the UN, [and] not having a regular army” (Adam, 1995, p. 587). Wivel and Oest (2010, p. 429) define microstates as “always weak at all levels, unless dealing with other microstates.” Additionally, Dumienksi (2014, p. 22) suggests that “microstates are modern protected states, i.e. sovereign states that have been able to unilaterally depute certain attributes of sovereignty to larger powers in exchange for benign protection of their political and economic viability against their geographic or demographic constraints.”

As mentioned in the introduction, defining microstates is easier compared to small states. However, as demonstrated above, there is a wide range of definitions that vary from expert to expert and from region to region, mirroring the complexity observed in the theory of small states. For the purpose of this study, Blevin’s research has been selected as the basis for defining microstates situated in Europe. This choice was motivated by Blevin’s comprehensive analysis of the European region, which incorporates international law, the work of international organizations and insights from regional experts. According to Blevin’s criteria, a microstate in Europe must have a population of less than 100,000 people and a surface area of less than 500 km²

(Blevin, 2017, p. 31). Notably, Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino meet the criteria outlined in this description.

To understand the general foreign policy tendencies of microstates, it is essential to consider the criteria put forth by Jeanne K. Hey, who is a significant theorist specializing in the foreign policy of small states:

“exhibit a low level of participation in world affairs, address a narrow scope of foreign policy issues, limit their behavior to their immediate geographic area, employ diplomatic and economic foreign policy instruments, as opposed to military instruments, emphasize internationalist principles, international law, and other moral minded ideals, secure multinational agreements and join multinational institutions whenever possible, choose neutral positions, rely on superpowers for protection, partnerships, and resources, aim to cooperate and to avoid conflict with others, spend a disproportionate amount of foreign policy resources on ensuring physical and political security and survival” (Hey, 2003, p. 5).

Among the above-mentioned foreign policy choices, the following are particularly suited to microstates: exhibit a low level of participation in world affairs, employ diplomatic and economic foreign policy instruments, secure multinational agreements and join multinational institutions, choose neutral positions, rely on superpowers for protection, partnerships and resources and aim to cooperate. Due to their inherent natural disadvantages, microstates typically lack substantial armies and resources, making it logical to distance themselves from global issues. Consequently, many microstates opted for neutral positions during the two World Wars, although in reality declaring neutrality often did not prevent invasions. While Hey’s generalization emphasizes seeking protection from superpowers, microstates, particularly in the European region, often look to neighboring countries for such support. For example, while not considered superpowers in a global context, Italy holds significance for the survival of San Marino and Switzerland plays a crucial role in the survival of Liechtenstein. Therefore, entering into a ‘treaty of friendship’ with these neighbors or obtaining memberships in international organizations proves advantageous for these countries. Pursuing cooperation and utilizing diplomatic tools are essential strategies for ensuring the survival of these countries.

The geographical conditions of microstates often compel them to cooperate with various actors and become dependent, to varying extents, on larger or adjacent states with which they share strong historical bonds. Consequently, their requests for membership in the UN have been rejected. This rejection is not due to issues related to national sovereignty or statehood criteria, but rather stems from their perceived ‘over-dependence’ on immediate neighbors. In essence, the issue is not solely about their geographical size, but rather about their dependence on other actors (Dumienski, 2014, p. 17).

On the other hand, Sharman elucidates how these states can maintain independence despite their dependence within the international context: “Specifically, their survival and multiplication illustrate the obsolescence and irrelevance of fears of conquest traditionally said to be an inherent feature of international anarchy” (Sharman, 2017, p. 560). The current system, instead of pursuing the conquest of such states, is geared towards ensuring their survival through various strategic mechanisms.

Arguably the most important factors contributing to the survival of these states can be summarized as ‘good relations with neighbors’, economic partnerships’ and ‘skillful diplomacy’. While trade relations with neighboring states are important, the diplomatic prowess of these microstates may be even more vital. Diplomacy supported by skilled diplomats plays an important role in ensuring the survival of these states. Furthermore, diplomatic success coupled with stability in domestic policies benefits these states (Scheldrup, 2014, p. 3). In these countries, the interconnectedness of individuals fosters a social environment where almost everyone knows each other, leading to individuals exerting a noteworthy influence on politics, aligning with the level of analysis in the social sciences (Veenendaal, 2015, p.100).

