FAILED STATE DISCOURSE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE US FOREIGN POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

YAHYA GÜLSEVEN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

NOVEMBER 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____
Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____
Prof. Dr. Feride ACAR
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Galip YALMAN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Galip YALMAN (METU, ADM) _____

Prof. Dr. Mustafa TÜRKEŞ (METU, IR) _____

Assist Prof. Dr Ferdan Ergut (METU, HIST) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

FAILED STATE DISCOURSE AS AN INSTRUMENT IN THE US FOREIGN POLICY IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

Gülseven, Yahya

M. Sc., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Galip YALMAN

November 2005, 96 pages

This thesis focuses on the use of the term 'failed state' as a category in the US foreign policy discourse in the post Cold War era. The concept of 'failed state' is critically examined in terms of its methodological and ontological flaws. It is suggested that the primary methodological flaw of the failed state discourse is its atomistic and essentialist approach which describes 'state failure' as an internal problem which needs external solutions. By rejecting the internal/external dichotomy, the dialectical method is offered as an alternative to examine the use of the term in the US foreign policy discourse in the post Cold War era. It is argued here that failed state discourse is used as a means in the justification of an international order based on 'preemptive strikes' and unilateral economic, political and military interventions. Building upon this ideological function of failed state discourse, the current discusssions on state failure is related to contemporary debates on imperialism**.**

Keywords : Failed state, state failure, imperialism, preemptive strike, US foreign policy

ÖZ

SOĞUK SAVAŞ SONRASI DÖNEMDE AMERİKAN DIŞ POLİTİKASINDA BİR ARAÇ OLARAK 'BAŞARISIZ DEVLET' SÖYLEMİ

Gülseven, Yahya
Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Galip YALMAN
Kasım 2005, 96 sayfa

Bu tez, 'başarısız devlet' teriminin Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde Amerikan dış politika söyleminde bir kategori olarak kullanımı üzerine odaklanmaktadır. 'Başarısız devlet' kavramı metodolojik ve ontolojik açıdan eleştirel olarak incelenmiştir. 'Başarısız devlet' söyleminin temel metodolojik probleminin, 'devlet başarısızlığı'nı dışsal çözümler gerektiren içsel bir sorun olarak yansıtan atomistik ve özcü yaklaşımı olduğu öne sürülmüştür. Bu noktada, içsel/dışsal ikiliği reddedilerek, 'başarısız devlet' teriminin Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde Amerikan dış politika söylemindeki kullanımını incelemede diyalektik yöntem bir alternatif olarak sunulmuştur. 'Başarısız devlet' söyleminin 'önleyici vuruş' ve tek taraflı ekonomik, siyasi ve askeri müdahalelere dayanan bir dünya düzeni oluşturulmasını meşrulaştırmada bir araç olduğu öne sürülmüştür. 'Başarısız devlet' söyleminin bu ideolojik işlevinden yola çıkılarak, 'başarısız devlet' tartışmaları günümüzdeki emperyalizm tartışmaları ile ilişkilendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler : Başarısız Devlet, devlet başarısızlığı, emperyalizm, önleyici vuruş, Amerikan dış politikası

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express sincere appreciation to Assist. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman for his guidance and insight throughout the research. Thanks go to Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ferdan Ergut, for their suggestions and comments. To Nuran Aytemur, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for her full support in the completion of this study. To my family, I thank them for always being there for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Immediately after the demise of the Soviet Union, the US administration initiated a reassessment of US national security policy in light of the changing global situation. The Bush administration put particular emphasis on the 'threat' posed by regional conflicts and instability in the Third World, and this 'threat' became an indispensible part of the discussions on the global and national security in the post Cold War era. Whereas regional conflict and instability was viewed as a secondary, subordinate danger during the Cold War, it was now seen as a major security challenge. Indeed, 'US strategists began to speak of a post-Cold War era in which "instability itself" represents the greatest threat to world peace' (Klare 1992, 51).

In this context, the so-called 'failed states' were declared as the sources of 'instability'. 'Failed state' is broadly defined as the one which is unable to perform the functions which are taken to be characteristic of a properly functioning state such as providing public goods, ensuring the protection and security of the population and maintaining law and order. 'Failed states', it is said, are torn apart by ethnic or religious conflict, civil unrest, corruption, crime, poverty, inequality and disease.

Although the characteristics associated with state failure, such as poverty, instability and civil war, do not specify a new situation, 'failed states' were considered as 'new threats' replacing the 'threat' posed by Soviet Union. A brief literature survey of the recent debates on the 'state failure' shows that 'failed states' have become an indispensible part of the debates on global security in general and the

US national security in particular in the post Cold War era. They have become an easy target which are held responsible for the most serious global problems from regional instability, poverty, drugs trafficking, refugee flows, terrorism to AIDS.

Particularly, as from the events of September 11, the argument has been increasingly made that the issue of 'state failure' was no longer limited to the humanitarian consequences of state failure for the local populations and destabilizing effects on neighbouring countries. We have been told that 'failed states' need more attention because any such state could become a 'breeding ground' or 'safe haven' for global networks of terrorism. Now, the failed state issue is seen in a more global context, and concerns are directed at the threats posed by 'failed states' to the developed nations of the world. The latest US National Security Strategy document, which warns against the threats posed by failed states and attempts to outline 'preventive meausures' for 'failure', can be considered as an indication that the issue of state failure has become a priority in national and global security considerations.

Thus, it is not surprising that the term 'failed state' has been increasingly used acquiring a central position in the foreign policy discourse of the Western countries, especially the United States since the early post Cold War period. It has become a regular part of diplomatic and political lexicon of the many Western countries without a serious questioning of how proper and meaningful the concept itself is. In recent years, the discussions on the state failure have not only grown in number, but also the subject has become more attractive for social scientists. What characterizes these theoretical discussions on state failure is the use of the term without a serious questioning even by those who have a critical stance towards the discourse on 'failed states'. This uncritical appropriation and use of the notion of 'failed states' is the main source of inspiration for this study. Given the fact that little has been achieved

in terms of critical evaluation of the concept of 'failed state', this study aims to critically evaluate it. In my opinion, starting with a theoretical discussion on the category of failed state will also be helpful in terms of leading to a better understanding of the use of the term in the US foreign policy discourse.

In such a context, the main concerns of this study can be explained in such questions: What lies beneath the emergence of the perception that 'failed states' are the 'new threats' to the global security in the post Cold War era? What critearia are used to differentiate 'failed states' from their 'successful' counterparts? How useful is the category 'state failure' as an analytical tool? How and in what ways does the failed state discourse serve as an ideology? Can we relate the current discussions on state failure to the contemporary debates on imperialism?

This study has four parts including the introduction in the first chapter and the conclusion in the last one. Since the major assumption in this study is that the very term 'failed state' is a misconception, it is appropriate to start from a theoretical discussion on the concept itself. Thus, the second chapter covers a theoretical discussion of the concept 'failed state'. In this chapter, first of all, a brief survey of the literature on 'failed states' including different conceptualizations and perceptions of state failure is given. Secondly, methodological and ontological flaws of failed state discourse are dealt with through the examination of 'therapautic approaches' and that of what Branwen Jones calls 'blaming the victim'. Here, the main criticism will be directed towards the atomistic and essentialist approach of the failed state discourse which, by taking states as isolated units and focusing simply on local conditions, holds the so-called 'failed states' responsible for their 'failure'. All these considerations will lead us to question the notion of failed state as an analytical tool to describe the crises and poor conditions in certain regions of the world. The chapter

will be concluded by suggesting an alternative method which is based on the dialectical method grounded on the notion of internal relations.

The third chapter analyzes the use of the term 'failed state' in American foreign policy discourse in the post Cold War era. This will be done through a critical evaluation of the official US government documents and the reports and findings of the government-appointed advisory commissions which are influential in shaping US foreign policy towards so-called 'failed states'. Moreover, statements, comments and speeches related to 'failed states' by the US foreign policy makers in the post Cold War period will be examined. The historical roots of the failed state discourse will also be given in this chapter. The traces of the failed states discourse will be sought in the concerns for political order and stability which were brought into the agenda by academicians, such as Samuel Huntington,especially in the United States in the 1960s.

The fourt chapter is an attempt to relate the failed state discourse to the contemporary debates on 'new imperialism'.[1] In doing this, first of all, the contemporary accounts of imperialism which offer a return to imperialism as a solution to the threats posed by failed state will be briefly mentioned. The attempts to find solutions to the problem of 'failure' mostly appear in the form of political, economic and military interventions. Here, a question arises as to whether the notion of failed state has an ideological function in providing such interventions in the post Cold War era. Then, the ideological function of the failed state discourse at the service of imperialism will be eloborated with reference to David Harvey and Ellen

[1] At this point, rather than following the trendy and widespread accounts of new imperialism, following Aijaz Ahmad, I will prefer to use the term 'imperialism of our time' in order to emphase the historical continuity of imperialism.

Meiksins Wood, who argue that the current US imperialism represents a passage from one strategy to another, namely from financial to militaristic one.

