

THE CAUSES OF THE EMERGENCE OF FAILED STATES

Hatidža Beriša, PhD¹

University of Defence, Belgrade, Serbia

Katarina Jonev Ćiraković, PhD Candidate

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Aleksandar Ćiraković, PhD Candidate

Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Introduction

The end of the Cold War and the emergence of the New World Order at the end of the 20th century were greeted with a lot of optimism. The ideological confrontation between East and West ended, the threat of superpower nuclear war disappeared, the “evil empire” (as the former Soviet Union was called in the West) collapsed, and communism in Eastern Europe collapsed. All this fueled the post-Cold War hopes of humanity entering a period of a brighter future. It was expected that the new stage in the development of international relations would be based on democracy, human rights, prosperity and peace. However, very soon events in parts of the Third World (Global South), then the Balkans and the Caucasus (civil wars, mass suffering of the civilian population, terrorism, hunger, poverty, epidemics of infectious diseases, crime, etc.) will undermine the optimistic expectations that a world of prosperity, without conflicts and wars is on the horizon. Soon, academic circles will identify a new threat to international peace and security - failed states. For them, they are a new source of evil, black holes of globalization, a safe haven for terrorists, a haven for drug and arms dealers, etc. Because of what is happening in these countries, many authors in the last three decades define international relations as “coming anarchy” (Kaplan, 1994). Military interventions in failed states can generally be divided into those from the nineties and interventions after September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on USA. The first were justified by preventing the suffering of the civilian population in failed states, and the second were justified by defense against international terrorism. High officials of the State Department after September 11, 2001 have been continually repeating that a turning point has occurred in the perception of failed states from a humanitarian to a strategic problem. States that do not control their territory and no longer have strong state institutions are threats to their population, their neighbors and the international community. The Western understanding of the security threat has changed in the following direction: the danger no longer lies in the strength, but on the contrary in the weakness of states.

Today, states are in a situation where they share their traditional sovereignty in politics, security and economy with state and sub-state entities - international organizations, multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, powerful individuals, etc. The weakening and transformation of nation states did not produce the same consequences for all states. Stronger and more developed countries have largely remained immune to this phenomenon, or have been slightly affected. However, a part of weak states evolved into failed states, which manifested itself through: extreme weakening of state institutions, inability to provide basic social goods to citizens, strong growth of corruption and poverty, and in the worst case, through a bloody civil war with great human casualties and material destruction that have led to the disintegration and disappearance of certain states. Failed states did not

¹ berisa.hatidza@gmail.com



appear on the international stage for the first time with the end of the Cold War, but it is characteristic that the scale of their appearance, as well as the dramatic consequences caused by their appearance, surpassed earlier eras. Failed states are given enormous importance today, both in academic and political circles. When it comes to politics, it should be emphasized that the strategic documents in the field of security of the Euro-Atlantic countries and international organizations necessarily treat failed states as security threats.

It is difficult to obtain precise data, but the security implications of the emergence of failed states are measured in millions of human victims, tens of millions of refugees and displaced persons, and even more those who do not have living conditions worthy of a human being. However, the security threat caused by failed states has spread over time from the local to the regional and finally to the global level.

The Emergence of Failed States

The end of the Cold War and the beginning of the process of intensive globalization confronted the state with many challenges that will weaken its power and threaten its position as an indisputable subject of international relations. Individual states were not able to cope with those challenges, and their weakness was manifested by the emergence of civil wars, mass suffering of the population, weakening of state institutions, impoverishment of the fragile economy, loss of control over state territory, strengthening of parastatal entities, etc.

Weakening and Transformation of the State After the Cold War

In the post-Cold War era, the nation-state will face serious challenges that tend to transform its traditional role in the political sphere. Some authors believe that the state has changed through historical epochs, so even today the state is being transformed by adapting to global changes.