4. The Case of Landlocked Microstates of Europe: Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino’s Foreign Relations

As also indicated by Veenendaal, “having long successfully maintained their political independence and even surviving two world wars, the four European microstates appear to be remarkably effective in the management of their international affairs” (Veenendaal, 2020, p. 162). This observation includes Monaco along with Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino, which are the landlocked microstates of Europe constituting the case studies of the present work. As previously mentioned in the sections about landlocked theory and microstates theory, the survival of these three countries in the international system is a great achievement considering their geographical disadvantages. For example, in Asia or Africa, landlocked states, regardless of whether they are microstates or not, are usually at the lowest ranks of development or economic indexes. In other words, even being only landlocked is a disadvantage for the development of these countries. These three states which are both micro and landlocked are ‘exceptions’ not only in the European region but also in the international system.

These three European states which could be described as “land-connected”(Casal and Selamé, 2015, p. 270) are highly integrated into one of the richest world-regions and engage in intense trade with wealthy neighbors as well as globally, thanks to excellent connecting infrastructures, capitals near the sea, and plenty of navigable rivers (Casal and Selamé, 2015, p. 270). This observation explains the actual ‘exceptional’ situation of Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino. The factor that liberates these diplomatically strong states from their geographical disadvantages is their ‘powerful’ neighbors. Consequently, these states are almost considered to be ‘land-connected’. They do not experience the disadvantages of not having access to the sea like other countries, and

they do not have negative economic impacts. Andorra's ties with France and Spain, with which it is double-landlocked; Liechtenstein's relations with Switzerland and Austria, with which it is also double-landlocked; and finally San Marino's intimacy with Italy, in which it is an enclave, greatly affect the survival of these microstates.

Moreover, despite not being members of the European Union (EU), the expansion policies of the union have been advantageous for these microstates. "Cornerstones of EU policy, among which open borders, the free flow of people and goods and the single market have provided the microstates with a politically secure and economically highly profitable external environment, offering them opportunities that are far out of reach for microstates and small states in other world regions" (Veenendaal, 2020, p. 163).

Within this framework, the theoretical section summarizes the factors ensuring the survival of the European landlocked microstates as good diplomacy, positive neighborhood relations and strong economic partnerships. Meanwhile, the reasons behind their decent level of prosperity can be attributed to their good relations with their 'powerful' neighbors with which they are 'landlocked' and also by their relations with the EU. The following sections will discuss Andorra, Liechtenstein and San Marino's country profiles and foreign relations in an attempt to substantiate the above observations.

4.1. Principality of Andorra

Andorra, one of the three micro principalities of Europe, is a double landlocked state situated between Spain and France. (BBC News, 2023a) With a surface area of 468 km² and a population of 86,600 people according to 2024 data (Britannica, 2024), Andorra fulfills the criteria of European microstates outlined by Blevin in the theoretical section. Operating under a dyarchical system (i.e. a system where power is vested in two rulers or authorities), Andorra boasts one of the most atypical government structures in the world (Blevin, 2017, p. 86). As a co-principality, one of Andorra's princes is the Bishop of Urgell in Spain, with whom it shares spiritual ties, while the other is the President of France, with whom it maintains political ties. In 2024, these roles are held by Joan Enric Vives i Sicília, the Bishop of Urgell and the French President Emmanuel Macron. Of particular relevance to the present study is the fact that Spain and France are the very states that place Andorra in a landlocked position. In essence, Andorra is wedged between French and Spanish territories, however, it maintains strong historical and political ties with both states.

Duursma, explains Andorra's liberation from the disadvantages of being both a microstate and landlocked through its diverse foreign policy strategies. These strategies align with the microstates theory, encompassing the adoption of the neutrality principle on occasions, membership in international organizations such as the UN and close ties with the EU. Additionally, they align with the landlocked theory, involving the establishment of political and commercial ties with France and Spain (Duursma, 1996, pp. 334-367).