The conclusion part, written in the light of the discussions above, is an attempt to reach a general assessment of failed state discourse as an instrument of the US foreign policy in the post Cold War era.

CHAPTER II

A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION ON THE CATEGORY 'FAILED STATE'

In this chapter, different definitions and the current perceptions of state failure in the West will be given. The problem with the failed state discourse is not the empirical identification of social, economic and political crisis as such, but its 'manner of characterizing and explaining the nature and production of crises' (Jones 2004). Therefore, the problem with the failed state discourse is assumed to be first and foremost a problem of method. Failed state discourse places responsibility and blame on the state and its people for the conditions in the so-called failed states. This atomistic and essentialist approach legitimizes external interventions by assigning responsibility and blame to the so-called failed states. However, this methodological flaw can not be overcome by putting the blame on the external factors (e.g. actions and policies of the developed nations) at the expense of internal ones. In my opinion such an approach is also misleading. Therefore, rejecting the internal/external dichotomy, I will argue for an alternative method which is grounded on the dialectical method.

Over the past decade a considerable academic and policy literature has grown which focuses on the problem of the failed states and 'the notion of failed states has gradually acquired a position of centrality in the foreign policy discourse of the

United States, Canada and the UK, as well as featuring in statements by the European Union and John Howard's government of Australia'[2] (Jones 2004).

One of the defining characteristics of the discourse is that failed state is generally described in terms of what it is not, rather than what it is. The phrase 'failed state' contains an implicit acknowledgement of a 'successful' state, namely the advanced capitalist states of the West, which serves as a criterion for determining whether a state is 'failing' or 'failed'. In other words, failed states are addressed in terms of the absence of the features that 'successful' states of the West have. Another defining characteristic of the discourse, as Jones argues, is the widespread use of descriptive terminology. States have been described as 'failed', 'being at the risk of failure', 'fractured', 'poor performers', 'low income countries under stress', 'non-existent', 'dysfunctional', 'chaotic', 'profoundly flawed', 'aborted', 'quasi', 'broken-down', 'anaemic', 'phantom', 'shadow', 'captured', 'collapsing', 'collapsed', 'imploded', 'dissolved', 'disintegrated', 'rogue' (Jones 2004). These notions are mostly used interchangeably.

Several research programmes concentrating on the theme of failed states have been carried out in recent years in Europe and more especially in the United States.[3]

---

[2] 'Hillary Benn, UK Secretary of State for International Development, in a speech in June 2004, said "weak and failing states provide a breeding ground for international crime" ' (quoted in Jones 2004). 'At a meeting of the Pacific Islands Forum in Auckland earlier this year, to discuss a coordinated approach to counter-terrorism in the region, Australia warned that "failing states in the Pacific could become a haven for terrorists and organized crime" '(BBC News 2004a in Jones 2004, 32n.). 'Canada's National Security Policy, which was issued by the government, suggests "failed and failing states can provide a haven for terrorists, which can pose risks to the security of Canadians" ' (quoted in Jones 2004). United States National Security Strategy (2002) suggests 'America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones...We must defeat these threats to our Nation, allies, and friends.'

[3] 'The World Peace Foundation and Harvard University carried out a five-year project, "the Program on Interstate Conflict", with Robert Rotberg as a lead researcher. The Failed States research project at Purdue University, USA, held a series of annual conferences between 1998 – 2001: "Failed States and International Security: Causes, Prospects and Consequences" (1998), "Failed States and International Security II: Sources of Prevention, Modes of Response, and Conditions of State Success and Renewal" (1999), "Failed States III: Globalization and the Failed States" (2000) and "Failed States

Jones (2004) argues that the Western social science communities' overriding concern with diagnosing, categorizing, mapping and predicting state failure is intimately connected with 'the wish to guide foreign policy makers, so that the West can know how and when to intervene to failed states'. She writes:

> Many reasons are offered justifying the urgent need to identify, understand, diagnose, predict, and prevent these conditions of failure. It is claimed that Failed States are likely to cause or be characterised by a host of problems: corruption, conflict, poverty, hunger, disease... All of these, it is asserted with self-evident drama, have a tendency to spread through 'contagion' or 'spill-over', 'spawning' wider regional conflicts and instability...
>
> (Jones 2004)

However, 'the discourse seems to have taken a populist and militarist turn since the events of September 11' (Hughes and Pupavac 2001). It is claimed that failed states harbour terrorist organizations and provide convenient environment for arms and drug trafficking as well as organized crime (see US.Commission on National Security 2000; US Department of Defense 2001; Takeyh and Gvosdev 2002; Rotberg 2002, 2003, 2004; Fukuyama 2004).

2.1. Different Conceptualizations of 'Failed State'

Failed State seems to have become a term that is used in whatever the way that user finds it strategically useful. Despite the wide-ranging use of this term by European and US foreign policy makers, neither they nor academicians have clearly

---

IV: Structures, Cases and Policies" (2001)' (Jones 2004). A World Bank research project titled 'The Economics of Civil Wars, Crime and Violence' has analysed economic aspects of civil war, ethnic violence, etc. Resources include working papers datasets, conference presentations and links about civil war onset and termination as well as economic causes and consequences of civil strife (see the World Bank's page on 'Conflict Analysis'). The Center for Global Development has convened a panel of politicians and academic to issue a report outlining policy recommendations for the Bush administration on dealing with failed states and produced a report titled 'On the Brink:Weak States and US National Security' in June 2004. The Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University has established a research programme on 'Effective and Defective States' which focused on the Balkans. The Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' has conducted several research projects about conflict in developing countries. Their list of publications features case studies about Colombia, Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone and a few other countries. The British Prime Minister's Strategy Unit's 'Weak and Failing States Project' formulated policy options for intervening in or supporting failing states. (These conferences and researches listed above are available at http://www.politik.uni-koeln.de/jaeger/links/statef.html)

identified what characteristics a state must display to fall into this category. There is no agreement in the scholarly literature on the definition of state failure. Although most definitions acknowledge similar characteristics, they differ in their emphasis. In most analyses, the analytical category of failed state and related terms are taken to be valid and accepted uncritically.

The most often cited definition was given by Zartman who argues that states fail when 'the basic functions of the state are no longer performed' (1995, 5). Zartman describes failed states as follows:

> As the decision making center of government, the state is paralysed and inoperative: laws are not made, order is not preserved, and societal cohesion is not enhanced. As a symbol of identity, it has lost its power of conferring a name on its people and a meaning to their social action. As a territory, it is no longer assured security and provisionment by a central sovereign organization. As the authoritative political institution, it has legitimacy, which is therefore up for grabs, and so has lost its right to command and conduct public affairs. As a system of socio-economic organization, its functional balance of inputs and outputs is destroyed, it no longer receives support from nor exercises controls over its people, and it is no longer even the target of demands, because its people know that it is incapable of providing supplies. No longer functioning, with neither traditional nor charismatic nor institutional sources of legitimacy, it has lost the right to rule.
>
> (Zartman 1995, 5)

Helman and Ratner describe the failed state as 'utterly incapable of sustaining itself as a member of the international community' (Helman and Ratner 1993, 3). They observe that failed states threaten neighboring countries because civil strife, economic collapse, and the breakdown of food and health systems 'force refugees to flee to adjacent countries.' These states may also 'be burdened with illicit arms traffic, solidarity activities by related ethnic groups, and armed bands seeking to establish a safe haven.' There is also a 'tangible risk that such conflicts will spill over into other countries.' They suggest that a list of such failed states would include 'Haiti, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, Lebanon, Sudan, Liberia, Afghanistan,

Cambodia, Ethiopia, Zaire, and the former Soviet Union' (Helman and Ratner 1993, 8).

For Straw (2002) failed state situation is similar to the Hobbesian state of nature, in which

> continual fear and danger of violent death rendered life 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. These words have contemporary resonance in countries such as Somalia, Liberia, and the Democratic republic of Congo where the central authority of the state has collapsed, law and order is non-existant and territory is controlled by competing fiefdoms and gangs.
>
> (Straw 2002)

However, state failure is not just treated as the Hobbesian nigthmare of the the local populations because state failure is mostly linked to regional and global instability. Fukuyama (2004, 125) defines failed states as the states which 'commit human rights abuses, provoke humanitarian disasters, drive massive waves of immigration, and attack their neighbours'. For him, failed states are the source of many of the world's most serious problems, from poverty, AIDS and drugs, to terrorism.

Ignatieff (2002) uses a 'Weberian' definition. For him, failed states are characterized by an 'inability to maintain a monopoly of the internal means of violence'. From this perspective, a state is 'successful' if it maintains a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within its borders. His list of failed states would include countries, such as Sri Lanka and Colombia, which are 'capable states nevertheless fighting losing battles against insurgents' (Ignatieff 2002, 117).

