UNDERSTANDING STATE FRAGILITY: DISCOURSE AND CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNINGS OF FAILED AND FRAGILE STATES

Safiullah Tariq[1], Dr. Sadia Sulaiman[2]

Original Article

1. Lecturer at Department of Pakistan Studies, National University of Modern Languages Islamabad. Email: satariq@numl.edu.pk

2. Independent Consultant & Assistant Professor at Area Study Center, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. Email: ssadia@qau.edu.pk

Abstract

'Fragility' is undermining developing countries of the world in managing challenges of capacity, legitimacy, and authority in their designated territories. The donor organizations and international developmental agencies label such countries as failing, failed, or fragile because they are unable to perform and fall short to deliver basic services to their population. They categorize such states based on multiple indices and reflect their performance through indexes in all sectors which shaped the perception of such states around the globe and the world perceives them with pre-determined notions. This article critically examines the methods, frameworks, or approaches used by such donor and international organizations to trace the origin of the concept of 'fragility'. The brief historical context of such indexes like World Bank, FSI, USAID, DFID, and CIFP, has also been discussed to analyze the purpose and objective of formulating or maintaining a database of failing, failed, and fragile states. Assessment methodology and data collection method of indexes have also been discussed for a better understanding of the concept. Fragility is a fluid concept and the academic definition of this concept is yet to be ascertained.

Keywords: Fragility, State Failure, Indexes, State Fragility

Introduction

The concept of a fragile state holds a critical position in academic debates as the idea of this term is contested against the performance of the state in delivering the best services to people as per the international model of statehood along with the challenge of human security. The traditional focus of states was the distribution and exercise of power. Now it is about national security and international relations with attention to identifying the threats and challenges being faced by failed and fragile states----as the "weak and failing states have arguably become the single most important problem for the international order" (Fukuyama, 2004). The state performance indicators witnessed visible changes which resulted in a fragile system of governance, low economic growth, and little human security. Fragility is a process through which states demonstrate their capacity to respond to a threat in a resilient manner. The basis of fragility prevails in internal threats rather than the external ones embedded with the threats to the economy, military, environment, society, and political landscape of the country.

States are blessed with multiple natural resources which determine their capacity whether the state is weak, strong, or heading towards failure in terms of challenges and opportunities. From 1955 to 1994, the world has already witnessed 12 full collapses in 40 years and 243 partial state failures, conflicts, and crises (Davies & Gurr, 1998). This type of state failure and collapse is referred to as a severe political crisis as experienced by Somalia, Bosnia, Liberia, and Afghanistan. These states passed through the crises despite being weak to maintain political legitimacy and authority beyond the capital city. This is the question of credibility capacity and legitimacy for these states to maintain order over the governing territories (Davies & Gurr, 1998).

State failure is not a new phenomenon and has been present in all phases of development since the inception of nation-states. In the past, it was not considered a major issue, but today the world is more concerned about the security of states and achieving strategic objectives around the globe. As a result, greater attention is being paid to addressing the challenge of state fragility.

The US foreign policy regarding failed, failing, and fragile states has transformed after the incident of 9/11. President George W. Bush declared in the National Security Strategy 2002 that "America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones". This perception and perspective have shaped the world view about those profiled states. The new strategy confirms the shift from the policy of preventive to preemptive military intervention in weak and failing states like Afghanistan which may pose a threat to the national security of the USA. The reason for profiling has initiated the assessment of such states so that the world or great powers and donor agencies shall know about the actual intensity of ongoing issues which will provide them room to transform. Failed, failing, and fragile states, during the post-Cold War era, experienced increasing violence, instability, and disorder specifically "civil strife, government breakdown, and economic privation" (Helman & Ratner, 1992).