Martin Shaw believes that the traditional form of state form (Westphalian) is not and will not always and necessarily exist as such. The shape of the state form is transformed over time and right now the historical transformation of statehood is underway. He further points out that in ancient Greece and Europe in the early modern era, cities were also states, while many would agree that the European Union (EU) has an increasing number of state attributes. These examples tell us that the levels of state power have changed over time through: city, nation and international organization. City-states in Europe in the early modern era paved the way to the nation-state (Shaw, 2000:189). The transfer of political power from the nation-state to international organizations is underway, which leads to the weakening of the state.

Under the pressure of supranational powers, a new political challenge will appear for the state in the form of attempts at its transnationalization, which implies that the state will be in the function of various international organizations (UN, EU, IMF, etc.). William Robinson believes that national states, as an integral element of a transnational state, perform three essential roles: adopt fiscal and monetary policies; they ensure the basic infrastructure network for global economic activity (airports and seaports, communication networks, educational networks, etc.) and ensure social order, i.e. stability, through the apparatus of state coercion (Mathews, 1997). In this way, the national state increasingly loses its independence and becomes an executive apparatus for supranational powers.

The nation-state in the modern age is also challenged in the economic sphere. The system of sovereign states is still the most important on the world stage, but that system is under attack from both above



and below. It was especially attacked by the so-called non-territorial actors (transnational organizations, multinational companies and non-governmental organizations), and since the state is a spatial phenomenon, it is unthinkable for it that the territory is not important (Robinson, 2004:125). Nye argues that non-state actors have made the most progress compared to states in terms of economic power. Power is less and less in the hands of nation states and is moving more and more towards other actors and entities. National governments have not only lost their autonomy in the globalized economy, but are sharing power with transnational companies, international organizations and numerous non-governmental organizations.

Change of State Sovereignty

Sovereignty represents supreme power over the state territory and population, independent of any other government and limited by the rules of international law (Avramov, Kreća, 2001:93). International political practice increasingly shows that the sovereignty of national states is no longer “inviolable” and that the Westphalian concept of sovereignty was seriously undermined. There is a growing number of predictions that the modern world is moving in the direction of post-sovereignty, where legitimate and absolute power no longer rests on territorially determined state units. Such changes, to varying degrees, deny the dominant and irreplaceable role of states in both international and domestic life.

The sovereignty of national states as their basic feature in the period after the Cold War came under the impact of globalization, supranational integration and unipolarism in the form of humanitarian interventions aimed at protecting human rights. This impact was first of all felt by small and weak national states. Conventional sovereignty presupposes a world of autonomous, internationally recognized and well-governed states. In the future, the better performance of domestic government in poorly managed, failed and occupied states will require overcoming the adopted rules, including the creation of joint sovereignty in some special areas. Krasner (Krasner, 2007:205-206) relativizes and distorts its very essence, not only the state, but the entire centuries-old conception of international relations is called into question.

Donald W Potter considers sovereignty from the aspect of the state's responsibility, not its right as the traditional approach. He proposes the introduction of a model of state responsibility, according to which states could be defined and classified as weak and failed, and can serve the international community to determine which states need international support or intervention in order to fulfill the obligations arising from sovereignty. A sovereign is a responsible state that has institutions capable of providing social goods for its population: security, health care, education, economic opportunities, good governance, legal order and basic infrastructure requirements (transportation and communications). The state becomes a failure when it can no longer, or does not want to, provide these goods. Potter points to alternatives to the classic definition of state sovereignty through the assessment of the quality of domestic institutions: If states were defined according to the quality of domestic institutions, not all of today's states would be recognized. Some would have to be subject to international supervision, until they meet certain requirements of the international community (Potter, 2004:8-9). However, there is no provision in international law that would allow a state to threaten its sovereignty due to the poor quality of domestic institutions. In this way, an attempt is made to relativize the sovereignty of weak and underdeveloped states and enable the interference of external factors. The relativization of sovereignty did not end with theoretical considerations. The concrete actions of the international community in the last three decades have shown that the sovereignty of the state is not what the UN Charter envisages.