According to Gros (1996, 462), 'failed states tend to be the Bart Simpsons[4] of the international economy; they are parennial underachievers'. Gros (1996, 455-71) constructs a taxonomy of failed states that measures 'failure' along a continuum. He

[4]Bart Simpson is a popular cartoon character in the USA from a television show called The Simpsons. Bart is a little boy who constantly underachieves.

places the states on this continuum according to whether they fulfil the Weberian criteria of statehood. As a result, he provides a taxonomy of five types of 'failed states'. These include so-called 'anarchic states', 'phantom' or 'mirage states', 'anaemic states', 'captured states' and 'aborted states'.

Rotberg (2002a) argues that state failure can be measured by its inability to deliver political goods. For Rotberg, 'the state's prime function is to provide the political good of security' (Rotberg 2003c, 5). Other political goods that a state should supply are 'medical and health care, schools and educational instruction, roads, railways, harbors and other arteries of commerce, a money and banking system, a fiscal and institutional context within which citizens can pursue entrepreneurial goals and prosper; space for the flowering of civil society; and methods of regulating the sharing of the environmental commons' (Rotberg 2003c, 5). At the bottom of this hierarchy of political goods is a state's ability to supply a functioning educational and healthcare system. In his description of failed state situation, 'security is non-existent, the economic infrastructure has failed, the health care system is in decline, and the educational system is in shamble, GDP per capita is in a precipitous decline, inflation soars, growth rates go negative, corruption flourishes, and food shortages are frequent' (Rotberg 2002b, 90).

An even more all-embracing definition has been given by the US State Failure Task Force[5]. According to the reports of the Task Force, narrow definition of state

[5] 'State Failure Task Force implements a data-driven study on the causes of state failure with the aim of developing a methodology to identify key factors and critical thresholds signalling high risk of political crisis in countries some two years in advance. A list of state failures was originally prepared in 1994 by a research team directed by Ted Robert Gurr of the University of Maryland and (for genocides and politicides) Barbara Harff of the US Naval Academy. It consists of a panel of academic social scientists, experts in data collection, and consultants in statistical methods. Its objective was to develop a methodology to identify key factors and critical thresholds signaling a high risk of political crisis in countries .some two years in advance. Although the task force identified only twelve cases of complete collapse of state authority during the last 40 years, they enlarged the dataset

failure refers to the instances in which the central state authority collapses for several years. However, the Task Force suggests that the definition of state failure must not simply be limited to total state collapse and must be expanded to include all instances that pose challenges to US foreign policy. Therefore the Task Force broadens its definition and enlarges its dataset to include a wider range of revolutionary wars, ethnic wars, genocides or politicides, or adverse or disruptive regime changes. These are defined as follows:

- *Revolutionary wars*: episodes of sustained military conflicts between governments and politically organized challengers that seek to overthrow the central government, to replace its leaders, or to seize power in one region.
- *Ethnic wars*: episodes of sustained violent conflict in which national, ethnic, religious or other communal minorities challenge governments to seek major changes
- *Adverse regime changes*: major, abrupt shifts of patterns of governance, including state collapse, periods of severe elite or regime instability, and shifts away from democracy toward authoritarian rule.
- *Genocides and politicides*: sustained policies by states or their agents and, in civil wars, by either of the contending authorities that result in the deaths of a substantial portion of a communal or political group.

The Task Force's analysis produced five models (Global, Sub-Saharan Africa, Muslim Countries, Ethnic War, and Genocide and Politicides). The key factors associated with state failure in different geographic regions were enumerated in *State Failure Task Force Report: Phase III* (2003) as follows :

---

to include almost all revolutionary wars, ethnic wars, genocides and politicides, and adverse or disruptive regime transitions between 1955 nd 1994 a total of 127 cases'
(available at the State Failure Task Force Web site: http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/stfail/)

• Quality of life, the material well-being of a country's citizens.

• Regime type, the character of a country's political institutions.

•International influences, including openness to trade, memberships in regional organizations, and violent conflicts in neighboring countries.

• The ethnic or religious composition of a country's population or leadership.

• Low levels of material well-being, measured by infant mortality rates.

• Low trade openness, measured by imports plus exports as a percent of GDP.

• Presence of major civil conflicts in neighboring states.

• Large total population and high population density.

• Factors such as environment, ethnic or religious discrimination, price inflation, government debt, or military spending.

The choice of the dataset, which results from an underlying definition that equates state failure with internal wars makes it even more difficult to determine the scope of state failure . The State Failure Task Force project treats state failure merely as a new label and does not distinguish state failure from much larger category of political crises and wars. This failure to distinguish conceptually the phenomena of state failure obscures a clear comprehension of what the Task Force's definition of state failure is. For instance, the database of the Task Force includes the Rwandan genocide of 1994, even though Clapham (2000) rightfully observed that 'the killing in Rwanda was overwhelmingly carried out by disciplined forces under the control of the state'. Rather than being a symptom of state failure, the genocide proved the strenght of the state. At this point, Wallensteen (2000) suggests that 'there is state failure if the state is not effective enough on the one hand, a case where the state is under-consolidated. There is also state failure when the state becomes a threat to its

inhabitants it is supposed to protect, a case where the state is over-extended vis-a-vis the inhabitants'.

There is another literature on state failure, which focuses less on the violent the breakdown of state institutions than on factors such as failure to integrate with the global economy and attracting foreign investment. According to one such author 'persistent shortfalls in growth rates compared to comparable countries provides prima facie evidence of state failure and its severity' (Khan 2002). From this perspective, countries such as Argentina after its recent economic crisis can be labeled as a 'failed state'.

When these various definitions are taken into account, it seems that since the early post Cold War period state failure has become a term which is used to describe various phenomena including civil wars, genocide, regime changes, revolutionary wars, etc. The term does not denote a precisely defined and classified situation. However, the issue is more than one of careless use of the term. This is not an issue of mere 'namecalling.' Politically, leaving the term vague and blurred makes it open to abuse and the term serves the political interests by those who use it.

2.2 Perception of State Failure in the West

Since the early post Cold War period various reports, official documents and academic works have warned that a new challenge ('new' meaning 'after communism') for international community is emerging. The states that earned the label 'failed' were presented as if they came down to earth from another planet. Many contributors to the discussions of state failure described the situation as if these so-called failed states never existed before the post Cold War period and they suddenly appeared as a 'new challenge' for the international community in the aftermath of the Cold War. Helman and Ratner, for example, were warning that 'from Haiti in the

Western Hemisphere to the remnants of Yugoslavia in Europe, from Somalia, Sudan and Liberia in Africa to Cambodia in Southeasts Asia a disturbing new phenomenon is emerging' (Helman and Ratner 1993, 3). As a matter of fact, 'state failure' does not describe a new situation. It just seems to provide a new label for old problems such as poverty, civil war and underdevelopment. The rise of the notion 'failed state' does not denote a new class of phenomena but instead represents a new perception held by some policy-makers towards some states. It is in this sense that the failed state discourse is an old wine in a new bottle.

Today state failure is problematized more in terms of the threat that failed states potentially pose to the security of powerful countries, than the well-being of the populations in the so-called failed states. Whereas state collapse and failure used to be regarded as an internal business of the respective states, and part of their responsibility as sovereign entities, now it has come to be widely accepted that its implications of state failure reach further to neighbouring states, regional security, and to the global society at large. This can be explicitly seen in the words of an economic counselor from IMF :

> In this era of growing world integration, the frustrated young man in a failed state affects the comfortable citizen in a developed country in a variety of ways, ranging from the benign, immigration, to the malign, terrorism. Just one statistic should be enough to make the point: approximately 95 percent of the world's production of hard drugs occurs in countries with civil wars Instead of erecting fortresses against these young men, would it no be more cost-effective to attempt to ameliorate their lot? Even if we do not see the moral imperative of rescuing those still living in a Hobbesian world, we should see our self-interest in doing so. Future generations will not forgive us if we do otherwise.
>
> (Rajan 2004)

A brief survey of the literature on failed states shows that the prime reason for being concerned about state failure is because failed states 'harbour' or provide 'safe havens' for terrorism, arms and drug trafficking and organized crime. All of these, it

is argued, tend to spread to wider regions leading to conflicts and instability: 'Failed states are more than problems for themselves. They create bad neighborhoods' (Ignatieff 2002, 115).

Such an approach parallels the domino theory of the Cold War period. The Foreign Secretary of Great Britain suggests that 'during the Cold War, some in the West drew inspiration from the domino theory: arguing that if Communism were not stopped in Korea, Vietnam, Nicaragua, or Angola, it would topple neighbouring countries and eventually reach us. Historians may argue about whether the domino theory really applied to Communism, but I have no doubt that does apply to the chaos of failed states' (Straw 2002, 61). In a similar manner, Kaplan (1994) offers horrific accounts of many African states, depicting government collapse amid rampant lawlessness, famine, disease, overpopulation, desertification, deforestation, pollution, and war. Kaplan (1994) maintains that 'political, social, and environmental degradation sets off a domino effect that will directly jeopardize the security of all states.'

In short, failed states are said to cause situations of widespread chaos, lack of order and control, with far-reaching effects which threaten the security of populations and economies in the West, and the very existence of the international state-system. State failure is thus perceived as a threat to the West and to the international system.