The fragility of a nation-state is not a new phenomenon, it is normal when the fragile state is unable to deliver to its people. In the past, it was a usual practice, and the rise or fall of a state did not create an impact over neighboring states but now after the incidents of 9/11, it is a matter of grave concern for the world because the failed and fragile states create instability in the region and have an impact over the global peace. The donor organizations and indexes have conducted studies about such states to assess the intensity of disorder, and the challenges of capacity, legitimacy, and authority to have the database in the formulation of development and security policies. This article explores the need, approaches, and methodology of indexes and world donor organizations to have an understanding of this whole data collection system in failed, failing, and fragile states. It also explores the conceptual understandings of fragile states that how those indices termed such countries and what definitions we had about such states.

Categorization of the States

States are blessed with multiple natural resources which determine their capacity whether the state is weak, strong, or heading towards failure in terms of challenges and opportunities. From 1955 to 1994, the world has already witnessed 12 full collapses in 40 years and 243 partial state failures, conflicts, and crises (Davies & Gurr, 1998). This type of state failure and collapse is referred to as a severe political crisis as experienced by Somalia, Bosnia, Liberia, and Afghanistan. These states passed through the crises despite being weak to maintain political legitimacy and authority beyond the capital city. This is the question of credibility capacity and legitimacy for these states to maintain order over the governing territories (Davies & Gurr, 1998).

The terms fragile failed, and weak states usually are used for such countries which face serious governance issues in their respective territories. Scholars are trying to reach an acceptable definition of all such states keeping in view the examples of completely failed states like Afghanistan, Somalia, Haiti, Liberia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Pierre Nkurunziza, President of Burundi, stated in his address to the United Nations General Assembly in

March 2009 that “It is better to use the term fragility with care because this term is based on conceptual interpretation of security-development nexus and besides emotional effects it has financial and political implications for a country” (Grimm et al., 2014). Failed States refer to countries that become ungovernable, lack control over the territories, and fail to provide basic services to the citizens like health, education, infrastructure, and maintaining law and order. In some cases, the power lies in the hands of terrorists, warlords, armed groups, and religious extremists which adds to the misery of the citizens and eventually makes the government vulnerable in exercising control over deteriorating political, social, security and economic circumstances.

The use of the term “failed state” lacks an understanding concerning policy discourse introduced by the policymakers rather than providing clear sustainable solutions they added confusion to the solution. These definitions are employed by international donor organizations, and they use them in the categorization of states based on indices to determine the strength of a country. The categorization has an impact on a state, which may increase the problem of violence, terrorism, human security, economy, capacity, legitimacy and, authority. These indices declared states as strong due to characteristics, capability to govern over the controlled territories, good economic growth, high per capita income, good human development index, and transparency in the internationally acknowledged capacity to deliver. The international organizations and donor agencies adopt the results and perceptions generated by those indices and acknowledged such states because of capacity, institutions, legitimacy of the government, and a higher level of security over governing territories.

The term ‘Failed state’ emerged on the surface during the 1990s concerning the state collapse mostly because of internal conflicts. George Mason University conducted this first study about the factors which contribute towards state failure and academic study was conducted in a contract of the CIA under the title of ‘State Failure Task Force’ (Esty et al., 1995). They selected thematic areas for data collection from demographic patterns, religious and ethnic pressures, political, economic, and environmental patterns. Implicitly that study highlighted the factors due to which states were leading towards the failure and suggested forecasting models to protect from all such threats. Examples of state failure were Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Somalia, and Afghanistan with no governing authority and control over the territory. All these countries were experiencing almost similar crises like forced displacement, humanitarian issues, and violations of international law coupled with massive destruction of public property which direly needed the intervention of the international community.

Similarly, the weak states possessed the features like being geographically landlocked, issues of governance, corruption, economic constraints, and external threats. Weak states badly suffer from ethnic, religious, political, economic, linguistic, and communal threats which result in building a violent the image of state in the world. The weak states are a bit more resilient and responsive to prevent large-scale destruction but failed states are more tense and prone to multiple threats of insurgencies, civil unrest, and political instability within the state, civil wars, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups. This also leads to stereotyping of such states especially by the major powers and donor organizations. The perceptions shaped by these actors have massive influence over weak states so they treat them with a pre-determined strategy. The doctrine of “anticipatory self-defense” is another example of a demonstration of power and perceptions through which the leading world powers like the United States wage war against any state (Cohan, 2003).