When analyzing the relations with its neighbors, it must be mentioned that Andorra made bilateral agreements known as *paréage* which defined the country's actual borders and geographical situation in 1278 and 1288 with Spain (Urgell) and France (Comté de Foix). Consequently, 1278 is recognized as Andorra's official date of independence. During the 16th and 17th centuries, French kings implemented protective policies regarding Andorra, in coordination with Urgell. Despite remaining neutral during the Second World War, Andorra experienced two great crises with France in 1957 and 1971 about its representation in UNESCO. For a long time, France did not recognize Andorra as a sovereign state (Blevin, 2017, pp. 86-99).

Andorra commenced its diplomatic activities following the 1993 Trilateral Treaty of Vicinage signed with France and Spain, and approved its new constitution the same year. With the trilateral treaty, France and Spain's authority to represent Andorra in third countries was also accepted. However, France or Spain alone cannot act as Andorra's highest representatives, as the principality is politically sovereign. Additionally, France and Spain are responsible for guaranteeing Andorra's defense as it does not maintain its own army (Coprince France, 2024).

The country which lacks maritime ports or airports boasts numerous heliports. Both aerial and land transportation necessitate crossing through French or Spanish territories. Consequently, foreigners visiting Andorra must have the right to transit through France or Spain (Britannica, 2024). In other words, possessing a Schengen visa is essential. There are two official land entry-exit points: 'La Seu d'Urgell' town in Spain where the Bishop of Urgell resides and 'El Pas de la Casa', a mountainous area in France. Additionally, thanks to an agreement, Andorra can use the small Seo de Urgell airport in Catalonia. France and Spain serve as the main import and export partners (Britannica, 2024). Furthermore, through another agreement signed in 2003 with France and Spain, the entry and exit of foreigners are regulated jointly. "Having close relations with both its French and Spanish neighbors, Andorra relies on these two countries for various services and before the introduction of the euro Andorra used both the French franc and the Spanish peseta" (Veenendaal, 2015, p. 163).

When examining Andorra's process of membership in international organizations, it should be noted that the country joined the UN in 1993, Council of Europe in 1994, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in 1996, International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002, and IMF in 2020 (Afers Exteriors Govern d'Andorra, 2024). It is also a member of many other international organizations. It is also interesting to note that Andorra is one of the few countries that use the euro without being a member of the EU (Klieger, 2013, p. 36). In this sense, it "enjoys a 'special relationship' with the EU, such as being treated as an EU member for trade in manufactured goods (no tariffs) and as a non-EU member for agricultural products" (Department of Foreign Affairs, 2024).

Tourism, banking and the financial sectors are important sources of income for Andorra despite its small surface area.

“Previously a longstanding tax-free entity, Andorra has enacted policies committing to greater domestic and international tax compliance (...) Andorra has signed tax information exchange agreements (TIEAs), including the OECD Declaration in 2014, and TIEAs with Spain and Italy in 2015. It has also signed double taxation treaties, including with France and Portugal” (Department of Foreign Affairs, 2024).

In short, Andorra’s current situation can be attributed to the 1993 treaty with its neighbors France and Spain, with which it is landlocked as well as to the special relations it has cultivated with the EU and its thriving banking sector. Andorra’s ‘protective’ neighbors also bolsters the country’s relations with the EU. The strong international and European positions of France and Spain, coupled with their mutual harmony, provide Andorra with a distinct advantage in line with the landlocked theory. Consequently, Andorra does not face significant challenges in the realms of transportation, trade, or development.

4.2. Principality of Liechtenstein

With a surface area of 160 km² and a population of 39,700 people according to 2023 data (European Commission, 2024), the Principality of Liechtenstein, like Andorra, fits Blevin’s definition of a European microstate (BBC News, 2023b). Moreover, it is double-landlocked with Switzerland and Austria. Liechtenstein is one of the wealthiest countries not only in Europe but also in the world despite its status as a microstate and its landlocked position (Bloomberg, 2024). This observation is particularly relevant for the present study. At the same time, the Liechtenstein Dynasty is recognized as Europe’s richest royal family (Business Standard, 2024). The country also holds the distinction of being the landlocked nation with the highest GDP per capita (World Atlas, 2024).