It is now commonplace to claim that conflict in post-Cold War era is different from the past (United Nations, 2004). The several complex wars in so-called failed states (wars of Yugoslavian succession, the wars of Soviet succession in the Caucasus region, and the perpetual warfare across West and Central Africa) have led many scholars and policy makers to conclude that the nature of conflict began to change and we have entered an era of 'new wars' in the post Cold War period (see Duffield

2001a, 2001b, 2002). We are told that the trend in warfare is sharply away from interstate conflicts. Instead, wars today, contrary to an earlier inter-state norm, are internal to states. Another feature of these new wars described by the Carnegie Commission report titled *Preventing Deadly Conflict* is that, 'unlike the national liberation struggles of yesterday, warring parties are now more likely to pursue narrow secterian interests, including criminal ones, rather than popular and legitmate causes' (quoted from Carnegie Commission[6] in Duffield 2002, 1051). Duffield (2002) tries to show this current Western consensus on the changing nature of conflict with reference to an NGO's report:

> Over the past 20 years, the nature and characteristics of contemporary conflicts have been transformed. As inter-state wars have declined in number, identity/ethnicity based internal conflicts have emerged to replace them as the primary threat to the developing world. In many ways, the effects of these new coflicts are even more devastating than in the case of traditional cross-border wars. They strike at the very heart of a nation's fabric ... laying the foundations for years of hatred and mistrust between peoples. In such conflicts, violence against cilivians is now the norm not the exception...leading to massive population displacements ... and disruption to long established patterns of economic, social and political relations. The consequence of such complete societal breakdown for overall development objectives are enormous. The collapse of state structures leads to the criminalization of the economy, the privatisation of violence ... which prevents sustainable development.
>
> (quoted from International Alert[7] in Duffield 2002,1051)

The ideas in the above passage reflect the conventional approach towards the so-called 'new wars' in the post Cold War era. As Duffield (2002, 1052) suggests, the description of new wars create a series of implicit 'them' and 'us' dichotomies. The above passage suggests that the wars, which take place in the context of failed states, are internal, illegitimate, charecterized by destruction, abuse civilians, lead to

[6] Carnegie Commission.(1997), Preventing Deadly Conflict. Washington DC: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict.

[7] International Alert, 'March 6 Memorandum from International Alert', 1999.

social regression, rely on privatized vioence, and so on. By implication, wars in the West are between states, are legitimate and politically motivated, respect civilians, and based on accountable force. There is a huge contrast between portrayals of war between, for instance, Africans and portrayals of war-making by western powers, which is invariably portrayed as 'ethical' and 'surgical.'

The changing perception of conflict and the identification of 'new wars' within the borders of failed states as a new perceived threat to a peaceful international environment has contributed to a new definition of security, where failed states are considered a new international security challenge which have replaced that of the collapsed Soviet Union. For instance, whereas once American officials worried about the potential for the massive nuclear attack from Moscow, they have expressed fears of threats stemming from failed states since the early 1990s.

This changing perception of security has profound implications for international governance. Today most governments identify state failure as a root cause of many of today's world's problems, such as terrorism, civil war or refugee flows. Understood that way, state failure serves as a concept that ties together several security risks (such as refugee flows, AIDS, terrorism) that were formerly understood as phenomena that were distinct from one another. When we examine the related literature and policy reports on how to cope with the 'new security threats' stemming from failed states, it is possible to form the impression that. the failed state discourse is a new variant of those concerns and approaches, which arose in Western -especially American- political science in early postwar period, about political stability and order in 'traditional societies' which were associated with unrest and instability and increasingly regarded as a threat to the liberal world

order.[8] Policy documents as well as statements by senior government officials from the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia and other countries clearly show that failed states are increasingly being perceived as sources of threat. In the following, some of these statements and documents will be presented.

In the United Kingdom, The 2003 Strategy of the the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) lists several strategic imperatives, emphasizing the importance of fighting terrorism and protecting the UK from illegal immigration, drug trafficking. In *FCO Departmental Report* (2002, 3), state failure has been identified as a root cause contributing, both directly and indirectly, to these problems: 'Whether it is terrorism, drugs on our streets, asylum seekers at our borders or damage to our overseas trade, we cannot escape the consequences when communities collapse, societies disintegrate and states fail.' (quoted in Lambach 2004). Similarly, Tony Blair draws attention to the threat of state failure in the context of the 'war on terrorism': 'September 11 showed us what happens when we don't take action, when we leave a failed state basically living on terrorism and drugs, repressing its people brutally. When we leave that state in place then sooner or later we end up dealing with its consequences.' (quoted from Blair[9] in Lambach 2004)

Similar to FCO in the United Kingdom, 'the Foreign Office (Auswärtiges Amt – AA) of Germany has been the driving force in introducing the concept of state failure into German policy discourse' (Lambach 2004). After the September 11 attacks, the connection between terrorist groups and failed states rapidly entered the Foreign Office's rhetoric. Lambach (2005) notes that the term 'failed state' first

[8] This point will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.
[9] T. Blair, Interview with BBC World Service, 5 April 2002.

appeared in July 2000 when Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer called failed states a 'growing problem' from a global governance and human rights point of view:

> Above and beyond fighting terrorism with military means, is it not necessary to prevent terrorism from developing in failed states? Should we not greatly step up our economic, social and political commitment in order to avoid having failing states in the first place, those 'black holes' of statehood? Is not nation-building a key issue? Or increased assistance for the poor countries?
>
> (quoted from Fischer[10] in Lambach 2005)

In a like manner the Federal Chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, suggests that 'Failed states, in which governments are unable or unwilling to guarantee the security and the welfare of their citizens, represent one of the biggest threats of our time.' (Schröder 2004).

On 12 December 2003, the heads of state of the European Union's member nations formally adopted the European Security Strategy (ESS) drafted by Javier Solana, the EU's High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The ESS defines five key threats to European security: terrorism, WMD proliferation, regional conflict, state failure and organized crime. The ESS also lays out the relationships between these diverse threats. The report argues that 'collapse of the state can be associated with obvious threats, such as organized crime or terrorism. State Failure is an alarming phenomenon, that undermines global governance, and adds to regional instability' (European Security Strategy 2003, 8). External Affairs Commissioner Chris Patten, says that the 'events of September 11 brought home to us that the existence of failed states - like the one the Taliban took over in Afghanistan - is something which contributes to both regional and global

[10] J. Fischer , Speech in the German Bundestag, 11 October 2001.

instability; that is a problem to which we must devote more time, more political energy, and more money' (quoted in Dempsey 2002).

As it can be clearly seen from the above examples, the term 'failed state' is widely used without a serious questioning in the foreign policy discourses of many Western countries.Thus it is not surprising that criticisms to the Western approach to the question of state failure mostly came from non-Western world. For example, Khor (2002), the director of the Malaysia-based Third World Network, suggests the failed states discourse is a means to justify military intervention in poor countries around the world. In an essay entitled 'Failed States Theory Can Cause Global Anarchy', he refers to a discussion with a senior official of an international organization about 'failed state theory':

> In the new theory of failed states, the 'international community', or a set of countries, or even a single country, can intervene in another country, including to change its government, if that country is a failed state. This in itself was a scary 'theory', since it would not only legitimise the actions of the US in Afghanistan, but would raise these actions to the level of general justification for future actions (multilateral or unilateral) against other 'rogue countries.' But what was really frightening was when the senior official elaborated that the definition of 'failed states' was not confined to the countries that had already been often accused of being 'terrorist', such as Iraq, North Korea or those in a state of anarchy like Somalia. The 'failed states' would include countries such as Iran, Egypt and Nigeria, which are unable to provide jobs, education and development for their own people. Since this lack of development could spawn discontent and violence that would spill over to other countries, through terrorist acts, then other countries have the right to act against the 'failed states' to prevent the terrorism that could otherwise harm the other countries.
>
> (Khor 2002)

Similar to Khor, Fituni likens the political discourse on failed states to propaganda:

> The demonization of a (potential) enemy, for example, is an important instrument of foreign policy and propaganda. To implement such a policy, it is necessary to stigmatize the country in question. To this end, the state will be labelled 'terrorist', 'criminal' or 'on the brink of collapse'. […] Implicitly, the state affected will be robbed of its legitimacy and its

> privileges as a sovereign nation. In the end, such a state can be invaded, its government deposed and its population robbed of its civil rights without the legitimacy of such a move being challenged.
>
> (quoted from Fituni[11] in Lambach 2005)

What Fituni tries to show is that the failed state discourse is employed by Western countries as one of the tools to persuade their own populations that certain other countries represent a danger to the their well-being. Despite the weaknesses in their analyses in terms of remaining within the boundaries of failed state discourse, Khor and Fituni are among the few who have a critical stand towards the failed state discourse.

2.3. Therapeutic Approaches to 'Failed States'

In today's international discourse of failed states, the global political and economic context are framed out of analysis. Instead, conflict and state failure are blamed on cultural traits. A number of accounts of the break-up of the Yugoslav federation, which will be mentioned in the following, are illustrative. The intention here is not to engage in a debate about the post-Yugoslav conflict. The aim at this stage is limited to drawing attention to how political and economic economic context is framed out of analysis and state failure is explained through indigenous cultural traits.