To elaborate on the policy discourse of fragile states, the United States Institute of Peace-USIP, has tried to address this issue by defining the concept and definition of fragility-- according to them, '*A fragile state typically suffers from a weak authority, legitimacy, and capacity* (BURNS et al., 2016). Besides this is apt to remember that we cannot apply universal and borrowed solutions for all such states because every state is different from the other one, and so they are fragile in their way. These states may be experiencing instability and being at the brink of collapse due to poor governance worsening the issues of capacity, legitimacy, weak institutional foundations, corruption, ineffective authority and weak rule of law (Kaplan, 2008). Cooley and Snyder referred to such states as a source of grave security threats particularly for development and an impediment to achieving human development goals (Cooley & Snyder, 2015).

Interestingly, the studies also referred to Pakistan as a politically fragile country because of the inconsistency in the political process and since inception it has experienced instability (Davies & Gurr, 1998). The scholars identified decolonization as a root cause for the state failure because the states which got independence from colonial states had no prior experience to compete with the emerging challenges of democracy. Democratization is another reason for this vulnerability because such states are unable to make a successful transition from an autocratic form of government to a democratic structure. This unsuccessful transition made such countries vulnerable to all kinds of threats regarding their capacity, legitimacy and authority. So the reasons for failure and fragility can be determined as mismanagement, corruption and the capitalist economy which compromised the capability of such states (O'Callaghan et al., 2021).

Somalia is a failed state which has experienced decades of political instability and violence in its governing territories. The geographical location of Somalia in the 'Horn of Africa' attracted the attention of the international community and other donor organizations to initiate development programs to stabilize Somalia so that it may not affect regional security and international trade through the Indian Ocean. Yemen is another example of a failed state which suffered from a humanitarian crisis, displacement and civil war since 2015. The strategic location of Yemen in the Arabian Peninsula compelled the international community to take the initiative for security and regional stability. So broadly we can link this development in fragile and failed states with the strategic objectives and security of world trade.

Assessment Organizations & Methodology

In the 1990's Development Organizations i.e. World Bank, IMF, DFID, USAID, FSI, Transparency International, Ratings and Rankings Organizations (RROs) like Moody's, Standard and Poor's, and Fitch started the ratings of states based on the country's performance. Previously, Development agencies used to shun violent conflicts covertly and are now actively engaged in conflict prevention and conflict transformation to ensure the safety and security of states in the world. Today, the major powers are promoting change in policymaking aligned with these ratings and improving their domestic institutions. The connection between security and development has provided new foreign policy dimensions and now big powers are using these assessments to shape their foreign policy goals.

The assessment of performance by the states is based on perceptions and they take developed states as a standard to determine the ranking of the state. This concept evolved as the donor's concept as donor organizations like World Bank, DFID, FSI, USAID, and OECD make assessments before providing aid to such states based on multiple indicators known as the measurement approach and the descriptive approach (Grotenhuis, 2016). There are multiple frameworks and instruments in the world used to measure fragility, and assess the performance of a state against certain state functions and the purpose is to record states' past, present and future performance. The objective of these assessments is to provide strength and sustainable solutions to failing countries so that they can improve themselves. These institutions are working to help vulnerable states to strengthen their capacity to prevent violent conflicts, maintain authority over governing territories and establish the legitimacy of the rule to maintain global peace.

i. World Bank

The World Bank's LICUS (Low-Income Countries under Stress) changed its name in 2005 to the Fragile States Unit and later merged it with Post-Conflict Unit and renamed it as 'Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Group' (Grotenhuis, 2016). It defines the fragility as "a) a composite World Bank, African Development Bank and Asian Development Bank 'Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)' rating of 3.2 or less; or b) the presence of United Nations and/or regional peace-keeping or peace-building mission (e.g African Union, European Union, NATO), with the exclusion of border monitoring operations, during the past three years" (Fialho & Van Bergeijk, 2017).