As mentioned in the introduction, when considering other landlocked micro states from a quality-of-life perspective, Liechtenstein along with Andorra and San Marino is certainly an exception. However, beyond being merely an ‘exception’, Liechtenstein has now reached a ‘unique’ position. Some researchers believe that this microstate’s economic power and presence in the international system depend partly on luck and partly on the intelligence and determination of its governors regarding independence (Klieger, 2013, p. 53).

“Liechtenstein presents the clearest example of the single-minded determination of one family to create a polity free of the constraints of excessive alliances and military deployment, rich in traditional particularisms, graced with direct democracy, dedicated to social welfare, and above all, framed with the recognized right of self-determination for all its people” (Klieger, 2013, p. 53). The principality governed by the House of Liechtenstein for centuries is named after the Castle of Liechtenstein in Austria, near Vienna. Liechtenstein maintained close ties first with the German Confederation and then with Austria for many years. It became independent in 1866, but continued to sign treaties of friendship with the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Following

the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after the First World War, the borders of Liechtenstein were recognized in accordance with Article 27 of the 1919 Saint-Germain Treaty. After the war, Liechtenstein grew closer to Switzerland, the other country with which it is landlocked (Blevin, 2017, pp. 69-81).

Duursma explains Liechtenstein's success through dynamics similar to those of Andorra, including close relations with Austria and Switzerland with which it is landlocked, membership in international organizations and the occasional adoption of the neutrality principle (Duursma, 1996, p. 160). Similar to Andorra, if one focuses on Liechtenstein's relations with the countries with which it is double-landlocked, it must be noted Austria and Switzerland are also states with high levels of prosperity. As mentioned in the theoretical section, when the neighboring countries surrounding a landlocked state have high prosperity levels, lack infrastructure problems and are not involved in military conflicts, the situation tends to benefit the landlocked country. Additionally, similar to Andorra, Liechtenstein has historical ties with both Switzerland and Austria, leading to cultural and historical closeness between their societies.

Liechtenstein does not have a political system that creates co-principality. This situation reinforces the image of Liechtenstein as an independent entity within the international system.

“Switzerland has safeguarded Liechtenstein's interests abroad since 1919. With the Customs Treaty of 1923, the Principality of Liechtenstein joined the Swiss economic area. Liechtenstein introduced the Swiss franc as its official currency in 1924. This common economic area continues even following Liechtenstein's accession to the European Economic Area (EEA) in 1995. In 1919, Liechtenstein opened a legation in Bern, which – following a temporary closure – was transformed into an embassy in 1969” (Confédération Suisse, 2024).

In other words, Liechtenstein, which does not have an army, mainly secures its defense through the treaty signed with Switzerland, and the two countries share an important economic partnership as well. In 2023, the 100th anniversary of the Customs Treaty was celebrated. Today, the only physical separation between Switzerland and Liechtenstein – which are both located in the Schengen zone – consists of metal signposts and there are no controls when crossing from one country to the other (Swiss Info, 2011).

Liechtenstein has no airports and has signed over 50 treaties with Austria, its other neighbor, in areas such as culture, health, defense, justice, economy and social matters (National Administration Li, 2024). It should be noted that Austria is also part of the Schengen zone. While Liechtenstein has established close relations with both of its neighbors and has no conflicts concerning its borders, it can be said that it maintains closer ties with Switzerland as evidenced by the 1923 Custom Treaty and its membership in the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

In addition to EFTA, Liechtenstein is also a member of the Council of Europe. While it is not a member of the EU, it joined the European Economic Area in 1995 and the Schengen Area in

2011. Additionally, it is a member of the WTO and became a member of the UN in 1990. As also noted by some scholars, “Liechtenstein has achieved an advantageous position in Europe in terms of conducting its own foreign policy. The principality, which is internationally acknowledged as the prime example of a successful microstate, was able to strengthen its sovereignty vis-à-vis Switzerland through its membership in the European Economic Area (EEA)” (Forster and Mallin, 2014, p. 2). Even though it does not possess rich natural resources, it is still a highly industrialized economy, supported by a thriving financial sector. “Major industries include metal manufacturing, textile, food processing, pharmaceuticals, and power tools. Besides the financial sector, tourism also contributes significantly to the country’s GDP” (World Atlas, 2024).