It is possible to see the implications of 'new barbarism' thesis in many accounts of the post-Yugoslav conflicts. In these accounts, history is portrayed as having a particular hold over the population. The idea of South Slav atavism was put forward as the cause of post-Yugoslav conflicts. The indigenous cultural factors are treated as independent variables that explain levels of political antagonisms and the behaviours of the ethnic groups. For instance, Kaplan (1993) claims that the nations of

[11] Fituni (2004), p. 26-27, translation from the original German by Lambach.

Southeastern Europe have always engaged in tribalistic wars, and no matter what the West tries to do to stop bloodshed in the Balkans, the risk for new waves of angry battles and appalling massacres will always be very high. Kaplan refers to the Balkans as 'a confused, often violent ethnic cauldron' and attributes the conflicts to the 'psychologically closed, tribal nature of the Serbs, Croats, and others' (Kaplan 1993, 16). The British TV journalist Nicholson defines Balkan conflicts in an even more extreme fashion:

> The ferocity of the Balkan peoples has at times been so primitive that anthropologists have likened them to the Amozon's Yanomamo, one of the world's most savage and primitive tribes. Up until the turn of the present century,when the rest of the Europe was concerned as much with the social etiquette as with social reform, there were still reports from the Balkans of decapitated enemy heads presented as trophies on silver plates at victory dinners. Nor was it unknown for the winners to eat the loser's heart and liver...The history books show it as a land of murder and revenge before the Turks arrived and long after they departed.
>
> (quoted from Nicholson[12] in Goldsworhty 2003)

As these examples display, post-Yugoslav conflicts are depicted as having their roots in atavistic instincts and tribal sentiments of intolerance and violence. The culture of the Balkan peoples are considered as intolerant and atavistic and used to explain the root causes of the conflicts. Following Hughes and Pupavac (2001), we can argue that these framings of conflicts do not only hold the the local populations themselves responsible for the conflict, but also claim that 'the motivations for such conflict', which cannot be explained in isolation from a broader international context, arise from the inherent tendency toward violence of the societies in the Balkans. The people in failed states are pathologized as irrational and violent and individuals are depicted as being trapped in 'cycles of violence perpetuated from generation to generation' (e.g. South Slav atavism).

[12] M. Nicholson, Natasha's Story, 1994, p.16

Increasingly, various political, economic and social issues in failed states are described in the language of 'therapy' and, accordingly, problems, solutions and precautionary measures are formulated in therapeutic terms. In recent decades 'therapy' has become a cultural phenomenon rather than just a clinical technique, influencing virtually every sphere of life. A therapeutic approach now dominates humanitarian interventions in international conflicts. In a similar manner, the failed states are increasingly described by therapeutic terms. As I have already shown, the failed states are conceived as an abnormality and a deficiency that must be cured or eradicated. In Helman and Ratner's terms state failure can be compared to a 'serious mental or physical illness'. Following this kind of reasoning, they use the analogy of a 'haples individual' to describe failed states. In comparing failed states to 'haples individuals', the assumption here is that these states can be cured, if the 'qualified' and 'sane' nations of the developed world are willing to lend a helping hand :

> in domestic systems when the polity confronts persons who are utterly incapable of functioning on their own, the law often provides some regime whereby the community itself manages the affairs of the victim. Forms of guardianship or trusteeship are a common response to broken families, serious mental or physical illness, or economic destitution. The haples individual is placed under the responsibility of a trustee or guardian, who is charged to look out for the best interests of that person. ..It is time that the United Nations consider such a response to the plight of failed states.
>
> (Helman and Ratner 1993, 12)

The examples of such accounts can be expanded. Frost (1991, 195) suggests that 'failed states must be educated, they must be tutored and guided in the aspects in which they are deficient, just as social workers attempt to educate inadequate parents to the responsibilities of parenthood'. In a very similar manner, Straw draws an analogy between a patient and a failed state:

> In medicine, doctors look at a wide range of indicators to spot patients who are at high risk of certain medical conditions - high cholesterol, bad diet, heavy smoking for example. This does not mean they ignore everyone else

> nor that some of those exhibiting such characteristics are not able to enjoy long and healthy lives, against our expectations. But this approach does enable the medical profession to narrow down the field and focus their efforts accordingly. We should do the same with these failed states.
>
> (Straw 2002)

The Western countries, according to Straw, are the doctors who will diognose and treat the deficiencies of failed states. The use of the medical metaphors has far-reaching implications for perceptions of appropriate roles for the failed states and the 'successful' states of the developed world as patients and doctors respectively. By means, the international discourse of failed states legitimizes perpetual international supervision.

Pupavac (2001) shows how the pathologization of populations encourages new forms of governance and external interventions. What she calls 'psychosocial intervention'[13] is informed by a therapeutic understanding of social problems. In this therapeutic paradigm, populations in so-called failed states are projected to be suffering from mass trauma and in need of mass therapeutic intervention. International therapeutic governance pathologizes the populations in failed states as emotionally dysfunctional and questions their right to self-government, leading to extensive external intervention.

> ...[P]sychosocial intervention demonstrates a view of recipient populations as irrational and emotionally immature and therefore implicitly incapable of determining their lives without outside professional intervention. Effectively, the psychosocial model involves both invalidation of the

[13] Pupavac (2001, 358-72) analyses psychosocial intervention as a new form of international therapeutic governance and shows that psychosocial programmes have become an integral part of the international humanitarian response to complex emergencies in the context of failed states. She examines the international psychosocial model and its origins in an Anglo-American therapeutic ethos. Psychosocial activities include trauma counselling, peace education programmes and initiatives to build life skills and self-esteem. Describing a given population as having experienced the trauma of conflict is sufficient for international agencies to judge that they are in need of psychosocial assistance. Under this model, individuals who have witnessed violent conflict are seen as being 'at risk' of becoming future perpetrators. Psychosocial intervention is believed to be required to rehabilitate victims and to break the cycle of violence and conflict.

> population's psychological responses and their invalidation as political actors, while validating the role of external actors. The psychosocial model envisages an indefinite suspension of self-government in postconflict societies or so-called 'failed states'.
>
> (Pupavac 2001, 368)

As I have already pointed, the identification of failed states as a new challenge in the post-Cold War era contributed to a new definition of security, where underdevelopment in the context of failed states is considered a threat to international security because it can fuel drug-trafficking, the spread of terrorism and increased refugee flows. In the period since the end of Cold War, international supervision of the so-called failed states has expanded, although these states are formally recognized as sovereign, and are not under formal trusteeship arrangements. However, while a lot of similarities can be observed, the contemporary mode of regulating these states is distinct from colonial rule. Formal colonial government was based on the manipulation of local communities through their elites or direct coercion. However, contemporary international government, as Pupavac (2001, 2002, 2004) rightly observes, involves changing the behaviour of populations within countries through psycsocial intervention and therapeutic governance. At this point, a World Bank Report is illustrative. Using Liberia and Guatemala as case studies, the report titled *From Civil War to Civil Society: The Transition from War to Peace in Guatemala and Liberia* seeks to provide policy suggestions for ending conflict and postconflict recovery. According to the report securing the peace first and foremost involves changing the behavior and mentality of local populations:

> For the peace to extend beyond the negotiating table to the larger society, a number of transformations need to occur. First, *behavior* must be altered from the application of violence to more peaceful forms of dispute settlement; second, a transition from a wartime to a peace *mentality* needs to occur.
>
> (World Bank and the Carter Centre 1997, 3)

Following Pupavac, we may argue that the psychosocial model involves both the invalidation of the local populations as political actors, while validating the role of external actors. Consequently, treating people as 'psychological casualties' diminishes their autonomy and prepares the ground for legitimizing external interventions (Pupavac 2001).

Contemporary representations of 'irrational' and 'chaotic' failed states, which are regarded as principal source of danger and insecurity in the international system, closely parallels centuries-old Western representations of non-Western societies as irrational, dangerous and impervious to the logic of reason and respectful only of coercion. Said's Orientalism, among others, has described this dominant Western way of interpreting the non-West as being more a product of the culture that produced it, rather than an accurate reflection of its object. Orientalism, Said writes, is 'a systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage- and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post- Enlightenment period' (Said 1979, 3). Orientalism is a discourse about the non-Western world that makes use of Western concepts and categories to render that world intelligible to Westerners. Said showed how the knowledge about the Orient and its peoples is created, and he argued that the study of the Orient promoted a binary opposition between the familiar (the West/us) and the strange (the Orient/them).