The World Bank annually published reports with the help of the African Development Bank and Asian Development Bank to assess the situation of countries facing fragile situations with the help of CPIA index. The CIPA is comprised of four broad groups and sixteen indicators to assess the conditions of low income countries, their institutional policies, poverty reduction strategies, and effective use of developmental assistance.

A. Economic Management 1. Monetary and Exchange Rate Policies 2. Fiscal Policy 3. Debt Policy and Management **B. Structural Policies** 4. Trade 5. Financial Sector **6.** Business Regulatory Environment	**C. Policies for Social Inclusion/Equity** 7. Gender Equality 8. Equity of Public Resource Use 9. Building Human Resources 10. Social Protection and Labor **11.** Policies and Institutions for Environmental Sustainability **D. Public Sector Management and Institutions** 12. Property Rights and Rule-based Governance 13. Quality of Budgetary and Financial Management 14. Efficiency of Revenue Mobilization 15. Quality of Public Administration **16.** Transparency, Accountability, and Corruption in the Public Sector

*Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CIPA) 2017 Criteria

The CIPA assessment methodology remained under criticism and international organizations and relevant countries criticized the method of data collection used by the World Bank.

ii. Fund for Peace (FFP)

The Fund for Peace is an American think tank established in 1957, based in Washington D.C and Nigeria, working with their partners (government, military, academics, journalists, civil society, non-governmental and international organizations) in more than sixty countries. The objective is to create relevant, timely and useful tools for conflict mitigation by utilizing local knowledge. FFP publishes the Fragile States Index (FSI) in which they suggest “many remedies and treatments for the ‘political pathology’ of failed states and recommended that the policy makers shall pay more attention to building state institutions, particularly the ‘core five’ institutions-- military, police, civil services, the system of justice and leadership” (Grotenhuis, 2016). There are a total of 12 indicators used by the Fragile State Index to measure and analyze a state whether is it going to be most or least fragile. These indicators are grouped into four broad themes--cohesion, economic, political and social.

COHESION INDICATORS	ECONOMIC INDICATORS	POLITICAL INDICATORS	SOCIAL AND CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS
C1: Security Apparatus C2: Factionalized Elites C3: Group Grievance	E1: Economic Decline E2: Uneven Economic Development E3: Human Rights and Brain Drain	P1: State Legitimacy P2: Public Service P3: Human Rights and Rule of Law	S1: Demographic Pressures S2. Refugees and IDPs S3: External Intervention

Source: Fragile State Index (FSI)

FSI uses the “Conflict Assessment System Tool (CAST)” for the analysis which critically analyzes the situations across the globe in 179 countries for the assessment it includes Content analysis, qualitative review and quantitative data. This assessment methodology was developed in the 1990s adopted by policymakers and practitioners for the understanding of dynamic and complex situations (Pavlovic et al., 2008). The content analysis is based on the analysis of millions of reports published in a year and the main 12 indicators are divided into sub-indicators for a better understanding of the complete system. The quantitative data is gathered from international organizations like IMF, World Bank, UN etc. and that data is compiled along with other assessment tools used by FSI to develop the index. Qualitative data is being organized by a team of researchers around the globe and they study all countries to develop the index and based on their analysis the CAST framework publishes the final product.

iii. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

USAID was established on November 3, 1961 under the ‘Foreign Assistance Act of 1961’ to channelize the American aid “*From the American People*” and aimed to achieve the foreign policy objectives abroad. The evolution of this agency since 1960s shows gradual change in the policy as during the 1970’s the priority was to address the ‘Human Needs’ like education, health, population, human resource development and the objective during 1980s aimed to stabilize the economies and currencies of the world to strengthen the concept of ‘Free Market’. The decade of 1990s projected ‘sustainability and democracy’, which changed in post-2000 era to ‘War and

Rebuilding'. Presently the agency is promoting the objective of 'Self-reliance and Encouraging the world' to lead their journeys for sustainable growth and development.