In short, Liechtenstein is an example of a successful microstate, just as its neighbor Switzerland exemplifies a successful small state. While the ties of Andorra and Monaco with France, or San Marino’s position within Italy are often questioned, there are few doubts regarding Liechtenstein’s independence today. In fact, it is one of the wealthiest countries in Europe despite its landlocked status. Compared to other microstates, it is less dependent on its neighbors. With the exception of defense matters, it possesses nearly the profile of a self-sufficient state.

4.3. Republic of San Marino

With a surface area of 61.2 km² and a population of 35,200 people according to 2024 data (Britannica, 2024) there is no doubt that the Republic of San Marino is a microstate. Unlike Liechtenstein and Andorra, San Marino is a landlocked state completely surrounded by Italy. From this perspective, it has limited options for overcoming its geographical disadvantages and has historically maintained good relations with Italy.

San Marino, which declared independence in 300 A.D., is considered one of the oldest existing republics. The microstate established its first constitution in 1600 and was recognized by the Pope in 1631. From the very beginning, San Marino has maintained peaceful relations with both Italy and other European countries. Invited to the 1815 Vienna Congress as a state, it declared neutrality during the First and Second World Wars (Blevin, 2017, pp. 120-126). Since 1862, San Marino and Italy have regularly renewed their ‘Customs Union and Friendship’ treaties (BBC, 2023c).

Duursma has adapted her analysis of Andorra and Liechtenstein to San Marino. According to her findings, San Marino’s foreign policy tendencies include: first, the close ties established with Italy; second, adherence to the principle of neutrality; third, the reinforcement of its international status; fourth, contributions to the resolution of international problems; and fifth, membership in international organizations (Duursma, 1996, p. 222). In line with the foreign policy tendencies of landlocked countries, membership in international organizations and good relations with Italy are also significant for San Marino, similar to the other examples discussed in this study. Additionally, the principle of neutrality aligns well with microstate theory. What sets San Marino apart from the other cases is that, despite being a microstate, it does not remain indifferent to

the dynamics of the international landscape. Within this context, peace, human rights, and the development of individuals and wealth are the primary focuses (Duursma, 1996, p. 223).

The ties between San Marino and Italy, which landlocks it, are stronger than those seen in Andorra and Liechtenstein. For example, San Marino cannot make decisions regarding financial measures without Italy's approval. The influence of Italian financial institutions on San Marino's banking sector is substantial, most judges in the justice system are Italian, and the media sectors of both countries cooperate closely. In instances where San Marino lacks its own consular or diplomatic representation, Italy fulfills this role (Duursma, 1996, p. 257). On the other hand, when examining the political landscape, it is noted that "democratization in this microstate has largely mirrored developments in Italy" (Veenendaal, 2020, p. 103). In terms of political, economic, and defense matters, San Marino is more dependent on its neighbor than other microstates. Italy remains its primary commercial partner. There is a level of transparency between Italy and San Marino similar to that between Italy and the Vatican. San Marino is easily accessible from Italy, with Rimini Airport located only 16 kilometers away. The country faces few challenges regarding transportation and access to resources, thanks to treaties with Italy that have been regularly renewed since 1862. Being completely 'enclaved' by Italy and not double-landlocked like Andorra and Liechtenstein, San Marino is more dependent on its neighbor. This situation significantly limits its maneuvering opportunities in foreign policy. Furthermore, being surrounded by a single state means that San Marino is affected by international crises concerning Italy almost to the same degree as Italy itself.

San Marino applied for membership in the UN in 1947 and became a member in 1992. It joined the Council of Europe in 1988 and is also a member of various international organizations, including the IMF, World Health Organization (WHO) and ICC. While it has been using the euro as a currency since 2012, it is not a member of the Schengen Area. In 2023, it signed the "Association Agreement between the EU and Andorra and San Marino", which facilitates mutual cooperation on issues such as the internal market, financial services, areas of common interest, and institutional frameworks (European Commission, 2023). It has also been a member of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) since 2002 and has ratified all conventions (Daily Cargo News, 2024), which is an aspect that distinguishes it from Andorra and Liechtenstein.

