

## FAILING STATES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON GLOBAL SECURITY\*

### Abstract

The increasing phenomena of failing states are alarming considering their effects on global security. This paper primarily examined failing States and their effect on global security. Accordingly, some objectives were stated which includes to examine the nature of failing States, appraisal of the causes of failing States, evaluation of the characteristics of failing State, as well as their effects on global security. The research utilizes secondary data such as book, journals, magazines, and internet. It was the finding of this paper among others those failing States arises when there are misgovernance, poverty, weak institutions, unemployment, abuse of human rights etc. It was recommended amongst others that Promoting opportunities for broad-based growth and poverty reduction, capacities building, infrastructure enhancement, good governance and democratic institutions by better targeting existing flows of assistance for democracy, broad public participation in government affairs, adequate management of national resources should be carried out/practiced in nations to prevent failing States.

**Keywords:** Failing States, Effects, Global Security, Terrorism

### 1. Introduction

In contemporary times it has been noted to hear that insecurity and mis-governance are fertile for weak or failing States. Failing States provide an environment which enables the emergence – or infiltration – and operation of terrorist organizations which launch attacks within these nations or elsewhere. As a corollary, failing States – such as Somalia, Afghanistan, and Sudan – are very likely to breed terrorist organizations than stable, strong States. This contention relates to a broader evolution in thinking about international security and terrorism. State failure or poor governance is greater threats, as terrorist organizations exploit the absence of civil order and regulation. The association between failing States can be seen in the context of broader dangers; thus, failing States have become one of the important security problems for international community.<sup>1</sup> Terrorists are strongest where States are weakest,<sup>2</sup> and that challenges to security therefore ‘come not from rival global powers, but from failing State.’<sup>3</sup> Terrorist organizations have fled to some of the least governed, most lawless places in the world to find sanctuary. Therefore, failing States should be a primary focus for the prevention of terrorism, curbing global insecurity, crises and lawlessness, to avoid the emergence of States within where rebels and organized criminal gangs can operate with impunity.<sup>4</sup> The paper is set out to consider the notion of failing States as an analytically useful concept in understanding and explaining global insecurity. It also seeks to appraise the relationships between failing States and their effects on global security. This topic is relevant to international law, international relations and politics to the extent that bad governance, misguided leadership, misgovernance, poverty, violence, crises, conflict, tension, war, hunger threaten the contemporary world in some States are the by-products of failing States. Invariably, peace, security, human rights, and good standards of living are not guaranteed in failing States.

According to the conventional ‘Westphalian’ model of international politics, threats to international security come essentially from failing States. The phenomenon of weak States refers to a situation where central government has a poor capacity to control public order within its territory, is unable to consistently control its borders, cannot reliably maintain viable public institutions or services, and is vulnerable to extra-constitutional domestic challenges. Indications of this condition can be found in poor levels of economic performance, human welfare, economic distribution, and levels of conflict. State failure means that the government is completely unable to maintain public utilities, institutions, or authority, and that central control over territory does not exist. Failing States are sanctuaries for global insecurity that threaten international interests. Consequently, peace, security, good governance, enhanced standard of living and development are not guaranteed or obtainable in failing States. That is why there are different spots of war, crisis, tension and conflicts in diverse parts of the world today. More

---

\*By Alfred ABHULIMHEN-IYOHA, LLB (HONS); BL; LLM; PhD (Law); MPA (Public Administration); MSc {Political Science (International Relations)}; PhD (International Relations & Strategic Studies); PGD; TRCN (Education); Diploma (Christian Theology); Diploma (Alternative Dispute Resolution); Diploma (Business Administration); Diploma (International Convention & Maritime Law); Diploma (Mental Health); Diploma (Nursing Leadership & Care Management); Diploma (Health Studies) (Ireland); Certificate (Healthcare) (UK); FLSC/NCA Candidate (Canada); Chief Magistrate, Edo State Judiciary, Benin City, Nigeria. E-mail: aaiyoha@yahoo.com. Tel: +2348055968440, +447424215549

<sup>1</sup>F. Fukuyama, (2003). *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 92. See also Chester A. Crocker, “Bridges, Bombs, or Bluster?” *Foreign Affairs* 82, no. 5.

<sup>2</sup>J. Straw, (2002). *Reordering the World: The Long-Term Implications of September 11*. London: Foreign Policy Research Center, 2002.

<sup>3</sup>C. Hagel, (2004). A Republican Foreign Policy, *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 4: 64.