The agency introduced the framework in 2005 at the Burundi workshop while addressing the issue of Fragile States as "USAID's Fragile State Assessment Framework" for their own larger understanding. They also wanted to have basic guidelines for the internal assessment of fragile countries and to build the capacity of practitioners to have basic knowledge about the patterns of resilience in fragile states (*USAID Brundi Framework 2005 - Google Search*, n.d.). The definition stated that-- "Fragile states refer to a broad range of failing, failed, and recovering states that are unable or unwilling to adequately assure the provision of security and basic services to a significant portion of their populations and where the legitimacy of the governments is in question. USAID distinguishes between fragile states that are vulnerable from those that are already in crisis" (Negro, 2016). It further added that states which are losing the capacity to govern is "failing, failed and recovering states, including vulnerable states which are unable to assure security and basic services and the legitimacy of government is compromised with no control over the territories and facing violent conflict are the fragile states" (Rotberg, 2004). USAID refers fragility as "the extent to which state-society relations fail to produce outcomes that are considered to be effective and legitimate" (LY, n.d.).

The methodology used by USAID is a standard approach to studying the fragile states, referred to as FRAME which comprises the tools and indicators to study the patterns of fragility (Ghani & Lockhart, 2009). The tools used in this framework are applied with a rational approach based on collective, action-oriented and consistent. The aim is to keep ground realities in mind and achieve maximum outputs from ongoing programs, integrated with all USAID's frameworks of conflict, democracy and governance. FRAME is more sensitive in approach and the intent behind designing this strategy is to have a deep understanding of conflicts and evolving challenges of legitimacy or governance so that it can achieve maximum from designed programs. The fragility indicators used for the assessment, effectiveness and legitimacy of the institutional policies are closely associated with the Political, Security, Economic and Social sectors. FRAME helps USAID to identify and map key factors of fragility, and resilience along with the governance and institutional arrangements. This strategy helps USAID to follow the pattern and engage multiple agencies to carry out program activities along with enriched strategic partnerships.

The Global Fragility Act (GFA) 2019 is approved and implemented and it emphasized that the USA remained careful in its foreign policy aid in conflict prevention. The act defined fragility and its four elements that fragility is surrounded by the issues associated with capacity, legitimacy, authority and social cohesion. The Act determines the situation of a country based on five indices which are the OECD states of fragility report, Fund for peace fragile states index, World Bank Harmonized list of Fragile Situations, Institute of Economics and Peace Global Peace Index and Holocaust Museum Early Warning Project Risk Assessment (Act, 2019).

iv. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

The OEEC was established after WW-II in 1948 to monitor the American and Canadian Aid to Europe provided under Marshall Plan to reconstruct war-torn Europe, it was renamed as OECD in 1961. Since then the OECD has been working to assist governments to develop resilient, inclusive and sustainable policies to achieve global standards. They are also working in collaboration with more than 30 governments to meet the challenges by adopting a resilient approach, making the world safer and trying to introduce sustainable solutions in all fragile situations across the globe.

OECD defines fragility as "A fragile region or state that has the weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and cannot develop mutually constructive relations with society. Fragile states are also more vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters. More resilient states exhibit the capacity and legitimacy of governing a population and its territory. They can manage and adapt to changing social needs and expectations, shifts in elite and other political agreements, and growing institutional complexity. Fragility and resilience should be seen as shifting points along a spectrum" (OECD, 2012). Since 2014 OECD has been publishing a State Fragility Report and highlighted almost 47 countries that are passing through fragile situations around the globe as declared by international organizations like World Bank, IMF, FSI etc.

