




WEAKENING OF THE STATE

Lucie Konečná
CDSn4005 Security Systems and Actors
5/4/2023



State Components and State Types

- The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications:
 - *a) a permanent population;*
 - *b) a defined territory;*
 - *c) government;*
 - *d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states*(Convention on Rights and Duties of States 1933)
- Typology of states:
 1. Superpowers
 2. (Regional) Powers
 3. „Normal“ states
 4. Microstates
 5. Dependent states and territories
 6. Failed states

Position of States in the International System/Polarity

- Polarity expresses the number of autonomous centers of power and is a function of the distribution of power among only the most important actors
1. Unipolarity
 2. Bipolarity
 3. Tripolarity
 4. Multipolarity
 5. Hyperpolarity (total symmetric desintegration of power)
 6. „Zero-polarity“ (total cooperation)

Position of States in the International System/Alliance

Security alliance is „formal agreement between two or more actors (usually states) to cooperate together on perceived mutual security issues. By allying themselves together it is anticipated that security will be increased in one, some or all of the following dimensions:

1. By joining an alliance system of deterrence will be established or strengthened;
2. By joining an alliance a defence pact will operate in the event of war;
3. By joining an alliance some or all the actors will be precluded from joining other alliances“ (Evans, Newnham 1998: 15).

Temporally - Permanent	Symmetric – Asymmetric
Single-Issue – Multi-issue Limited – General	Efficient – Non-Efficient Successful – Unsuccessful

Strategies for Ensuring Security

- Schroeder (1994): „Do all states, or virtually all, or all that really count, actually resort to self-help? → in the majority of instances, they have NOT!
- four possible strategies
 1. **balancing** - *as a form of self-help*
 2. **bandwagoning** - *joining the stronger side for the sake of protection and payoffs,*
 3. **transcending** - *to solve the problem, end the threat, and prevent its recurrence through some institutional arrangement*
 4. **hiding from threats** - *ignoring the threat / declaring neutrality / withdraw into isolation / assuming a purely defensive position...*
- the prevalence of balancing in international politics not backed up by evidence


Position of States in the International System/ Balancing and

Balancing	Allying with others against the prevailing threat.
Bandwagoning	Alignment with the source of danger.

1. Balancing is more common than bandwagoning.
2. The stronger the state, the greater its tendency to balance. Weak state will balance against other weak states but may bandwagon when threatened by great powers.
3. The greater the probability of allied support, the greater the tendency to balance. When adequate allied support is certain, however, the tendency for free-riding or buck-passing increases.
4. The more unalterably aggressive a state is perceived to be, the greater the tendency for other to balance against it.
5. In wartime, the closer one side is to victory, the greater the tendency for other to bandwagon with it (Walt 2009: 102)

Functions of the State

- „A successful state, therefore, does not only enjoy international legal or de jure recognition of its statehood, but the government and organs of the state also possess the capabilities to project and protect their authority throughout the entirety of its sovereign territory and consequently enter into collaborative arrangements with other states.“ J. Hill.
- The only legitimate monopoly on violence.
- Basic functions according to Zartman:
 - a) state as a sovereign authority (law and order)
 - b) state as an institution (good governance)
 - c) state as a guarantor of security (domestic peace)
- Robert I. Rotberg: state is an instrument for providing political goods to citizens. Three Dimensions:
 - a) Political (e.g. effective rule of law, political freedom)
 - b) Security (state's monopoly on the use of violence)
 - c) Economic (economic opportunities, education, etc.)



Reasons for Weakening and Collapse

- Rotberg - so-called Indicators of Failure:

- a) **Political Indicators** (non-functioning democracy, subordination of legislation and judiciary to the executive, only privileged groups can use all state services, etc.)

- b) **Economic Indicators** (declining income of the population, rising unemployment, poor education and health system experiencing deficiencies (medicines, textbooks), lack of fuel, corruption, etc.)

- c) **Security Indicators/Level of violence** (increasing levels of violence due to skirmishes, hostilities or civil war; decreasing level of security; rising crime rates and civilian casualties in conflicts)

- Daniel C. Esty - three indicators, their fulfillment leads to collapse: closed domestic market, high infant mortality rate and undemocratic establishment.