Said shows how this opposition is crucial to European self-conception: if colonized people are 'irrational', Europeans are 'rational'; if the former are 'barbaric', 'sensual' and 'lazy', Europe is civilization itself with its dominant ethic that of hard work; if the Orient is 'static', Europe can be seen as 'developing' and 'marching ahead' (Loomba 1998, 47). In Said's account, 'Orientalism is more a

product of a European culture than a knowledge of the Orient, and as such it contrives a new reality adequate to its own ways of knowing' (Bromley 1994, 11). This gave Europe a sense of its own cultural and intellectual superiority. The West consequently saw itself as a dynamic, innovative, expanding culture, as well as 'the spectator, the judge and jury of every facet of Oriental behavior' (Said 1979, 109).

Primary significance of Said's study is that, by drawing attention to the relationship between power and knowledge, he made a first step towards challenging the hegemonic narratives of the West. Since its publication Said's Orientalism has provided inspiration for the analysis of development as discourse. In fact, Said's Orientalism can also be instructive for the study of discourses on failed states. Just as Said studied Orientalism as a way of understanding how Western culture conceives itself through an alienated, oriental 'other', the discourse on failed states, which originated in the West, can be seen as an attempt to define a 'successful self' through a 'failed other'. It is the existence of the 'successful self' that generates the doctrines, policies, and institutions for the purpose of placing, domesticating, and normalizing the ' failed other.'

Mitchell (1998) defines Orientalism as consisting of three components: 'essentialism, otherness, and absence'. The Oriental is understood as the product of unchanging racial or cultural essences; these essential characteristics are in each case the polar opposite of the West (passive rather than active, static rather than mobile, emotional rather than rational, chaotic rather than ordered); and the Oriental other is, therefore marked by a series of fundamental absences (of movement, reason, order, meaning, and so on). In a similar way, discourses on failed states priviledges Western states and explain the situation in so-called failed states as deviation. On the one hand, state failure is regarded having primarily internal causes and hence

explicable with reference to particular local conditions. On the other hand failed states are characterized by a series of absences (of stability, liberal democracy, free market economy, security etc.).

The important point here is that embedded in contemporary Western representations of failed states is a kind of Orientalism, a reading of so-called failed states that is informed more by Western prejudices than by the realities of these states. A perfect example of this is the 'new barbarism' thesis. 'The "new barbarism" thesis implies explanations of political violence in failed states that omit political and economic interests and contexts when describing violence, and presents violence as a result of traits embedded in local cultures' (Tuastad 2003, 591). For example, Africa has been referred to as a 'failed continent' (Short, 2002). Such accounts regard state failure as a result of political or cultural factors internal to African states. The explanation for why Africa is in crisis is because it is backward, uncivilized, brutish, etc. But since these are the very features which are assumed to characterize Africa in the first place, what such accounts imply is that Africa is in crisis because it is African.

When all these considerations are taken in to account, it seems that there are many reasons for being sceptical of the discourses on 'saving failed states'. Failed state discourse contain elements of Orientalism and colonialism. It regards state failure as being explicable with reference to a particular local condition. The state failure discourse frequently reproduces the teleological assumptions of Orientalism. The underlying assumption is that failed states can be rescued given the 'right' kind of assistance. In this context, the Western perception of the populations of failed states as irrational and pathological represents the return of Rudyard Kipling's

concept of the 'Whiteman's Burden' and conceptualization of the non-Westerner as 'half savage, half child' (1899).

2.3.1. 'Blaming the Victim'

Up to now, I have argued that the defining methodological flaw of the failed state discourse is that it identifies state failure as being primarily of internal origin. Masud is explicit:

> If one analyses the causes of state failure in recent times, the inescapable conclusion one reaches is that state failure is man made because leadership decisions and leadership failures have destroyed states and continues to weaken the fragile foundation of society.
>
> (Masud 2004)

The explanation for the causes of 'failure' that is provided above characteristically locates the cause 'failure' in the state involved, as a result of, for instance, poor policy choices of the local rulers, corruption, flawed institutions or ethnic tensions. Similarly, Rotberg (2002b) suggests:

> State failure is man-made, not merely accidental nor fundamentally caused geographically, environmentally, or externally. Leadership decisions and leadership failures have destroyed states and continue to weaken the fragile polities that operate on the cusp of failure.
>
> (Rotberg 2002b, 93)

According to authors, such as Masud and Rotberg, it is only the local leadership who is responsible for state failure. In this sense, state is taken as an actor which is responsible for its own failure. As I have already indicated, failed states in contemporary world are generally perceived as a domestic problem that is in need of external solution. In this way, external aid and intervention of the states of the developed western world become the only solution for the states that have failed in other parts of the world. The discourse of state failure portrays states as isolated, externally related units. The causes of particular characteristics and conditions are thus logically located internal to the so-called failed states which are conceived as

externally related atomistic units. By simply focusing on the internal dynamics, the discourse of failed states explains state failure simply by states' own 'wrong' policy preferences. Through this internal/external dichotomy, global context is framed out of analysis, as state failure is seen to arise purely from within national boundaries and conflict and state failure are blamed on particular local conditions.

What Jones (2001) calls 'blaming the victim' becomes relevant at this point. Jones (2001) draws attention to the ideological nature of the failed state discourse. She argues that since the end of Cold War, a discourse about state failure, which shapes our approach towards these so-called failed states, has emerged in the West and was articulated in various ways and in various sites. These include academia, gevernmental and non-governmental organizations, policy think-tanks, the media, etc. She suggests:

> The logic of 'blaming the victim' rests on an atomistic ontology which assumes that states are isolated and externally related units ... such an assumption underlie different variants of voluntaristic and behaviorist pollitical thought ... the failure of a state is explained by that state's own choices, commitment and so on. ... Ideological structure, which locates blame internal to the atomistically conceived unit of the state, is directly related to today's dominant discourses about global social issues such as 'state failure'.
>
> (Jones 2001)

Jones (2001) provides a very impressive critique of discourse about 'failed states' in the post Cold War era. What she calls 'blaming the victim' draws attention to the methodological and ontological shortcomings of the analyses of failed states.

The implications of 'the logic of blaming the victim', which arises from the implicit location of cause and blame internal to the atomistically conceived unit of the state, can be found in countless official reports, consultancy documents and academic works on state failure which depict failed states as the source of many of the world's most serious problems, from poverty, AIDS and drug trafficking to

terrorism. These analyses of state failure are typical of a broader world view which is informed by a particular understanding of the causes of various phenomena in today's world such as global poverty and inequality, violence, war, immigration etc. According to this understanding, states are entities in themselves and they are completely responsible for their own 'failure' or 'underdevelopment'.[14] However, this understanding neglects the global context and the relations which lead to the emergence of the poor conditions in the so-called 'failed states'. Jones (2001) quotes Marx to draw attention to the 'the various causally efficacious social relations which generate and co-determine particular social outcomes, and distribute social power':

> When investigating political conditions, one is too easily tempted to neglect the objective character of the relationships and to explain everything from the wills of the persons acting. There are relationships, however, which determine both the actions of private persons and of individual authorities, and which are as independent of the will as breathing. If this objective standpoint is taken from the beginning, one will not presuppose an exclusively good or bad will on either side. Rather, one will observe relationships in which, at first, only persons appear to act; and as soon as it is proved that something was necessitated by circumstances, it will not be difficult to work out under which external conditions this thing actually had to come into being, and under which other conditions it could not have come about although a need for it was present.
>
> (quoted from Marx[15] in Jones 2001)

Obviously, there is no reference to state in the passage above. However, what Marx suggests can also be seen at the level of ideas about failed states. The comments and statements about state failure stick to the surface appearances, and

[14] Jones (2001) draws an anology between this ahistorical, atomistic discourse of failed states and the notion of the isolated individual which is central to liberal thought and practice. She argues that in liberal thought, which rests on an atomistic ontology, individuals are held responsible for their poverty, ignorance, criminal behavior etc. After all, if all individuals are equal, it must be a person's own fault and responsibility. if they are poor, unemployed, failing to take advantage of the equal opportunities they face. Likewise, in failed state discourse a state is blamed for its 'failure' and poor conditions (such as poverty, civil unrest, insufficient infrastructure, etc.) which are explained with reference to its internal characteristics and policies. Thus 'the wealth or poverty, success or failure of a person or a state is their fault and their responsibility, it is to be explained by their choices, attitude, commitment, and so on' (Jones 2001).

[15] Marx, K. (1842), Karl Marx: Selected Writings, p. 24-25.

thus do not take into account the real relations which generate the surface appearances[16]. That is to say, they try to explain state failure from outwardly visible appearances which in fact could be be explained as the manifestations of the crisis of the global capitalism rather than the causes of wrong policy choices of individual nation states.

Most analyses of state failure in the West yield a knowledge of the surface appearances of social reality, but are inadequate for knowing the underlying structures, that cause social life to have such appearances. While being practically adequate and therefore plausible, these ideas about failed states, which stick to the surface appearances, are likely to identify the causes of those appearances wrongly. However, 'reality is more than appearances, and that focusing exclusively on appearances, on the evidence that strikes us immediately and directly, can be extremely misleading' (Ollman 1992, 11).