The OECD fragility framework 2016 measure fragility based on five dimensions i.e. economic, political, security, environmental and societal along with mix method approach to study the context of fragility. The methodology is based on principal component analysis (PCA) to group contexts and in all five dimensions there are 8-12 indicators besides this the foundation of data is based on 44 indicators gathered by other data sources to analyze fragility across 175 contexts. The approach of OECD in data analysis is based on comprehensive data sets and the framework is also very complex but authentic in analyzing all fragile situations.

"Pockets of Fragility" is the term being highlighted by OECD that there are many areas within states which may cause instability and any conflict situation it may be national or sub-national but can play an effective role in destabilizing the state. Based on recent studies they have declared eight factors that influence domestic conflict and fragility.

v. Global Peace Index

Global Peace Index was founded by Steve Killelea and produced by The Institute of Economics & Peace (IEP), Sydney based think tank working around the globe to analyse Peace and to quantify its economic benefits via using multiple indicators. GPI comprises of 23 indicators to assess a country's capacity via using 3 domains of peacefulness i.e Ongoing Domestic and International Conflict, Level of harmony or discord within the nation and the country's militarization.

The assessment methodology used by GPI was assessed by the team of experts using the accepted methodology for robustness to analyze all 23 indicators weighted and combined in a systematic way using three domains of GPI. "The Economist Intelligence Unit Approach" a country's analysis team follows strict rules and processes to ensure the authenticity and reliability of the GPI using qualitative indicators (Sarangi, 2018). These scores are also analyzed by external experts before finalization and circulation around the globe.

vi. Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO)

The Department of International Development (DFID) was initiated in 1997 by the British Government and it remained effective till September 2020, presently merged into the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO) (Orliange & Zaratiegui, 2022). DFID worked to implement UK's international goals to make aid more effective by adopting sustainable policy approaches in fragile states. The aim was to strengthen global peace, security, governance, building resilience, poverty eradication, transparency and global prosperity in developing countries.

According to DFID "those where the government cannot or will not deliver core functions to the majority of its people, including the poor" are the fragile states (*Wp51.Pdf*, n.d.). It further unfolds four types of environments in which fragile states experience first 'Monterrey' cases of strong capacity and reasonable political will, second 'weak but willing', third 'strong but unresponsive' and fourth 'weak-weak' (*Wp51.Pdf*, n.d.). The focus remained on building stronger institutions with enhanced capacity to respond to all extreme issues which arose due to the weak capacity of the state.

The methods used by DFID in defining fragility is a combination of three frameworks introduced by the World Bank, Fund for Peace and Uppsala Conflict Database which are accepted by the world regarding their assessment of fragile states. The DFID also encourage states to show political commitment to shun violence and prevent conflicts in their relevant territories by taking all stakeholders on board. The UK government has developed a framework called 'Building Stability Overseas Strategy-(BSOS)', and implemented it through DFID for conflict prevention and building the capacity of state institutions. The approach adopted by DFID is implemented at the sectoral and state levels to ensure progress in developing an indigenious framework so that the 'theories of change' do not destablize the state (Stein & Valters, 2012).

DFID uses multiple tools to assess the fragility like the country's governance analysis, political economy analysis, strategic conflict assessment and gender and social inclusion analysis. Besides these other tools are 'Countries at Risk of Instability Framework (CRI)', critical path method and conflict audits for the on-ground assessment. DFID itself has four levels of analysis to manage the risk-- corporate, country, divisional and project (Stein & Valters, 2012). The 'Research and Evidence Division (RED)' have the responsibility to manage fragile, disaster and conflict situations around the globe through thematic teams grouped in 'governance, conflict and social development, human development, agriculture, growth and climate change (Stein & Valters, 2012).

vii. The Country Indicators for Foreign Policy Fragile States Index (CIFP)