<sup>4</sup>M. Ranstorp, (2003). ‘Statement to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, unpublished paper made available by the author, 11.

so, peace, justice, good governance, alleviation of poverty, promotion of human rights are absent in failing States. The world cannot certainly remain passive and watch on the sideline when there are recurrent cases of failing States threatening global peace and security

## 2. Conceptual Clarification

**Failing state:** A failing state is a political body that has disintegrated to a point where basic conditions and responsibilities of a sovereign government no longer function properly.<sup>5</sup> I hereby adopt the above definition as mine for this paper.

**Global Security:** Global security refers to the amalgamation of measures taken by states and international organizations, such as the United Nations, European Union and others, to ensure mutual survival and safety.<sup>6</sup> I also align myself with the above definition.

**Global Insecurity:** It is the state of being insecure or unsafe; or fraught with danger; want of secureness or stability around the world. It can be defined as international instability and lack of assurance or confidence, especially in regard to one's safety around the world.

**State:** A nation/state (or nation-state) is a place in which the great majority shares the same culture and is conscious of it. The nation-state is an ideal in which cultural boundaries match up with political ones.

A state is a stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, history, ethnicity, or psychological make-up manifested in a common culture. A state is distinct from a people,<sup>7</sup> and is more abstract, and more overtly political, than an ethnic group.<sup>8</sup> It is a cultural-political community that has become conscious of its autonomy, unity, and particular interests.<sup>9</sup> Before delving into the conceptualization of the above mentioned subjects, we need to first define the concept of the *state*.

Poggi<sup>10</sup> also captures the essence of a State when he said, 'the modern State is perhaps best seen as a complex set of institutional arrangements for the rule operating through the continuous and regulating activities of individuals acting as occupants of offices. The State as the sum total of such offices, reserves to 'itself the business of rule over a territorially bounded society; it monopolizes, in law and as far as possible in fact, all faculties and facilities pertaining to that business.' I also adopt the above definition as mine for the paper.

## 3. Differences between Weak and Failing State

A failing state has no effective national government. Banditry and lawlessness, with local warlords characterize them. Failing states tend to be non-aligned, mostly because no one wants to be friends with them. While a weak state has a small army incapable of military options. Either it doesn't have an economy to service its armed forces or it doesn't have the numbers or modern equipment. A weak state can always form alliances.<sup>11</sup> Weak states are not intrinsically weak, or weak because of geography or colonialism; they are weak because they supply lesser or less-than-adequate quantities of political goods, or poorer-quality political goods, or both. Failing states range from Fiji, with its many coups but its well-educated and prosperous population, westward through the fractious Solomon Islands and the violently corrupt Papua New Guinea to Laos, Bangladesh, many of the Central Asian polities, Lebanon, many of the Balkan polities, and across the Atlantic to much of Central America (barring Costa Rica) and parts of South America (Ecuador, Paraguay), or south to Africa, where nearly all of the Sub-Saharan countries are classified as failing.

## 4. Literature Review

There are several studies that deal with failing states. Failing states are tense, deeply conflicted, dangerous, and bitterly contested by warring factions. In most failing states, government troops battle armed revolts led by one or more rivals. Official authorities in a failing state sometimes face two or more insurgencies, varieties of civil unrest, differing degrees of communal discontent, and a plethora of dissent directed at the State and at groups within the state.<sup>12</sup> Studies of conflict and instability increasingly point to the weakness of the state as a key factor in the

---

<sup>5</sup>R. I. Rotberg, (2004). The Failure and Collapse of Nation-States: Breakdown, Prevention, and Repair. in *When States Fail: Causes and consequences*, edited by R. I. Rotberg. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

<sup>6</sup>M. D. Intriligator, (1994). Global Security after the end of the cold war. *Conflict management and peace science*, 13(2): 101-111.

<sup>7</sup>B. A. Garner, (2014). 'Nation' *Black's Law Dictionary* (10th ed.). 1183. ISBN 978-0-314-61300-4.

<sup>8</sup>P. James, (1996). *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. London: Sage Publications.

<sup>9</sup>A. D. Smith, (1991). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Wiley. p. 17. ISBN 978-0-631-16169-1.

<sup>10</sup>G. Poggi, (1978). *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1

<sup>11</sup>R. I. Rotberg, (2007). The Failure and Collapse of Nation States. in *Staatszerfall und Governance*, M. Beishem and G. F. Schuppert (eds.). 59-97; S. M. Patrick, (2011). *Weak Links: Fragile States, Global Threats, and International Security*. New York.