5. Conclusion

Landlocked countries are often considered geographically disadvantaged because access to water is crucial for the development of any state. Being classified as a microstate – defined by quantitative criteria such as a very small surface area and a small population – also inherently presents disadvantages. In fact, whether or not they have access to the sea, these countries face restricted resources. Today, the landlocked microstates of Europe are viewed as exceptions, despite typically experiencing the drawbacks associated with these two geographical conditions.

In the European region where they are located, Andorra, Liechtenstein, and San Marino have not faced significant issues related to their economies, development or survival for many years.

The present study aims to explain how the European landlocked microstates of Andorra, San Marino, and Liechtenstein have navigated their geographical limitations by focusing on their foreign policy priorities. There are notable similarities in the foreign policies of these three countries. Firstly, Andorra maintains close relations with France and Spain, which landlock it; Liechtenstein has strong ties with Austria and Switzerland, while San Marino is closely linked to Italy. These relationships stem not only from geographical proximity but also from historical and cultural connections. The neighboring countries, often referred to as “shelters” (Thorhallsson, 2018), provide support in areas such as transportation, development, economy, trade, politics, and defense. Through treaties signed with these neighboring states, which act as ‘protectors’, the landlocked microstates can mitigate the challenges posed by their geographical situations.

It is important to note that all these neighboring states possess robust economies and infrastructures, which, according to landlocked theory, creates advantages for the countries receiving support. Furthermore, the neighboring countries generally maintain amicable relations with each other, and this peaceful environment also benefits the landlocked states. While there are no significant issues regarding the independence of these three states, it should be emphasized that San Marino’s enclave position makes it more dependent on Italy. In contrast, the double-landlocked positions of Liechtenstein and Andorra provide them with greater options. Among these states, Liechtenstein stands out as the most independent in terms of foreign policy.

In line with microstate theory, these three states are members of numerous international organizations and maintain good relations with the EU, which contributes to their economic development. Additionally, in accordance with microstate theory, these countries excel in diplomacy and have embraced the principle of neutrality, particularly during the world wars.

In summary, what distinguishes Andorra, Liechtenstein, and San Marino as ‘exceptions’ is the unique dynamics of their region. While these states possess their own economic resources, such as tourism and the banking sector, their primary advantages stem from the prosperity of their neighboring countries and their interaction with the EU. From this perspective, it can be argued that the economic conditions of these states are largely influenced by the EU, whereas their survival is a result of their own diplomatic successes. As noted by Dumienski (2014, p. 22), “the European microstates truly are ‘medieval relics,’ but not because of their size, rather because they are the only surviving protected states.” Referring to the observations of Casal and Selamé (2015), it is more appropriate to describe these states as ‘land-connected countries’. Finally, in the context of political geography studies, it is important to recognize that the dynamics of a region can be crucial for overcoming geographical challenges. The presence of strong neighbors and the support of the EU have played significant roles in the survival of Andorra, Liechtenstein, and San Marino as sovereign states.