CIFP has its origin in GEOPOL a database developed in 1991 to assist the Canadian Forces in their operations and planning. It was the priority of the government to develop such a database for effective international engagement in the failed and fragile states. The Canadian government has working with the team of David Carment, Carleton University to study a broad range of indicators of the country's performance evaluation and forecasting. To achieve the objective CIFP has developed tools for monitoring, forecasting, evaluation and assessment. Besides this it addressed the issues or policies associated with development, security and economic issues in such states. The data is based on more than 100 indicators to study the domestic issues, armed conflicts, governance, instability, militarization, environment etc for 196 countries of the world. CIFP has drawn those indicators from international organizations like World Bank, and the UN to strengthen its database and to ensure authenticity.

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) played a vital role along with other organizations in the assessment of CIFP for the individual country's performance so that in the process of formulating policies or directing aid they have a rational approach while interacting with fragile or failed states. The CIFP is also working regarding the nature of state fragility, identifying key variables, and causes of state fragility through statistical and theoretical research. CIFP has been regarded as the authentic source due to its methodology and approach regarding such states.

Challenges of State Fragility and Implications for States

The challenges of state fragility have increased to the extent that states are fighting to cope with the issues of capacity, legitimacy and authority for survival. They became vigilant in response because the world has already witnessed the collapse of many states due to such problems. In the recent past, many organizations have introduced indexes to highlight the weak areas of states and tried to identify the reason behind the decline. The purpose was to act as an early warning system for such states so that the countries facing challenges take preventive measures and avoid greater risk. The fragility can be considered as an internal phenomenon and the challenges that emerged internally shall be resolved in the same way.

World has already witnessed many interventions in failed states since 9/11 like Iraq and Afghanistan. The US waged war on these sovereign states as a part of a preemptive strategy to eliminate safe havens of terrorism and the objective was to make the US safe for Americans. History has determined that such interventions further worsen the situation rather than resolve the issue of state failure. Learning the lesson that foreign or external interventions shall be avoided in sovereign states rather build the capacity and support them to develop internal mechanisms of conflict resolution. The examples of Afghanistan and Iraq can be quoted where US-led intervention has deteriorated the situation in both states. Later on the US intervention in Iraq was termed 'illegal' by former UN Secretar- General Kofi Anan because the priority was the security objectives rather than anything else (*Iraq War Illegal, Says Annan*, 2004).

The issue of failed, failing and fragile states has posed critical questions for the world. The perceptions shaped for such countries proved to be security driven rather than humanitarian concerns of developed states. It destabilizes them to the extent that it restricted the response of responding states to all such challenges. The perceptions created by developed countries undermined the capacity of responding states due to which they were unable to manage the conflicts, humanitarian crises, problems of governance, and security in governing territories.

Conclusion

The consciousness of the world in addressing the issue of state fragility is an effort to restore peace in the world. The contributions made to highlight the emerging challenges in weak, failed and fragile states have gained credibility in international development and donor organizations. The responding states must assume this as an early warning to prevent the escalation of challenges like governance, poverty, economy, security, capacity, legitimacy and authority. If failing, failed and fragile states haven't responded to such challenges, then it becomes a threat to regional and international security.

International development and donor organizations concerned with the indices have worked hard to highlight evolving problems in responding states. They proposed solutions to overcome the issues in internal settings and discourage foreign intervention in sovereign states. The development agendas of the world shall carry the essence of humanity and all such initiatives implemented on humanitarian grounds rather than security-driven agendas. Developed countries shall avoid using all developmental aid in achieving strategic goals. The solutions proposed shall be developed indigenously so that they carry the essence of the soil rather than applying borrowed solutions or fixed strategies to maintain peace. It is understood that every fragile state is different in its nature from other states " because they are unhappy in their way".

So the world must adopt the humanitarian approach in the resolution of conflicts and provide sustainable solutions in achieving peace around the globe. They should extend support to failed, failing and fragile states in maintaining their sovereignty which is the only way towards achieving progress and peace.