<sup>12</sup>R.I. Rotberg, (2003). Failed and Weak States in Theory and Practice. *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0119

onset of violent conflict—the ‘declining state’<sup>13</sup> or ‘the problem of the modern state’.<sup>14</sup> Some scholars have put this into a broad social context, suggesting fundamental changes in the nature of conflict. This argument holds that one of the most dramatic ways in which the post-Cold War world differs from the Cold War international system is in the pattern of violence that has been developing. A failing state is a political body that has disintegrated to a point where basic conditions and responsibilities of a sovereign government no longer function properly. For a stable state it is necessary for the government to enjoy both effectiveness and legitimacy. Likewise, when a state weakens and its standard of living declines, it introduces the possibility of total governmental collapse.<sup>15</sup> Common characteristics of a failing state include a central government so weak or ineffective that it has an inability to raise taxes or other support, and has little practical control over much of its territory and hence there is a non-provision of public services. When this happens, widespread corruption and criminality, the intervention of state and non-state actors, the appearance of refugees and the involuntary movement of populations, sharp economic decline, and foreign military intervention can occur.<sup>16</sup>

## 5. Theoretical Framework

This paper utilizes the theory of state collapse and theory of non-democratic regimes in explaining why there are failing states. This paper explores whether state failure could be better explained using categories described in literature on regimes and transitions, expanding the focus beyond the state itself. At the same time, it asks whether transitions theory should be amended to include categories of weak, collapsed and failing states. More specifically, the authors ask whether it is beneficial to utilize classic regime typologies when analyzing state collapse as well as state reconstruction. Meanwhile, the theory of failing states developed parallel, but largely independent from the abovementioned debates. The coexistence of both approaches prompts questions about connections between the two, such as: What role (if any) do regime types and regime transitions play in state failure? Is regime type being considered as a variable in the analyses of state failure, or should be? Is there a connection between the theory of transitions and theory of failing states in methodologies, categories and concepts employed? Would it be useful to analyze regimes in states which are heading to failure? Is there a correlation between regime type, transition period and state failure? For example, could a truly democratic state collapse, or does it first have to become non-democratic? Similarly, what regimes emerge after state structures were restored in cases where state failure was successfully reversed? Relevant literature is relatively silent on the above mentioned questions. Leading scholars in theory of non-democratic regimes and transitions to democracy,<sup>17</sup> demonstrate little interest in state as such and even less in failing states. For Aristotle (384–322 BC), the inherent dangers of democracy were, first, that conflict between the aristocracy and the poor was inevitable; and second, that it would usher in ‘mischief and corruption’. Both processes would lead to collapse unless independent controls and separation of powers were enforced. The ancient Greek philosopher Polybius (c.200 – c.118 BC) asserted that all nations follow a cycle of; democracy, oligarchy, dictatorship, tyranny and collapse. Islamic scholar Ibn Khaldun (1332 – 1406) also produced a general theory of State collapse. A ‘theological rationalist’, he transformed the study of history into a ‘new science’. In his eyes, dynasties repeatedly become ‘sedentary, senile, coercive, pompous, and subservient to desire ... liable to divisions in the dynasty.’ Group feeling (asabiyyah, group think) disappears as the dynasty grows senile. Ibn Khaldun was fatalistic; ‘This senility is a chronic disease which cannot be cured because it is something natural’. The Japanese philosopher Hajime Tanabe points to the quasi-religious role of the state to mediate between mortal individuals and the eternal universe, so that states regularly collapse; like religious figures, they must undergo a process of death and resurrection. In his view this may account for the perennial popularity of states because they regularly demonstrate their ability to transcend death. Zartman and Rotberg,<sup>18</sup> see the state as first and foremost a service provider. According to Zartman a state has collapsed ‘when the basic functions of the state are no longer performed’.<sup>19</sup> In other words, a state has collapsed when it is no longer able to provide the services for which it exists. A similar alternative is to describe states that have not been able to

---

<sup>13</sup>R. Vayrynen, (2000). ‘Complex Humanitarian Emergencies: Concepts and Issues, in E. Wayne Nafziger, Frances Stewart, and Raimo Vayrynen, eds., *War, Hunger, and Displacement: The Origins of Humanitarian Emergencies* (Volume 1), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 43.

<sup>14</sup>K. J. Holsti, (1996). Political Causes of Humanitarian Emergencies, in E. Wayne Nafziger, Frances Stewart, and Raimo Vayrynen, 239.