Robert Jackson distinguishes between positive and negative sovereignty, depending on the functionality of the authority over people and territories. Failed states have negative sovereignty. Due to the existence of negative sovereignty in certain states, he is an advocate of redefining traditional sovereignty, all with the aim of enabling external intervention that should provide “necessary assistance” to such states. Jackson believes that the biggest obstacle for more active involvement of the international community and assuming greater responsibility in solving the internal problems of failed states is precisely international law. According to him, key actors in the international community should act more decisively when it comes to the limitations contained in international law on the issue of sovereignty: If failed states threaten the international order, then there are no legal limits to intervention, because the great powers are responsible for preserving international peace and security in accordance with chapter 7 of the UN Charter (Jackson, 1984:4).

The UN itself, taught by unilateral military actions, will begin to take certain steps to redefine and limit sovereignty after several serious cases of violations of international law in this area. Humanitarian interventions, undertaken by certain parts of the international community in the post-Cold War period, are trying to be incorporated into international law through the UN system. One of the most serious attempts was the report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS - International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty) known as “Responsibility to Protect”. It refers to the responsibility of states towards their own citizens and the international community in the event that the state fails to fulfill its obligations regarding the protection of human rights. The real goal of this concept is to provide a legal and ethical basis for humanitarian interventions. This can be concluded not only from the content of the report, but also from the time when it was created (in 2001) after the aggression of the NATO alliance on the FRY. The Commission unanimously agrees that in the current international system there is no other body and higher authority than the UN Security Council to authorize intervention. However, the task is not to find an alternative to the UN Security Council, but to ensure its greater efficiency and more favorable conditions for decision-making than in the past. That is why they believe that any call for military intervention should also formally request a decision of the UN Security Council (Savić, 2007) on the conflict, and shortly thereafter, referring to this resolution, they will vote a new 1706 authorizing the deployment of the UN forces in Darfur, Sudan (UN).

Typology of States

Depending on the level of provision of key social goods for its citizens, Robert Irwin Rotberg distinguishes:

3. Strong states
4. Weak states
5. Failed states
6. Collapsed states (Rotberg, 2004:3-9).

Barry Buzan views the strength of a state through its ability to ensure security within its borders. However, he expands the concept of state security and introduces the term “security of human collectivities”, and the state is only one of them. Other collectivities can be: ethnic and religious communities, classes, etc. The ideal type of state is when ethnic and cultural boundaries coincide with political ones, but in many cases the nation and the state do not. The security of human collectivities includes five elements: military, political, economic, social and environmental security (Buzan, 2007:37-38). By analyzing national security, we come to the conclusion whether a country is strong or weak. Strong



states have a high degree of social-political cohesion and the ability to provide social security on their territory. Weak states are those with weak social-political cohesion that do not provide security for society (Buzan, 2007:93). It should be remembered here that according to Buzan, the strength of the state does not depend on nor is it mutually related to power.

The concept of legitimacy as a key measure of state strength was developed by Kalevi J. Holsti. Legitimacy is reflected through the attitudes of citizens, whether they reject or approve the right to rule over themselves by those who do it in the name of the state. He distinguishes two key aspects of legitimacy: vertical - loyalty to the ideas of the state and its institutions, that is, the extent to which the official power is confirmed by the electoral will; and horizontal - which refers to the degree of unity, mutual respect and tolerance of different communities (ethnic, religious, class, cultural, etc.) within the state.

For Holsti, modern states have some common characteristics: defined territory, symbols, membership in international organizations and internal characteristics, but they differ considerably in terms of horizontal and vertical legitimacy. According to him, states that have complete horizontal and vertical legitimacy are strong, and these are primarily the developed states of the West. Weak states lack not only legitimacy, but also the institutional strength to improve the situation. A weak state is caught in a vicious circle. It does not have the resources to create legitimacy through the provision of security and other goods for the population. Finally, for Holsti, horizontal and vertical legitimacy has completely collapsed in failed states (Holsti, 1996:102-103).