Typology According to Rotberg

- **Strong States** – provide all services, have a good GDP, Human Development Index, rule of law prevails, courts are independent, ensure political and civil liberties, low level of crime, etc.
- **Weak States** – mostly have linguistic, religious, or ethnic tensions (not violent), crime is rising, infrastructure is poor, GDP and the economy is declining or low, high levels of corruption which continue to grow, etc.
- **Failing States** – transitional phase, the beginning of violence across various armed factions (the deterioration of other indicators such as the drop in GDP, the increasing level of corruption, the growing crime rate etc.)
- **Failed States** – various armed factions fighting for power, high levels of violence and crime, huge levels of corruption, destroyed infrastructure, politicized military, declining GDP, economic opportunities only for the privileged, etc.
- **Collapsed States** – an extreme version of failed state (vacuum of authority, services are mediated privately, some not at all, the rule of the strong, not of law, territory is divided among VNSAs,


Reasons for Weakening and Collapse

- Zartman's so-called typical collapse scenario in Africa:

- within society
 - 1. long-term ruling regime unable to meet the needs of different groups
 - 2. newly dried up resources (reasons either exogenous or through internal waste and corruption)
 - 3. social and ethnic groups feel neglected
 - 4. atmosphere of discontent and opposition speaks out against the regime -
> intensification of repression
 - 5. sometimes a military regime is imposed; accompanied by martial law and escalating repressions
 - 6. the final stage of the collapse of the state

- The final stage of collapse is typically characterized by: central government loses its power base, power devolves to the peripheries, government malfunctions by avoiding necessary but difficult choices, government practice only defensive politics, centre loses control over its own state agents.

Fund for Peace – Fragile State Index



Fund for Peace – Fragile State Index

Country1	Rank	Σ												
Somalia	1st	111.9	9.5	10.0	8.7	9.5	9.1	8.6	9.6	9.8	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.1
Yemen	2nd	108.9	8.6	9.9	8.8	9.9	7.9	6.4	9.8	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.2
South Sudan	3rd	108.5	9.9	9.2	8.6	8.6	8.6	6.5	9.8	9.7	8.7	9.7	10.0	9.2
Congo Democratic Republic	4th	107.2	8.8	9.6	9.4	8.1	8.4	6.4	9.3	9.3	9.3	9.7	9.8	9.1
Syria	5th	107.1	9.4	9.9	9.1	9.6	6.5	8.0	10.0	9.0	9.1	7.4	9.1	10.0
Afghanistan	6th	106.6	9.7	8.7	8.3	9.6	8.2	8.5	9.4	10.0	8.7	9.2	8.6	7.7
Sudan	7th	106.2	8.3	9.6	9.3	9.3	8.5	7.5	9.4	8.6	9.2	8.8	9.6	8.1
Central African Republic	8th	105.7	8.0	9.4	8.1	8.2	9.6	6.2	8.9	10.0	9.1	9.3	9.5	9.4
Chad	9th	104.6	8.7	9.5	8.1	8.4	8.7	7.7	9.1	9.6	8.4	9.5	9.0	7.9
Haiti	10th	102.9	6.8	9.7	5.5	8.9	9.2	8.3	9.9	9.8	8.7	8.8	7.7	9.6
Ethiopia	11th	100.4	8.6	9.3	8.9	6.8	7.5	6.2	8.2	8.7	8.8	9.8	9.5	8.1
Myanmar	12th	100.2	9.1	9.0	9.7	7.6	7.3	6.3	9.3	9.1	9.3	7.0	9.2	7.3
Mali	13th	99.5	9.6	7.2	8.5	7.5	7.2	7.7	8.6	8.9	7.5	8.8	8.5	9.5
Guinea	14th	98.5	8.7	10.0	9.4	8.0	7.5	6.3	9.7	9.4	7.3	8.8	6.2	7.2
Nigeria	15th	98.0	9.0	9.6	8.6	8.8	8.1	6.7	8.2	8.8	8.6	9.6	6.4	5.6
Zimbabwe	16th	96.9	8.4	10.0	5.9	9.2	7.8	7.1	8.9	8.8	7.8	8.7	7.6	6.7
Libya	17th	96.1	9.5	9.3	7.3	8.9	6.4	5.0	9.6	8.0	9.3	6.0	7.5	9.3
Ukraine	18th	95.9	10.0	8.0	6.8	8.5	4.9	8.9	6.4	7.3	7.8	7.3	10.0	10.0
Eritrea	19th	94.5	6.0	8.4	8.7	7.1	7.9	8.6	9.7	8.1	9.1	7.7	6.6	6.6
Burundi	20th	94.2	7.8	8.5	6.7	8.8	7.2	5.2	9.1	8.0	8.6	8.7	8.0	7.6
Burkina Faso	21st	94.0	9.3	8.2	5.8	7.2	8.3	7.0	7.4	8.6	7.0	8.3	8.2	8.7
Mozambique	21st	94.0	7.0	6.3	7.4	7.7	9.2	7.1	7.1	9.7	7.2	9.6	7.9	7.8
Cameroon	21st	94.0	8.1	9.3	8.1	6.0	7.4	6.9	8.8	8.3	7.3	9.0	8.4	6.4
Niger	24th	93.4	8.3	9.6	7.7	6.4	7.8	6.6	6.6	9.5	6.7	8.9	7.9	7.4
Lebanon	25th	91.8	7.3	9.6	8.1	9.2	6.6	6.5	7.7	6.8	7.1	5.8	8.8	8.3