<sup>15</sup>S. Patrick, (2007). ‘Failed’ States and Global Security: Empirical Questions and Policy Dilemmas’. *International Studies Review*. 9 (4): 644–662.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>J. J. Linz, (2007): *Some Thoughts on the Victory and Future of Democracy*, in Berg-Schlosser, B. (ed.): *Democratization. The State of Art*, Barbara Budrich Verlag, pp. 133-153.

<sup>18</sup>W. I. Zartman, (1995). *Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers; R. I. Rotberg, (2007). *The Failure and Collapse of Nation States*. In Staatszerfall und Governance, M. Beishem and G. F. Schuppert (eds.). 59–97.

<sup>19</sup>W. I. Zartman, (1995). *Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

establish the features associated with nationhood as 'failing states'. Robert Rotberg, another leading authority on failing states, defines state failure as the inability of states to provide positive political goods to their inhabitants.<sup>20</sup>

There is no failing state without disharmonies between communities. Yet, the simple fact that many weak nation-states include haves and have-nots, and that some of the newer nations contain a heterogeneous collection of ethnic, religious, and linguistic interests, is more a contributor to than a root cause of state failure. In other words, state failure cannot be ascribed primarily to the inability to build states from a congeries of ethnic groups. In most cases, driven by ethnic or other intercommunal hostility or by regime insecurity, failing states prey on their own citizens. As in Mobutu SeseSeko's Zaire or the Taliban's Afghanistan, ruling cadres increasingly oppress, extort, and harass the majority of their own compatriots while favoring a narrowly based elite. As in Zaire, Angola, Siaka Stevens's Sierra Leone, or Hassan al-Turabi's pre-2001 Sudan, patrimonial rule depends on a patronage-based system of extraction from ordinary citizens.<sup>21</sup> From the foregoing, it can be seen that there are several theories explaining the concept of failing states.

#### **6. Nature of Failing States in Understanding Global Security**

Global Insecurity is the state of being unsafe; filled with danger; or harmony around the world. It can be defined as international instability and absence of law and order. Global insecurity is apprehension of change, loss, or damage; uncertainty, crises, violence, conflict, war or of *insecurity* pervading the international community. The global community is under severe threats by increasing insecurity and violence around the world. Global insecurity is an aggregation or combination of failing states characterized by misrule, insecurity, abuse of human rights, ethnic conflicts and poverty. Failing states include a broad continuum of states that are: inherently weak because of geographical, physical, or fundamental economic constraints; structurally weak result in internal antagonisms, management flaws, greed, despotism, or external attacks; and a mixture of the two. Driven by ethnic or other inter-communal hostility, or by the governing elite's insecurities, they victimize their own citizens or some subset of the whole that is regarded as hostile. As in Mobutu Sese Seko's Zaire or the Taliban's Afghanistan, ruling cadres increasingly oppress, extort, and harass the majority of their own compatriots while privileging a more narrowly based party, clan, or sect. As in Zaire, Angola, Siaka Stevens's Sierra Leone, or pre-2001 Sudan, patrimonial rule depends on a patronage-based system of extraction from ordinary citizens.<sup>22</sup>

#### **7. Characteristics of Weak and Failing States**

Characteristics of failing state include low economic base; lack of social trust among communities, religions, and tribes; weak governing institution; noncooperation of the citizens; strikes, boycott; political instability; loss of physical control of its territory, or of the monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force therein; erosion of legitimate authority to make collective decisions; an inability to provide reasonable public services, and; an inability to interact with other nations as a full member of the international community.<sup>23</sup> According to Rice,<sup>24</sup> failing states are not states in which the central government does not exert effective control over, nor is it able to deliver vital, services to, significant parts of its own territory due to conflict, ineffective governance, or State collapse. Some examples of a failing state are Sri Lanka, Syria, Somalia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Iraq, Yemen, Turkey, Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, Rwanda, Liberia, Yugoslavia, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Sudan, South Sudan.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>R.I. Rotberg, (2003). Failed and Weak States in Theory and Practice. *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0119

<sup>21</sup>R.I. Rotberg, (2003). Failed States, Collapsed States, Weak States: Causes and Indicators, In Rotberg, R.I. (ed.). *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2003). 4.

<sup>22</sup>R.I. Rotberg, (2003). Failed and Weak States in Theory and Practice. *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0119

<sup>23</sup>L. Sichinava, (2018). The Characteristics of the Weak States In The Globalization Era. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 4(7): 85-88.