References

Act, G. F. (2019). HR 2116. *116th Congress (2019-2020)*.

BURNS, W. J., FLOURNOY, M. A., & LINDBORG, N. E. (2016). *US LEADERSHIP STATE FRAGILITY*.

Cohan, J. A. (2003). The Bush Doctrine and the Emerging Norm of Anticipatory Self-Defense in Customary International Law. *Pace Int'l L. Rev.*, *15*, 283.

Cooley, A., & Snyder, J. L. (Eds.). (2015). *Ranking the world: Grading states as a tool of global governance*. Cambridge University Press.

Davies, J. L., & Gurr, T. R. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventive measures: Building risk assessment and crisis early warning systems*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Esty, D. C., Goldstone, J. A., Gurr, T. R., Surko, P., & Unger, A. N. (1995). *State failure task force report*.

Fialho, D., & Van Bergeijk, P. A. (2017). The proliferation of developing country classifications. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *53*(1), 99–115.

Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State-building: Governance and world order in the 21st century*. Cornell University Press.

Ghani, A., & Lockhart, C. (2009). *Fixing failed states: A framework for rebuilding a fractured world*. Oxford University Press.

Grimm, S., Lemay-Hébert, N., & Nay, O. (2014). 'Fragile States': Introducing a political concept. *Third World Quarterly*, *35*(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.878127

Grotenhuis, R. (2016). *Nation-Building as Necessary Effort in Fragile States*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1gr7d8r

Helman, G. B., & Ratner, S. R. (1992). Saving Failed States. *Foreign Policy*, *89*, 3. https://doi.org/10.2307/1149070

Iraq war illegal, says Annan. (2004, September 16). http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3661134.stm

Kaplan, S. D. (2008). *Fixing Fragile States: A New Paradigm for Development: A New Paradigm for Development*. Abc-clio.

LY, K. (n.d.). *VISION FOR ENDING EXTREME POVERTY*.

Negro, F. (2016). *Selected definitions and characteristics of 'fragile states' by key international actors"*.

O'Callaghan, T., Roach, S. C., & Griffiths, M. (2021). *INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS The Key Concepts Second Edition*.

OECD. (2012). *Think global, act global: Confronting global factors that influence conflict and fragility*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Paris.

Orliange, P., & Zaratiegui, T. (2022). International development cooperation as a global governance policy. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, *65*.

Pavlovic, N. J., Blackler, K., & Mandel, D. R. (2008). *Conflict and security indices: A summary of open-source data*. DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TORONTO (CANADA).

Rotberg, R. I. (Ed.). (2004). *When states fail: Causes and consequences*. Princeton University Press.

Sarangi, U. (2018). GLOBAL PEACE INDEX OF ECONOMIES. *International Journal on World Peace*, *35*(2).

Stein, D., & Valters, C. (2012). *Understanding theory of change in international development*.

USAID Brundi framework 2005—Google Search. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2023, from https://www.google.com/search?q=USAID+Brundi+framework+2005&rlz=1C1VDKB_enPK1052PK1052&biw=1366&bih=625&sxsrf=APwXEdfoRZMb6DtAb1k-

Swosp3BTqOBkdg%3A1683222078811&ei=Pu5TZOKKMaaOxc8P6vScuAM&ved=0ahUKEwjiodfwmtz-

AhUmR_EDHWo6BzcQ4dUDCA8&uact=5&oq=USAID+Brundi+framework+2005&gs_lcp=Cgxnd3Mtd2l6LXNlcnAQAzIHCCEQoAEQCjoKCAAQRxDWBBCwAzoICCEQFhAeEB1KBAhBGABQ1QJYqwtg1A9oAXABeACAAfgCiAHuDJIBBTItMS40mAEAoAEByAEIwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz-serp

Wp51.pdf. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2023, from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08b62e5274a27b2000af7/wp51.pdf