The classical example of this is Marx's critique of the phenomenal forms of classical political economy which revealed the essentially exploitative and coercive relations that lie behind the apparent freedom and equity of commodity production. 'According to Marx, rather than the exception, this is how most people in our society understand the world. Basing themselves on what they see, hear in their immediate surroundings, they arrive at conclusions that are in many cases the exact opposite of the truth' (Ollman 1992, 11). Having this criticism in mind, the causes of state failure must be traced beyond direct experience and observation. The comments and statements about state failure, which put responsibility on the part of the state and its

[16] This is a feature of Marx's theoretical framework which has often come under attack from empiricists - the idea that there is an objective structure to the world, which is not immediately visible, but which is scientifically discoverable, and which explains appearances, even those which seem to contradict it: 'Scientific truth is always paradox, if judged by everyday experience, which catches only the delusive appearance of things' (Marx 1865/1968, 209).

people for the breakdown in governance, are typical of the dominant, atomistic ideas which reflect the surface appearances generated by the development of capitalist social relations.

The failed state discourse, as already indicated, is based on an atomistic ontology which conceives states as externally related units. This empiricist atomistic ontology can be overcome by the dialectical method, which is built on the notion of internal relations. My understanding and appreciation of the notion of internal relations and their central role as the entry point for the dialectical worldview is owed chiefly to Bertell Ollman. He defines dialectics as the philosophy of internal relations:

> Dialectics restructures our thinking about reality by replacing the common sense notion of 'thing', as something that has a history and has external connections with other things, with notions of 'process', which contains its history and possible futures, and 'relation', which contains as part of what it is its ties with other relations.
>
> (Ollman 1992, 11)

In the dialectical worldview, there is a sharp rejection of atomistic ontology and the view of society as a mass of separable events. A thing is defined by its relations with other things and is considered as identical with those relations. The relations between the things and the events and are not simply the result of contingent happening, they are internal and essential to the identity of a thing. Accordingly, it is also impossible to accurately understand anyone or anything without taking into account how it relates to everything else. In sum, unlike non-dialectical research which starts with an isolated unit and tries to construct the whole by establishing external connections, dialectical research abandons the presupposition of independent individuality of entity and starts with the whole and then moves to an examination of

the part to see where it fits in the broader context of which it is a part (Ollman 1993, 11-19).

In accordance with the assumptions of the dialectical method, conceiveing a dichotomy between the internal and external and examining the two in isolation is meaningless. Such a conception takes the relations between the nation states as external relations. However, emphasizing the internal relations does not mean that the nation state is a meaningless concept. States have status in international law as separate entities. They are responsible for official actions in their name; they can enter into treaties and make war; they have rights; they have defined territories and people. The relation between states is a relation between autonomous entities in the international juridical system. Therefore, this is not to suggest that internal/external separation does not exist in the international juridical system. What is suggested here is that we should go beyond a conceptualization of nation states which assumes external relations between them and replace such an atomistic approach with a relational one.

So far I have argued that unfavourable conditions in so-called failed states in Africa and Asia should not be attributed to their being African or Asian. Rejecting the atomistic approaches which focus on internal causes of state failure, one should also avoid falling into the trap of approaches such as dependency theory, which exclusively emphasizes the external environment. Explaning the crises in so-called failed states by the actions of other states and putting the blame on the developed Westen countries for creating and perpetuating the environment for 'failure' may seem as an attractive alternative. However, focusing on the external dynamics (of state failure) at the expense of internal dynamics is equally meaningless since, as Holloway suggests, 'understanding the development of the nation state cannot be a

question of examining internal and external determinants, but of trying to see what it means to say that the national state is a moment of the global capital relation.' (Holloway 1995, 128). It means, he maintains, 'the development of any particular national state can be understood only in the context of the global development of capitalist social relations, of which it is an integral part' (Holloway 1995, 129) Thus, trying to understand the development of any nation state is not a question of choosing between the 'external' determinants and the 'internal' determinants since 'all nation-states are defined, historically and repeatedly, through their relation to the totality of capitalist social relations' (Holloway 1995, 125). Each nation state can only be conceptualized adequately as an integral part of the world market and none of them, 'failed' or 'successful', can be understood independent of its existence as a moment of the global capital relations. However, Holloway reminds that the relation between global capital and all nation-states is not the same. On the conrary, 'although all nation-states are constituted as moments of a global relation, they are distinct and non-identical moments of that relation' (Holloway 1995, 125).

As a matter of fact, 'the tendency to construct a dichotomy between the internal and external and to examine the two in isolation, with little or no attention to the moment where they overlap and intertwine, has a long history in the study of politics'(Abrahamsen 2000, 7). Behind this conventional, empiricist distinction lies the attempt by empiricist research to understand social reality in terms of methodological individualism and rational actor explanations. Contrary to this conventional, empiricist distinctions, this study is based on the argument that the existence of both the external and the internal are sustained and reproduced by the same capitalist world economy. 'Whether it be in Africa or Asia, the dominant explanation of 'failure' in the Third World has been an atomistic one. This

methodological individualism has contributed to the formation of an ideological consensus about the 'failure' of states and the 'burden' on the West to intervene on their behalf ' (Demir 2001). Neglecting the fact that the national and international contexts are the counterparts of the same whole, such ideas explain conditions and events in various places around the world (such as war and poverty) by locating the cause as local, internal to the nation-state or the region involved.

The main aim of this chapter has been to show that the defining methodological flaw of the failed state discourse is its identification of state failure as being primarily of local, indigenous origin. It rests on an atomistic ontology which sees states as isolated units, externally related to each other. Just as isolated individuals of liberal thought are held responsible for their poverty, ignorance, etc., the states are held responsible and blamed for their own 'failure' by reference to their internal characteristics and policies. This results in assigning responsibility and blame to so-called failed states and legitimizes political, economic as well as military interventions. In short, state failure is seen as an internal problem that is in need of external solutions which are mostly formulated in 'therapeutic' terms, assigning roles for the failed states as 'patients' and the 'successful' states as 'doctors'. It is through this internal/external dichotomy that global social relations which contribute to the emergence of 'failed states' are framed out of analysis and state failure is seen as emerging from within national boundaries. To overcome this problem, I suggest replacing atomistic method with the dialectical method which starts with the whole and then moves to an examination of the part to see where it fits in the broader context. In consequence, nation states are considered as integral parts of the global context rather than as isolated units which are externally related to each other.

CHAPTER III

THE USE OF THE CATEGORY 'FAILED STATE' IN THE UNITED STATES' FOREIGN POLICY DISCOURSE IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

3.1. The US Approach to 'Failed States' in the Post Cold War Era: Official Reports and Publications on 'Failed States'

Up to now, I have argued that the defining methodological flaw of the failed state discourse is that it identifies state failure as being primarily of local origin. I have shown that state failure is seen to arise purely from within national boundaries and state failure is blamed on particular local conditions. I objected the reduction of the dynamics of social crises in so-called failed states to local conditions and suggested replacing atomistic method with the dialectical method which is built on the notion of internal relations. Having these in mind, I will analyze the use of the notion of 'failed state' as a 'new threat' to the global security in the American foreign policy discourse in the post Cold War era. Given the Western countries' concerns for chaos and instability stemming from failed states in the post Cold War period, the historical antecedents of the failed state discourse will be sought within the concerns for political order and stability which emerged in 1960s under the main title of 'development'. In doing this, following Jones (2004), I willl argue that failed state discourse is a new variant of those concerns and approaches, which arose in Western -especially American- political science in 1960s, about political order and stability in 'traditional societies'.

The term failed state entered the US diplomatic discourse in the aftermath of the Cold War and became a widespread conception of the US diplomatic and

political lexicon. As it is mentioned in the Panel Charter of D.D. Eisenhower National Security Conference held in 2003, in early 1990s, failed states were among the four categories in Clinton Administration's typology of countries comprising the post Cold War international system, the other three being advanced industrialized democracies, emergent democracies with markets and the rogue states.