References

- Adam, L. (1995) Le Concept de Micro-Etat: Etats lilliputiens ou parodies d'Etats? *Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée* (2)3, 3577–3592.
- Afers Exteriors Govern d'Andorra (2024) Andorra and International Organizations. <https://www.exteriors.ad/en/multilateral-affairs-and-cooperation/andorra-and-international-organizations> (Accessed: 19.06.2024).
- Arvis, J., et.al. (2011) *Connecting Landlocked Developing Countries to Markets*, Washington: World Bank.
- Arvis, J., Raballand, G. & Marteau, J. (2010). *The Cost of Being Landlocked*. Washington: World Bank.
- BBC News (2023a) Andorra Country Profile. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-17028050> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- BBC News (2023b) Liechtenstein Country Profile. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-17535108> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- BBC News (2023c) San Marino Country Profile. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-17842338> (Accessed: 20.06.2024).
- Blevin, P. (2017) *Les Micro-Etats Européens, Etude historique, juridique et fiscal*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Bloomberg (2024) Centuries-Old Principality Set to Become IMF's Youngest Member. April 16. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024-04-16/centuries-old-principality-set-to-become-imf-s-youngest-member> (Accessed: 19.06.2024).
- Britannica (n.d. a) Landlocked Country. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/landlocked-country> (Accessed: 06.06.2024).
- Britannica (n.d. b) Andorra. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Andorra> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- Britannica (n.d. c) San Marino. <https://www.britannica.com/place/San-Marino-republic-Europe> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- Buchanan, I. (2023) Foreign Policy and Development Strategies of Small and Landlocked States: The Case Study of Rwanda. C. Bhatta & J. Menge (eds.) *Walking among Giants: Foreign Policy and Development Strategies of Small and Landlocked Countries* (209–225). Nepal: Friedrich-Ebert.
- Business Standard (2024) Europe's Richest Royal Family Builds Nearly 300 Billion Finance Empire. September 23. https://www.business-standard.com/world-news/europe-s-richest-royal-family-builds-nearly-300-billion-finance-empire-123.092.901398_1.html (Accessed: 19.06.2024).
- Carmignani, F. (2015) The Curse of Being Landlocked: Institutions Rather than Trade. *The World Economy* 38(10), 1594–1617.
- Casal, P. & Sélamé, N. (2015) Sea for the Landlocked: A Sustainable Development Goal? *Journal of Global Ethics* 11(3), 270–279.
- Confédération Suisse (2024) Bilateral Relations Switzerland-Liechtenstein. <https://www.eda.admin.ch/countries/liechtenstein/en/home/switzerland-and/bilateral-relations.html> (Accessed: 19.06.2024)
- Coprince France (2024) Constitution de la Principauté d'Andorre. <http://www.coprince-fr.ad/ca/constitution-principaute-andorre> (Accessed: 15.06.2024).
- Crowards, T. (2002) Defining the Category of Small States, *Journal of International Development* 14(2), 143–179.
- Çamyamaç, A. (2010) Denize Kıyısı Olmayan Devletlerin Denize Çıkışlarına İlişkin Bazı Uç Öneri ve Projelerin Uluslararası Hukuk Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 12, 1257-1301.

- Daily Cargo News (2024) Analysis: Landlocked Micronation San Marino's New Ship Registry. <https://www.thedcn.com.au/news/bulk-trades-shipping/analysis-landlocked-micronation-san-marinos-new-ship-registry/> (Accessed: 20.06.2024).
- Demir, A. F. & Kulalı, Y. (2019) Avrupadaki Mikro-Devletler ve Türk Dış Politikası Açısından Konuuları. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* 50, 117–138.
- Department of Foreign Affairs (2024) Andorra Country Brief. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/andorra/andorra-country-brief> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- Dumienski, Z. (2014) *Microstates as Modern Protected States: Towards A New Definition of Micro-Statehood*. Reykjavik: The Centre for Small States Studies.
- Duranthon, A. (2012) Qu'est-ce qu'un micro-Etat aujourd'hui? *Revue Française de Droit Constitutionnel* 4(92), 785–797.
- Duursma, J. (1996) *Fragmentation and the International Relations of Micro-States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- East, M. (1973) Size and Foreign Policy Behaviour: A Test of Two Models, *World Politics* 25(4), 556–577.
- European Commission (2023) The Commission Welcomes the End of the Negotiations for An Association Agreement with Andorra and San Marino. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_23_6522 (Accessed: 20.06.2024).
- European Commission (2024) Liechtenstein: Population: Demographic Situation, Languages and Religions. <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-education-systems/liechtenstein/population-demographic-situation-languages-and-religions> (Accessed: 19.06.2024)
- Faye, M. et.al. (2004) The Challenges Facing Landlocked Developing Countries. *Journal of Human Development* 5(1), 31–68.
- Forster, N. & Mallin, F. (2014) The Association of European Microstates with the EU. SWP. https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/180736/2014C27_frr_mln.pdf (Accessed: 20.06.2024).
- Hey, J. A. K. (2003) *Small States in World Politics*. London: Lynne.
- Idan, A. & Shaffer, B. (2011) The Foreign Policies of Post-Soviet Landlocked States. *Post-Soviet Affairs* 27(3), 241–268.
- Kashiha, M., Thill, J. & Depken, C. (2016) Shipping Route Choice across Geographies: Coastal & Landlocked Countries. *Transportation Review* 91, 1–14.
- Kassen, M. (2018) Understanding Foreign Policy Strategies of Kazakhstan: A Case Study of the Landlocked and Transcontinental Country. *The Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 31(3–4), 314–343.
- Klieger, C. (2013) *The Microstates of Europe*, London: Lexington Books.
- Lahiri, B. & Masjidi, F. (2012). Landlocked Countries: A Way to Integrate with Coastal Economies, *Journal of Economic Integration* 2(4), 505–519.
- Merriam Webster Dictionary (2024) Dyarchy. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dyarchy> (Accessed: 18.06.2024).
- Miyawaki, N. (2018) Without Sea, Can Landlocked Countries Hope Economic Security? *Journal of Policy Science* 12, 49–55.
- National Administration Liechtenstein (2024) Bilateral Relations: Austria-Liechtenstein. <https://www.llv.li/en/national-administration/diplomatic-representations/vienna-a-/bilateral-relations-austria---liechtenstein> (Accessed: 19.06.2024).
- Neemia, U. (1995) *Smallness, Islandness and Foreign Policy Behaviour: Aspects of Island Microstates Foreign Policy Behaviour with Special Reference to Cook Islands and Kiribati* [unpublished PhD thesis]. Wollongong: University of Wollongong.