COHESION

INDICATORS



- C1: Security Apparatus
- C2: Factionalized Elites
- C3: Group Grievance

ECONOMIC

INDICATORS



- E1: Economic Decline
- E2: Uneven Economic Development
- E3: Human Flight and Brain Drain

POLITICAL

INDICATORS



- P1: State Legitimacy
- P2: Public Services
- P3: Human Rights and Rule of Law

SOCIAL

AND CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS



- S1: Demographic Pressures
- S2: Refugees and IDPs
- X1: External Intervention

FUND FOR PEACE – FRAGILE STATE INDEX

How to Approach Collapsed States?

- Solutions, the UN Approach According to J. Hamre and G. Sullivan:
 - a) Do nothing
 - b) Isolate failed/collapsed states
 - c) Divide into small parts
 - d) Integrate into a larger entity
 - e) Establish international authority
 - f) Provide neighbourhood supervision
 - g) Help one side of a conflict
 - h) International response through intervention or other measures

Quasi States and de Facto States

- A state that has internal sovereignty but lacks external sovereignty
- Jochen A. Frowein – De Facto State
- De facto state, para-state, unrecognized state, empirical statehood, quasi-state
- *Entities that have the external attributes of the state (state symbols, institutions, economy, etc.), but lack the defining political characteristics of the state - external sovereignty - international recognition.*
- Scott Pegg - Quasi state ≠ De Facto State
- Case of Somaliland




Case Study of Somalia


■ Hussein Adam - the predominance of internal factors over external ones:

- a) Barre's dictatorial government
- b) Clanism as an ideology - favoring the Darod
- c) Repression of educated elites
- d) Persecution, brutality, and politics of divide and conquer
- e) Negative campaign against the north
- f) Foreign aid - the end of the Cold War

■ The different colonial history, the independence of Djibouti, the dispersion of Somalis across several states, the overall underdevelopment of the country, the climate – extreme droughts.



Case Study of Somalia



	Rank	Total
2023	1st	111.9
2022	2nd	110.5
2021	2nd	110.9
2020	2nd	110.9
2019	2nd	112.3
2018	2nd	113.2
2017	2nd	113.4
2016	1st	114.0
2015	2nd	114.0
2014	2nd	112.6
2013	1st	113.9
2012	1st	114.9
2011	1st	113.4
2010	1st	114.3
2009	1st	114.7
2008	1st	114.2
2007	3rd	111.1
2006	6th	105.9

Class Participation- Discuss the following points:

- Why should the international community deal with failed/collapsed states?? Try to find some reasons.
- Which of the eight mentioned Approaches to Collapsed States do you think is the most appropriate? Justify your answer
 - *Do nothing*
 - *Isolate failed/collapsed states*
 - *Divide into small parts*
 - *Integrate into a larger entity*
 - *Establish international authority*
 - *Provide neighbourhood supervision*
 - *Help one side of a conflict*
 - *International response through intervention or other measures*
- Do you know any example of a state where a natural disaster led to a collapse?

Thank you for your
attention