Concept and Typology of Failed States

In the period after the Cold War, failed states came into the focus of interest in politics and political science of Western countries for humanitarian and security reasons. Humanitarian motives for dealing with them were reflected in the concern of the international community for the suffering of the population in failed states. To illustrate, Western interventions in the civil wars of the 1990s were motivated by humanitarian reasons (at least that is what they officially declared). Jakub Grygiel says for the interventions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Somalia and Haiti that they were initiated when public opinion in the West was shocked by images of suffering and bloodshed, and not because of the feeling that failed states will directly threaten the US national security. He further concludes: "The attack on the USA on September 11, 2001 changed the perception that failed states in terms of security can be ignored" (Grygiel, 2009). Failed states suddenly became a security threat, not just a place of humanitarian crisis. Security motives related to their own protection after the terrorist attacks on the USA in 2001. The proclaimed reasons for the intervention of the US and its allies in Afghanistan were of a security nature and essentially boiled down to the claim that failed states with their weak institutions provide refuge to terrorists who threaten the security of distant regions and countries.

For Rotberg, the key element for classifying a certain state in the failed category is its ability, that is, its inability to provide social goods for its citizens. The social goods that the state should provide to its citizens are: security, rule of law, political rights and freedoms, health care and physical infrastructure (Rotberg, 2004:2-4).

Rosa Ehrenreich Brooks defines failed states in a similar way as Rotberg. However, she tries to systematize the challenges that arise from failed states in three groups, namely: humanitarian - poverty, disease, violence, refugee movements and dependence on foreign aid; international security - especially after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, failed states were recognized as fertile ground for extremism and an ideal place for organized terrorist groups; and legal challenges - given the existence



of poorly functioning states in the world, an international order based on state sovereignty is problematic. Such governments cannot enter into treaties, cannot participate in the dense and growing network of international trade, sign environmental and human rights treaties, and cannot enforce treaties between their own citizens and foreigners (Brooks, 2005).

Gross gave one of the most comprehensive definitions of a failed state, that is, he defined the criteria according to which a state could be classified as a failed state: the government does not exist, or it exists, but cannot fulfill the state's international obligations; the government cannot ensure public order in the entire territory of the state, or in its larger part; public order in a significant part of the country's territory is disturbed to the point where personal safety is seriously threatened and all or most forms of constructive, social and corporate activity are prevented due to insecurity and violence; this situation is not the result of transient phenomena (famine, flood, etc.), but reflects a permanent systemic problem or problems that are unlikely to be solved by limited conventional measures, such as reforms at lower levels of government, new financial structures supported by international institutions or donations from donor countries (Gross, 2004:3).

Bearing in mind the theoretical points of view presented in this paper, a failed state means a state that:

- 1) Lost physical control over a large part of its territory or monopoly over the legitimate use of force,
- 2) Is incapable of providing and relatively fairly distributing social goods for the population (safety from political and physical violence, supply of basic life needs of the population, political rights and freedoms, rule of law, independence of the judiciary, infrastructure, efficient health and school systems),
- 3) Is unable to enter into relations with other countries as an equal member of the international community
- 4) Is unable to provide legitimate authority for making collective decisions.

There is no official international institution competent to define a state as failed, or to indicate the existence of serious problems that could lead to the collapse of the state. However, there are non-governmental organizations that are engaged in researching the weaknesses of states.

The Causes of the Emergence of Failed States

Each country that is faced with the possibility of becoming a failure has its own specifics in terms of: history, internal structure, social cohesion, development of institutions, geopolitical position, democratic traditions and level of economic development. Accordingly, there are a number of causes having influence on the collapsing of the state and its institutions to the point where we can consider them to have failed. The causes of the emergence of failed states can be classified into five groups:

1. Colonial legacy - In the period after the Cold War, the most failed states were created in Africa, namely in its sub-Saharan region. For Holsti, the colonial legacy is the main cause of the emergence of weak and failed states in this part of the world through:

- 1) Territorial inheritance - which meant that the newly independent states should simply transform from territorial creations called colonies into modern states.
- 2) The nature of colonial political institutions, their bureaucratic structure. Colonies were not created on the principles of participatory democracy. The most important decisions were made in the colonization centers.