<sup>24</sup>S. E. Rice, (2003). 'The New National Security Strategy: Focus on Failed States,' *The Brookings Institute Policy Brief* No. 116, Feb., 2003. 2.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

**Table 1: Showing failing states index**

Rank	Country	2018 score	Change from 2017	Change from 2016	Change from 2015	Change from 2014	Change from 2013
1	<u>South Sudan</u>	113.4	▼ 0.5	▼ 0.4	▼ 1.1	▲ 0.5	▲ 2.8
2	<u>Somalia</u>	113.2	▼ 0.2	▼ 0.8	▼ 0.8	▲ 0.6	▼ 0.7
3	<u>Yemen</u>	112.7	▲ 1.6	▲ 1.2	▲ 4.6	▲ 7.3	▲ 5.7
4	<u>Syria</u>	111.4	▲ 0.8	▲ 0.6	▲ 3.5	▲ 9.8	▲ 14.0
5	<u>Central African Republic</u>	111.1	▼ 1.5	▼ 1.0	▼ 0.8	▲ 0.5	▲ 5.8
6	<u>Democratic Republic of the Congo</u>	110.7	▲ 0.7	▲ 0.7	▲ 1.0	▲ 0.5	▼ 1.2
7	<u>Sudan</u>	108.7	▼ 1.9	▼ 2.8	▼ 2.1	▼ 1.4	▼ 2.3
8	<u>Chad</u>	108.3	▼ 1.1	▼ 1.8	▼ 0.1	▼ 0.4	▼ 0.7
9	<u>Afghanistan</u>	106.6	▼ 0.7	▼ 1.3	▼ 1.3	▲ 0.1	▼ 0.1
10	<u>Zimbabwe</u>	102.3	▲ 0.7	▲ 1.8	▲ 2.3	▼ 0.5	▼ 2.9
11	<u>Iraq</u>	102.2	▼ 3.2	▼ 2.5	▼ 2.3	—	▼ 1.7
12	<u>Haiti</u>	102.0	▼ 3.3	▼ 3.1	▼ 2.5	▼ 2.3	▼ 3.8
13	<u>Guinea</u>	101.6	▼ 0.8	▼ 2.2	▼ 3.3	▼ 1.1	▲ 0.3
14	<u>Nigeria</u>	99.9	▼ 1.7	▼ 3.6	▼ 2.5	▲ 0.2	▼ 0.8
15	<u>Ethiopia</u>	99.6	▼ 1.5	▲ 2.4	▲ 2.1	▲ 1.7	▲ 0.7
16	<u>Guinea-Bissau</u>	98.1	▼ 1.4	▼ 1.7	▼ 1.8	▼ 2.5	▼ 3.0
17	<u>Kenya</u>	97.4	▲ 1.0	▼ 0.9	—	▼ 1.6	▼ 2.2
18	<u>Burundi</u>	97.4	▼ 1.5	▼ 3.3	▼ 0.7	▲ 0.3	▼ 0.2
19	<u>Eritrea</u>	97.2	▼ 0.9	▼ 1.4	▲ 0.3	▲ 1.7	▲ 2.2
20	<u>Pakistan</u>	96.3	▼ 2.6	▼ 5.4	▼ 6.6	▼ 6.7	▼ 6.6
21	<u>Niger</u>	96.2	▼ 1.2	▼ 2.2	▼ 1.6	▼ 1.7	▼ 2.8
22	<u>Myanmar</u>	96.1	▲ 0.4	▼ 0.2	▲ 1.4	▲ 1.8	▲ 1.5
23	<u>Cameroon</u>	95.3	▼ 0.3	▼ 2.5	▲ 1.0	▲ 2.2	▲ 1.8
24	<u>Uganda</u>	95.1	▼ 0.9	▼ 2.6	▼ 1.9	▼ 0.9	▼ 1.5
25	<u>Libya</u>	94.6	▼ 1.7	▼ 1.8	▼ 0.7	▲ 6.8	▲ 10.1
26	<u>Cote d'Ivoire</u>	94.6	▼ 1.9	▼ 3.3	▼ 5.4	▼ 7.1	▼ 8.9
27	<u>Mali</u>	93.6	▲ 0.7	▼ 1.6	▲ 0.5	▲ 3.8	▲ 4.3
28	<u>North Korea</u>	93.2	▼ 0.1	▼ 0.7	▼ 0.6	▼ 0.8	▼ 1.9
29	<u>Republic of the Congo</u>	93.1	▼ 0.3	▲ 0.9	▲ 2.3	▲ 3.5	▲ 3.1
30	<u>Liberia</u>	92.6	▼ 1.2	▼ 2.9	▼ 4.7	▼ 1.7	▼ 2.5
31	<u>Mauritania</u>	92.2	▼ 1.5	▼ 3.2	▼ 2.7	▼ 0.8	▲ 0.5
32	<u>Bangladesh</u>	90.3	▲ 1.2	▼ 0.4	▼ 1.5	▼ 2.5	▼ 2.2
33	<u>Angola</u>	89.4	▼ 1.7	▼ 1.1	▲ 1.3	▲ 2.0	▲ 2.3

Source: *Failing States Index (2018)*.

