

effectively responding to the needs of civilian populations and the realities currently facing them, promoting peace, justice, and effective protection of human rights.

SMALL STATE REPRESENTATIVE

doi:10.1017/amp.2019.210

By Tafadzwa Pasipanodya

INTRODUCTION

I am honored to be here, in San Francisco, representing a small developing country.

Right from the conception of my state, Small Developing Country X, following decolonization in the 1960s, we have engaged with this whole global project on the premise that there is an ever-increasing economic pie. We have acted on the assumption of the nation-state leading a process of expanding economic and social well-being of its citizens through international cooperation and solidarity. But as we all know, this assumption is under threat today. World economic expansion is under threat. The real wealth of the world, not just the economic wealth, may be shrinking. And, the well-being of our vulnerable populations is becoming further impaired.

In this context, the role of the state is questioned and contested, and the international community is increasingly fragmented. As we heard from Professors Koskeniemi and Orford yesterday, it seems that every day you wake up, another state is withdrawing, or exiting, or unsigned something.

But, as a small state, we can withdraw sometimes from some things, but we cannot withdraw from all things, all of the time. The global is everywhere within our local context. Not even the subsistence farmer in the most remote corner of my country can escape the global. The global reaches into her local world through climate change and through investment treaties that govern how her government can act and how foreign investors can conduct themselves in her backyard.

The global is indeed in the local, and few things make this clearer than climate change. Given the global roots of climate change, the solutions must also be global. And, although small states such as ours have had little to do with the creation of climate change, we have to join hands with other countries in resolving it, or else we will not survive it.

Of course, as a small state, we can see the problems of globalization. But we do not have the luxury of being able to reject it. We must seek to make it function. A strong global governance system is critical for a small state like us to achieve the goals that are still at the center of our existence: the personal fulfillment, happiness, and social well-being of our people. I am happy to be here to discuss how I think we should go forward in creating such a global governance organization.

SCOPE: SHOULD A SUCCESSOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS BE AS COMPREHENSIVE AS THE CURRENT ONE OR SHOULD THE FOCUS BE LIMITED TO PEACE, SECURITY, AND POLITICAL AFFAIRS?

In my view, the United Nations should continue to focus on peace and conflict, but we have to recognize the breadth of those two issues. As the current Secretary-General of the United Nations, António Guterres, said a few months ago, the “UN’s best tool for preventing conflict and building a future of peace” is “advancing sustainable development.” I do not think you should divorce the economic issues from the mandate of the United Nations. I think those are central issues people care about, and will fight for, and are willing to die for. We cannot leave them to the World Bank.

They have to be at the center of what the United Nations is doing, and the United Nations has to address them more effectively.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION: SHOULD THE NEW GLOBAL GOVERNANCE INSTITUTION HAVE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES ONLY, OR REPRESENTATIVES OF BUSINESS, CIVIL SOCIETY, AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AS WELL? IF NONSTATE ACTORS ARE INCLUDED, SHOULD THEY HAVE VOTING POWER?

We still live in a world in which states should be the ones with voting rights in a global governance institution. Nevertheless, I think we have learned, in particular from our attempts to deal with problems such as climate change, that we have to include the global citizenry to a much greater extent than we have in the past. I would advocate for a bicameral structure for the new global governance institution. Member states would be in one camera or chamber, in which they have voting rights. Nonstate actors, such as NGOs and business representatives, would form part of the other chamber, which would serve an advisory function. States would be required to take the advice of the nonstate actors into consideration, but would ultimately remain with the voting power.

POWERS AND STRUCTURE: SHOULD IT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO ADOPT BINDING DECISIONS AND CREATE NEW LAW? IF SO, IN A PLENARY BODY OR IN AN EXECUTIVE BODY SUCH AS THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL?

As a small state representative, I am very much against keeping the “great powers” as the sole states with permanent and veto authority. I think this is a critical issue that undermines the legitimacy of the United Nations and the UN Security Council. If we are rebuilding a new system we can and should be more inclusive. In my view, it is particularly unfair that African states do not have a permanent seat even though a majority of UN Security Council decisions are directed toward African states.

In my view, either all states on the UN Security Council should have veto power or none of them should have veto power. I would also support limiting the scope of the veto power.

Concerning the proposal of an enforcement body, as the representative of a small state, I would not entrust enforcement to a few wealthy powerful states. I would only support greater enforcement by an executive body of the United Nations if that body could be shown to be much more inclusive and fairer than the current UN Security Council.