- 3) The bureaucratic structure, namely, the colonial staff was not trained to be accountable to the local population and their interests, but to rule from the top down. Colonial authorities often favored certain groups at the expense of others, as in Rwanda, forming ethnic elites to rule over those deemed less valuable.
- 4) Separation of military and police forces from the rest of society.
- 5) Through the absence of vertical legitimacy (Holsti, 1996:99-100).

2. Global changes in the international system - One of the biggest changes in the international system in recent history is the end of the Cold War. This global change in international relations will bring the following: the disappearance of bipolarism and the emergence of unipolarism in the world (the dominance of the only remaining superpower - the USA), the disappearance of the socialist social order in Eastern Europe, the united Germany, the thawing of relations between Moscow and Washington and the collapse of the Soviet Union and the SFRY and the creation of many new states in Europe and Asia. The end of the Cold War brought on the soil of Europe one of the bloodiest conflicts at the end of the 20th century. The SFR Yugoslavia disintegrated in a multi-year civil war, experiencing in the worst way the tragedy of a failed state. Its disappearance did not stop the process of creating failed states in these areas. Bosnia and Herzegovina was a failed state at the time of its creation, that is, when it became a member of the UN in May 1992. The southern Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija, which a small part of the international community recognizes as an independent state, is a failed state. The disintegration of the SFRY is the result of several factors, but one is decisive - the end of the Cold War. One of the most serious analyses of the disintegration of the SFRY was given by Professor Dejan Jović. He claims that there are eight causes of state collapse, each of which is significant and carries a certain weight. He calls the factor of global change in the international system the "argument of international politics" and says, among other things: "Yugoslavia was maintained thanks to the balance between the two military-political blocs". Its non-aligned policy of equidistance towards those blocs, and the geographical position between them was, if not the main, then certainly a very significant reason for the survival of Yugoslavia as a united country" (Jović, 2003:68). According to him, it is completely clear that the end The Cold War destabilized the former Yugoslavia, because the external enemies, who until then had marginalized internal problems making them secondary, disappeared.

3. **Absence of legitimacy** - Legitimacy is the ability of the political system to arouse and maintain political beliefs that the existing institutions are the most relevant and appropriate for society. Holsti talks about how the state can lose its legitimacy: "Practices and policies that undermine the legitimacy of the state arise when it fails to guarantee security to citizens, when the economic dimension of legitimacy is violated, when there is a lack of social consensus on the political rules of the game, in cases appropriation of the state by individuals, families, groups or communities, when alternative concepts of governance and mass corruption appear." (Holsti, 1996:104)
4. **Globalization** - represents a universal process that includes the economic, technological, political, idea-cultural and military connection of people, nations and states according to the model of the Western civilizational paradigm. It becomes more and more intense and spreads to almost all spheres of human civilization. Due to its contradictory effects, an increasingly serious dilemma arises - does globalization create conditions for comprehensive peace and balanced development in the world or does it bring new serious threats to humanity. After the initial euphoria and optimism regarding globalization and its identification with the future planetary paradise, there are more and more serious warnings about the multitude of risks and dangers it can cause. Globalization caused the emergence of failed states through its socio-economic and political form, as well as a new round of military interventionism.



5. **The disappearance of bipolarism in the world** - The post-Cold War era in international relations, especially its beginning, was characterized by the complete dominance of the USA. The traditional balance of power in the international system has disappeared. America's power in the world had no one to restrain it, which produced negative consequences for the countries that got in the way of its interests. The end of bipolar competition has drastically reduced the motivation to use aid and trade as political instruments to win allies and keep them in power. What happened was that the superpower withdrew with its financial and military support, relying on the governing capacity of the domestic government. Regimes that did not develop their own domestic capacities, but were dependent on foreign aid, experienced a sudden collapse when that aid disappeared. Somalia is one of the most famous examples of state collapse after the Cold War, which was caused by the disappearance of the bipolar division of the world.