The essence of the above table is to further explain that most of the failing states are African countries, arising from the misdemeanor and wrongdoings of their political leaders. The Fragile States Index (FSI) is an annual

ranking of 178 states based on the different pressures they face that impact their levels of fragility. The FSI is an annual assessment of 178 states based on a measurement of the social, economic, and political pressures that each country faces.

The following factors are used by Fund for Peace to ascertain the status of a country:<sup>26</sup>*Social factors* include mounting demographic pressures and tribal, ethnic and/or religious conflicts; massive internal and external displacement of refugees, creating severe humanitarian emergencies; widespread vengeance-seeking group grievances; chronic and sustained human flight. *Economic factors* are widespread corruption; high economic inequality; uneven economic development along group lines; severe economic decline. *Political factors* include delegitimization of the nation; deterioration of public services; suspension or arbitrary application of law; widespread human rights abuses; security forces operating as a 'state within a nation' often with impunity; rise of factionalized elites; and intervention of external political agents and foreign nations.

## 8. Differences between a Nation and a State

### **The elements of State and Nation are different:**

The State has four elements—population, territory, government, and sovereignty. In the absence of even one element, a State cannot be really a State. A state is always characterised by all these four elements. On the contrary, a nation is a group of people who have a strong sense of unity and common consciousness.<sup>27</sup>

### **State is a Political Organization while Nation is a social, cultural, psychological, emotional and political unity:**

The State is a political organisation which fulfills the security and welfare needs of its people. It is concerned with external human actions. It is a legal entity. On the other hand, a Nation is a united unit of population which is full of emotional, spiritual and psychological bonds. A nation has little to do with the physical needs of the people.

### **Possession of a Definite Territory is essential for the State but not for a Nation:**

It is essential for each State to possess a fixed territory. It is the physical element of the State. State is a territorial entity. But for a nation territory is not an essential requirement. A nation can survive even without a fixed territory

### **Sovereignty is essential for State but not for Nation:**

Sovereignty is an essential element of the State. It is the soul of the State. In the absence of sovereignty, the State loses its existence. It is the element of sovereignty which makes the state different from all other associations of the people. It is not essential for a nation to possess sovereignty.

The basic requirement of a nation is the strong bonds of emotional unity among its people which develop due to several common social cultural elements. Before 1947, India was a nation but not a State because it did not have sovereignty. (State = Nation + Sovereignty).

### **Nation can be wider than the State:**

The State is limited to a fixed territory. Its boundaries can increase or decrease but the process of change is always very complex. However a nation may or may not remain within the bounds of a fixed territory. Nation is a community based on common ethnicity, history and traditions and aspirations.

### **There can be two or more Nationalities living in one State:**

There can be two or more than two nations within a single State. Before the First World War, Austria and Hungary were one State, but two different nations. Most of the modern states are multinational states.

### **Nation is more stable than State:**

A nation is more stable than the State. When sovereignty ends, the State dies, but not the nation. A nation can survive even without sovereignty. For example, after their defeat in the World War II, both Germany and Japan lost their sovereign statuses and outside powers began to control them. They ceased to exist as States. But as nations they continued to live as nations, which after some months regained their sovereign statuses and became sovereign independent states.

### **A State can be created while a Nation is always the result of evolution:**

A State can be created with the conscious endeavors of the people. Physical elements play an important role in the birth of a State. For example, after the Second World War, Germany got divided into two separate states West Germany and East Germany. But Germans remained emotionally as one nation.

Ultimately in Oct., 1990 the Germans again got united into a single state. In 1947 Pakistan was created out of India as a separate State. A state is a unity of the people which emerges slowly and steadily. No special efforts go into the making of a state.