- Neumann, I. & Gstöhl, S. (2006) Introduction: Lilliputians in Gulliver's World. C. Ingebritsen et al. (eds.), *Small States in International Relations* (3–36). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2019) Bound to Fail: The Rise and Fall of the Liberal International Order. *International Security* 43(4), 7–50.
- Peyrony, E. (2015) *Les Pays Enclaves et la Mer*. Paris: Centre d'études stratégiques de la marine.
- Richards, J. (1990) Micro-States: A Specific Form of Polity? *Politics* 10(1), 40–46.
- Rosiere, S. (2007) *Géographie politique et Géopolitique*, Paris, Ellipses.
- Scheldrup, M. (2014) *Lilliputian Choice: Explaining Foreign Policy Variation* [unpublished undergraduate thesis]. Colorado: University of Colorado Boulder.
- Sharman, J. C. (2017) Sovereignty at the Extremes: Micro-States in World Politics. *Political Studies* 65(3), 559–575.
- Simpson, A. (2022) On the Identification and Definition on Microstates, *Journal of International Affairs* 74(2), 67.
- Swiss Info (2011) No More Controls on Swiss-Liechtenstein Border. December 19. <https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/swiss-politics/no-more-controls-on-swiss-liechtenstein-border/31796054> (Accessed: 19.06.2024)
- The World Bank (2024) Small States Overview. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/smallstates/overview> (Accessed: 05.06.2024).
- Thorhallson, B. (2018). *Small States and Shelter Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Tür Ö. & Salk N. (2017) Uluslararası İlişkilerde Küçük Devletler: Gelişimi, Tanımı, Dış Politika ve İttifak Davranışları. *Uluslararası İlişkiler* 14(53), 3–22.
- UNTreatyCollection (2024) United Nations Convention of Law of the Sea, 1982. https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetailsIII.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XXI - 6&chapter=21&Temp=mtdsg3&clang=_en (Accessed: 11.06.2024)
- Veenendaal, W. (2015) Democracy in Microstates: Why Smallness Does not Produce A Democratic Political System. *Democratization* 22(1), 92–112.
- Veenendaal, W. (2020) Politics of the Four European Microstates: Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco and San Marino. G. Baldacchino & A. Wivel. *Handbook on the Politics of the Small States* (150–167). Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Wivel, A. & Oest, J. N. (2010) Security, Profit or Shadow of the Past? Explaining the Security Strategies of Microstates. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(3), 429–453.
- World Atlas (2024) Landlocked Countries of the World. <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/landlocked-countries-of-the-world.html> (Accessed: 19.06.2024).