Conclusion

In the last three decades, there have been major changes in terms of the importance, place and role of the state both in the domestic sphere and in the international system. The process of intense globalization continues to transform and weaken the national state, the global economic process based on the neoliberal model has carried out a redistribution of power in international relations to the detriment of states, while supranational centers of power threaten to change the essence of sovereignty as one of the basic features of the state. Sovereignty in the economic sphere states share with international organizations and multinational companies, sometimes on a voluntary basis, and often forced. The collapse of sovereignty in the political sense was not a matter of choice, but imposed by the neoliberal elite through its military-political lever of power - the NATO alliance. The combination of weak state structures and external pressures caused by changes in the international system led to the loss of the basic functions of individual states, which were given the attribute of failure. Soon after the end of the Cold War, these countries were marked as one of the main sources of security threats.

The causes of failure are specific to each country, so there is no universal pattern for the emergence of failed states. Global changes in the international system led to the disintegration of communist federations, and that led certain newly formed states to a bloody civil war. When the state is not able to guarantee the safety of its population or a certain part of its ego, then it loses the legitimacy of ruling and endangers its citizens. The process of intensive globalization will weaken a large number of countries through its various forms, and some countries will become direct victims of this process. The most brutal form of globalization is the new round of military interventionism with the proclaimed goal of imposing democracy, human rights and a neoliberal form of economy. With the disappearance of the bipolar division of the world, a part of the states will lose the support of the great powers, which will lead to serious problems in the functioning of the state, and in an extreme case to collapse. The above-mentioned causes, individual or multiple, can weaken the state to the point of failure. Therefore, the international community should actively participate in their recovery.

References

- Avramov S, Milenko Kreća M, (2001), "Međunarodno javno pravo", Savremena administracija, Beograd, 2001, str. 93.
- Buzan B, (2007) "People, States and Fear: An Agenda For International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era", ECPR Press, Colchester, 2007, p. 37-38



- Ehrenreich Brooks R, "Failed States, or the State as Failure?" Georgetown U. Law Center, <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2117&context=facpub>
- Grant T, (2004) *Partition of Failed States: Impediments and Impulses*, Wolfson College, Cambridge, 2004, p.52
- Gros, J. (2004) "Towards a Taxonomy of Failed States in the New World Order: Decaying Somalia, Liberia, Rwanda and Haiti", in *Partition of Failed States: Impediments and Impulses*, ed. Thomas D. Grant (Wolfson College, Cambridge, 2004), p. 3
- Gros J, (2013) "Towards a Taxonomy of Failed States in the New World Order". In *Failed States and Institutional Decay*, in *Understanding Instability and Poverty in the Developing world*, ed. Natasha M. Ezrow, Erica Frantz (Bloomsbury Academic, New York, 2013), p. 24-25
- Grygiel J, (2009) "Vacuum Wars", 2009, (accessed on 27 July, 2023); <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2009/07/01/vacuum-wars/>
- Holsti K, (2006) *The State, War, and the State of War*, Cambridge University Press, p. 102-103
- Jackson R, (1998) "Surrogate Sovereignty? Great Power Responsibility and Failed States", Institute of International Relations The University of British Columbia, November 1998, p. 4
- Kaplan D., R. (1994) "The coming anarchy", Publisher Atlantic Monthly
- Krasner S, (2007) "Podela suvereniteta", Nova srpska politička misao, prevod Miloš Trifunović, Nova edicija. Vol. XV, broj 3-4, Beograd 2007, str. 205-206.
- Kuper R, (2006) "Raspad nacija" and Consequences, Princeton University Press, 2004, p. 3-9
- Mathews J, (1997) *Power Shift*, Foreign Affairs article, (accessed on 23 July, 2023); <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1997-01-01/power-shift>,
- Potter D, (2004) *State Responsibility, Sovereignty, and Failed States*, School of Government, University of Tasmania, p. 8-9
- Robinson I., W. (2004) *A theory of global capitalism: Production, class and state in a transnational world*, The Johns Hopkins University press, Baltimore and London
- Rotberg R., (2004) "When States Fail: Causes and Consequences", Princeton University Press, p. 2-4
- Shaw M, (2000) *Theory of global state*, Cambridge University Press
- UN, The Responsibility to Protect, <https://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/pdf/bgresponsibility.pdf>