### **The State uses police power (force) for preserving its unity and integrity, the Nation is bound by strong cultural and historical links:**

State has police power. Those who dare to disobey it are punished by the state. A nation does not have police power or force or coercive power. It is backed by moral, emotional and spiritual power. A nation survives on the

<sup>26</sup> Fragile States Index and CAST Framework Methodology'. The Fund for Peace. 2018.

<sup>27</sup>Y. Bhardwaj, (2017). What is the difference between a nation and a state? youarticlelibrary.com

power of sense of unity of the people. A nation appeals, the State orders; a nation persuades, a State coerces; and a nation boycotts, the State punishes. State is a political organisation, while the nation is a unity.

### **9. Causes of Failing States**

States fail when it has stopped providing any basic public services, systems leading to the outbreak of air borne diseases.

- a. Mass unemployment reaching unprecedented levels.
- b. Political leaders either using violence to eliminate his opponents or co-opting them.
- c. When executive economic institutions do not create the incentives needed for people to save, invest and innovate.
- d. Exhaustive institution paves the way for a complete nation failure by not only destroying law and order but also result in economic stagnation.  
E.g. Angola, Cameroon, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Liberia, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Zimbabwe, illustrate civil war, man displacement, famine and epidemics making many of their citizens poorer than they were.
- e. Fighting because people are tired of being perpetual victims of nation sponsored poverty and human degradation by autocratic rule and militarism.
- f. Forcible recruitment particularly of children by both warring camps i.e. both federal and rebel leaders.
- g. Mass massacres, organized force labour.
- h. Military discipline completely disappears.
- i. Homes and buildings entirely destroyed.
- j. Nation become failing states when the executive institutions concentrate power and wealth in the hands of those controlling the nation.
- k. Executive institutions that expropriate and impoverish the people and block economic development are quit common in African countries.
- l. A country marred by violations of civil liberties, extrajudicial executions, violence against civilians and civil war.
- m. A prosperous nation is one that has lucrative economic institutions, rules as those in South Korea or in the United State of America, are those that allow and encourage participation by the great mass of people in economic activities that make best use of their talents and skills and that enable individuals to make the choices they wish. To be inclusive, economic institutions must feature, secure private property, an unbiased system, of law and a provision of public services that provides a level playing field in which people can exchange and contract. It must also permit me entry of new businesses and allow people to choose their careers.

### **10. The Effect of Failing States on Global Security**

Failing states are the source of the world's most pressing security threats today. The international community's leadership sees such nations as an existential threat as well, evidenced in Kofi Annan's 2004 claim that 'our defenses are only as strong as their weakest links.' This is not surprising. The most destructive attack on the US in its history originated in one of the world's poorest countries. Deadly communicable diseases seem to constantly emerge from the world's poorest regions, and transnational crime appears to flourish in weakly governed. The effect covers five key security threats: terrorism, transnational crime, WMDs, pandemic diseases, and energy insecurity. The rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria, the Paris attack on Jan. 7, the Boko Haram terrorism in Nigeria or the Al-Shabab threat in Somalia, among others, have once again unveiled the fragile nature of the current global order in the face of local and international terrorism. There are many reasons for the spread of terrorism but one key factor is the fact of failing states. A failing state is usually defined as one that is unable to provide security and basic services to its citizens. Failing states impact on global security through security and economic means.

#### **Security and Economy Impact**

Somalia is a tragic example of a failing state that has put enormous security and economic pressures on the international community and neighboring-states for nearly two decades. After the December 2006 attacks, fleeing Islamic fundamentalists escaped into Kenya, which is now home to over a quarter million documented refugees, the majority of whom are Somali or Sudanese. Failing states often spawn wider regional conflicts, which can substantially weaken security and retard development in their sub-regions. The conflicts in Sierra Leone, Congo, and Sudan, each largely internal in nature, have also directly involved several other States. In some extreme cases, these conflicts have exacerbated conditions in neighboring States, accelerating, and sometimes precipitating their failure. Examples include the impact of the Sierra Leone conflict on Guinea, and Congo's on Zimbabwe.'

#### **Migrants, Refugees and Displaced Persons**

State weakness also results in the creation of high outflow of migrants in search of greener pastures. These migrants often move to the more advanced states, creating internal security problems. Failing states like Somalia and Afghanistan on the other hand create refugees and internally displaced persons. Through refugees they foster the spillover of ethnic, religious or ideological conflicts and the potential for the spread of disease.

Rice tells us that ‘the costs of such conflicts to the United States are substantial.’<sup>28</sup> They include: refugee flows that can reach American shores; conventional weapons proliferation that exacerbates regional instability and strengthens international outlaws; billions spent on humanitarian and peacekeeping assistance; the opportunity costs of lost trade and investment; and the exportation by criminal elements of precious, portable resources including diamonds, narcotics, tanzanite, and coltan — a mineral found in Congo that is used in products such as cellular phones — that failing states often possess

#### **Haven for Terrorism**

Terrorist organizations take advantage of the porous borders of failing States’, their weak or nonexistent law enforcement and security services. The ineffective judicial institutions of such States are also exploited to move men, weapons and money around the globe. Smuggling out precious resources like diamonds, crude oil and narcotics that help fund their operations. Somalia, lacking any effective central government, has afforded safe operational space to affiliates of Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have hidden effectively in various African States (including Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Cote D’Ivoire, Mauritania, and elsewhere), where they planned and financed. ‘. Moreover, failing states may, in some cases, maintain armed forces that are able to acquire military hardware that can then be illegally sold or provided to terrorists.’

#### **Narcotics Trafficking**

The United States and other OECD states consider illegal drug threat as an important aspect of the impact of failing State. Illegal drugs wreak havoc in urban, suburban and rural areas, among all racial and ethnic groups, all income groups, and all ages. The social and economic costs to the United States are enormous. The damage to minority communities is particularly heavy. The connection between narcotics trafficking and failing states is also well documented. Narcotics traffickers need access to territory, especially agricultural production areas, means of transportation and distribution, cooperative government officials, and freedom from law enforcement in order to conduct their illicit activities. Failing states offer tremendous advantages in these areas. This has an important effect on members of the OECD countries.

### **11. Conclusion and Recommendations**

Failing states serve as a catalyst to non-state terrorist networks. They provide locations for critical face-to-face meetings/training that create the lifelong bonds of trust necessary for the smooth operation of covert networks. They are also excellent conduits for transnational crime (drug and human trafficking primarily) that fund ongoing operations. However, an exact definition of what a failing state is and how they become failing states is fuzzy. Several events have occurred throughout history where strong states watched and observed genocide and destruction, the United States sat idly by as a genocide occurred in Rwanda. The United States did not act based upon the difficulties it found in intervening in Somalia in 1991-1992. The United States must make an effort to engage in stabilization and reconstruction operations around the world. ‘Learning how to succeed in these missions is one of the greatest challenges of the century’, however, the United States cannot standby and allow states to fail, causing harm to regions and the world. Imagine a nuclear armed Pakistan suffering from a collapsed government and terrorists seizing nuclear weapons. Failing states remain an important national security threat to peace and stability of the international system. For all the problems of the United States effort in Iraq and Afghanistan, it was the United States and to a lesser extent NATO, that the Arab League looked to in Libya and looks to now in Syria. This should tell us something about the international system, for all the talk about states avoiding interventions and state building, states expect and sometimes support ‘state building’ in failing states in the hope of spreading ideals and protecting others. They are black holes in regards to all indicators of health. Collapsed states can become failing states with intervention. Historical examples: Lebanon, Tajikistan, and Sierra Leone. We have also seen that failing states have some attendant effects on global security. In the light of the foregoing, there is need for the following measures.

1. Promoting opportunities for broad-based growth and poverty reduction through increased market access for developing and under-developed states, capacities building, infrastructure enhancement, promoting investment, expertise and resources utilization for the betterment of the citizens of failing states;
2. Support legitimate, broad public participation in government affairs, good governance and democratic institutions by better targeting existing flows of assistance for democracy. Create effective international assistance through the United Nations to police and military forces to help governments develop the ability to secure their territories and protect the rights of their populations;
3. Peace and democracy dividends: the ability to make prompt, symbolic down payments on longer-term goals such as debt relief and market access that help boost the legitimacy and prestige of struggling governments, dependable regional peacekeeping capacities;

---

<sup>28</sup> S. E. Rice, (2002). U.S. Foreign Assistance and Failed States (Reports). Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-foreign-assistance-and-failed-states/>



4. Active and sustained diplomacy, backed by increased crisis capacity and a more strategic presence in the field, for orchestrating multidimensional political responses to crises. Adequate management of national resources.
5. Building an effective information strategy that devotes resources to monitor key failing states and gets that analysis into the right hands. Engage major developing-state governments, through regional organizations and groupings. Offer common approaches to support and improve the capacities of international institutions, including the United Nations and the World Bank.
6. Promotion of human rights, good governance worldwide. Corrupt dictatorial leaders that are responsible for failing states should be sanctioned by the international community.