Although 'failed state' and 'rogue state' are sometimes used as replacable terms in the daily political lexicon, they differ from each others on several grounds. The first difference mentioned by Bilgin and Morton (2004) is the use of the 'failed' state to refer to the internal characteristics of a state, while states are labelled as 'rogue' due to their anti-Western foreign policy perspective. Secondly, 'failed states' are considered as a matter of concern when they are about to collapse, whereas 'rogue' states are seen as a direct threat to the international order. Thirdly, the labels 'failed' and 'rogue' are used to differentiate the two kinds of states, namely 'friends' from 'foes':

> When 'friends' (or client states during the Cold War) posed a threat to international stability because of their 'weakness,' the recommended policy was usually one of building 'strong' states (as is the case with Pakistan, Indonesia, Colombia, and Sierra Leone). When the 'failed' state happened to be a 'foe' it was invariably represented as a 'rogue' state and containment became the recommended policy course (as with North Korea)'.
>
> (Bilgin and Morton 2004, 174)

Although Brian Atwood, US Agency for International Development Administrator, argued as early as 1994 that 'disintegrating societies and failed states with their civil conflicts and destabilising refugee flows have emerged as the greatest menace to global stability', in the early 1990s it was rogue states rather than the failed ones that was of primary concern to the US policy makers. The 'rogue' label emerged predominantly in US foreign policy lexicon in the post Cold War era. A few brief comments illustrate this:

> Where I think we have all come to in this, in the US government, is that there is a different set of threats out there right now than there was during the height of the Cold War when we- the US and the Soviet Union - were threats to each other. Now there are a variety of other threats from rogue states that have the capabilities they did not have before.
>
> (quoted from Albright[17] in Hoyt 2000, 297)

> The future is rushing at us in the form of new dangers that threaten to boil over and to jeopardize our national security interests and stability and prosperity that we currently enjoy. You can look around and see the prevalence of rogue regimes, of ethnic hatreds, of brutal terrorists, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. These are all the fiery realities of our time
>
> (quoted from Cohen[18] in Hoyt 2000, 297)

The interest in 'rogue states' instead of the 'failed states' continued during the early days of the George W. Bush administration which was criticized for neglecting the issue of 'failed states' and the 'problems' such states might pose (Stohl 2001, 5-6). 'George W. Bush said very little about failed states during that moment, indicating that he did not believe that events in Africa concerned the US national interest and that 'nation-building' was not a proper role for the United States military' (Stohl and Stohl 2001, 10). What was on the agenda of the Bush administration was rogue states rather than failed states:

> Today's most urgent threat stems not from thousands of ballistic missiles in the Soviet hands, but from a small number of missiles in the hands of these states, states terror and blackmail are a way of life. They seek weapons of mass destruction to intimade their neighbours, and to keep the United States and other responsible nations frrom helping allies and friends in strategic parts of the world.
>
> (Bush 2001)

---

[17] Madeleine K. Albright, 'Press briefing en route to Moscow, Russia' , 25 January 1999. http:// secretary.state.gov/www/statements/1999/990125.html .

[18] William Cohen, 'Remarks to the Department of Defense Conference on Base Reuse "Recognizing a Decade of Community Redevelopment" ', 22 March 1999, http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/

According to the then National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice (2000, 46-47), the most significant task of the United States and its allies was 'to deal decisively with the threat of rogue regimes and hostile powers', which were 'increasingly taking the forms of potential threats for terrorism and the development of weapons of mass destruction.' Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State, stated in February 2001 that 'we believe that it is our responsibility to have a missile defense shield to protect the United States and our friends and allies from rogue states' (quoted in Bilgin and Morton 2004, 173).

However, since the al Qaeda attacks of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent war on terrorism, state failure came to the fore as a security concern and its usage became considerably more frequent in US foreign policy lexicon.[19] It began to be emphasized more regularly by the Bush administration especially in discussions of 'war against terrorism'. Failed states have been viewed as potential threats for national security, becoming an indispensible part of the national security considerations in recent years. Policy documents and speeches by senior Bush administration officials reflect a broad appreciation of the threat posed by failed states. President Bush's *National Security Strategy*, released almost one year after September 11 events, has also expressed concern about the linkage between state failure and the direct threat to the United States from regional instability, drug trafficking and terrorism. From the President's introduction to the end of the document threats like regional instability, drug trafficking and terrorism is directly or indirectly linked to state failure.

[19] The proliferation in the usage of the term is also observed in academic discussions. Recent special sections devoted to 'failed states' in leading journals focus on the problem of insecurity and terrorism in failed states and its repercussions for international security and US national security in particular (Milliken and Krause 2002; Chege 2002; Cohen 2002; McLean 2002; Rotberg 2002; Takeyh and Gvosdev 2002).

The National Security Strategy indicates that the United States will be involved in conflict resolution 'when violence erupts and states falter,' implying that weak or failing states are to some degree responsible for creating environments that breed regional instability. The Strategy identifies several conflict situations in which the United States has a particular national security interest. In a similar manner, The State Department/Agency for International Development (State/USAID) *Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2004-2009*, released in August 2003, reminds the threat to the United States posed by regional instability. It suggests that failed states can spread instability to their region and directly or indirectly threaten the US national interests. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Walter Kansteiner attracts attention to the the relationship between state failure and regional instability:

> Leo Tolstoy did not have successful and unsuccessful states in mind when he wrote, in *Anna Karenina,* that 'all happy families resemble one another; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.' Nevertheless, his words apply to our discussion today. For all their differences, successful states resemble each other because they all have found ways to function as polities; they have cohesive national identities and social compacts that bind them together. Unsuccessful states, however, fail as polities for a wide variety of reasons. Some so-called 'failed states' have been torn asunder by civil war, others by external aggression. Some have foundered on unresolved conflicts based on clan or ethnicity; drought and grinding poverty have claimed still more. All have potential for destabilizing their neighbors.
>
> (Kansteiner 2002)

In the introduction of *The National Security Strategy*, president George W. Bush also attracts attention to the threats to the United States from illegal drug trafficking and to weak and failed states' vulnerability to 'drug cartels'. Similarly, The State/USAID Strategic Plan refers to the linkage between international drug trafficking, organized crime, terrorist financing and weak states in stating that 'narcotics trafficking, crime and poverty feed off each other.' Quadrennial Defense

Review (QDR) Report 2001 suggests failed states in Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere 'create a fertile ground for drug trafficking'.

Apart from regional instability and drug trafficking, terrorism is the mostly emphasized threat linked to the state failure. Calling the September 11 attacks a 'wake-up call' to the new realities of international threats to the US and its allies, former Republican Representitive John Edward Porter, noted that, 'terrorist organizations, transnational crime networks, disease and violence flourish in these countries' (quoted in Lobe 2004). In a like manner, the State/USAID Strategic Plan suggests that 'failed and failing states can provide fertile ground for terrorist organizations. The heightened threat of terrorism in states with despotism, weak institutions, and neglected social, political and economic capacity, requires greater emphasis on moving states toward more accountable, legitimate, and democratic governance.'

The former Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet explains how state failure provides a convenient environment for terorrist organizations in his speech at the Congress. He suggests:

> These conditions are no less threatening to US national security than terrorism itself. The problems that terrorists exploit – poverty, alienation and ethnic tension –will grow more acute over the next decade... We have already seen – in Afghanistan and elsewhere – that domestic unrest and conflict in weak, states is one of the factors that create an environment conducive to terrorism.
>
> (quoted from Tenet[20] in Wise 2004)

Again in February 2003 report to the Congress, Tenet emphasizes the connection between state failure and terrorism:

> We know from the events of September 11 that we can never again ignore a specific type of country: a country unable to control its own borders and

[20] George Tenet, 'Converging Dangers in a Post 9/11 World: Testimony of Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence', February 7, 2002.

> internal territory, lacking the capacity to govern, educate its people, or provide fundamental social services. Such countries can, however, offer extremists a place to congregate in relative safety.
>
> (quoted from Tenet[21] in Wise 2004)

In their attempt to explain why US should engage in nation building in failed states to combat terrorism, Takeyh's and Gvosdev (2002, 97-98) makes an analogy between international business organizations and global terrorist network. They suggest:

> Failed states are the global terrorist network's equivalent of an international business's corporate headquarters, providing concrete locations, or stable 'nodes', in which to situate their factories, training facilities, and storehouses. Where the analogy differes is the type of state that each seeks. While the multinational corporation seeks out states that offer political stability and a liberal business climate with low taxes and few regulations, failing and failed states draw terrorists, where the breakdown of authority gives them the ability to conduct their operations without risk of significant interference. Today's terrorist do not need a strong state to provide funding and supplies. Rather, it seeks a weak state that can not impede a group's freedom of action.
>
> (Takeyh and Grosdev 2002, 98)

Failed and failing states are identified as one of the principal threats also in Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report, which is issued by the US Department of Defense to be submitted to the Congress in every four years to guide changes in US defense strategy. Considering the post Cold War strategies, QDR report 2001 refer to 'the increasing challenges and threats emanating from the territories of weak and failed states'. QDR report 2001 points that 'the absence of capable or responsible governments in many countries in wide areas of Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere creates a fertile ground for non-state actors engaging in drug trafficking, terrorism, and other activities that spread across borders' (US Department of Defense 2001, 5). Additionally, when we examine the reports and findings of National

---

[21] George Tenet, DCI's 'Worldwide Threat Briefing', 2003.

Intellligence Council (NIC), which is a center of strategic thinking within the US Government providing coordinated analyses of foreign policy issues for the President and other senior policy makers, state failure is primarily seen as a threat to US global influence and necessity for US intervention is implied.[22]

This rising interest in failed states after the September 11 is based on an unquestioned relationship between failed states and terrorism. Menkhaus (2003, 38) suggests:

> Since the al Qaeda attacks of September 2001 and the subsequent war on terrorism ..., failed states are viewed as potential security threats of a high order ... Nation-building, or 'postconflict reconstruction' has consequently been, or is in the process of becoming, 'securitized.' That is, it is now justified not as a worthy humanitarian or development objective but rather as a tool with which to promote a broader national security goal. That objective is to combat terrorism by 'draining the swamp' to deprive terrorist networks of safe operating bases. Failed states are part of the swamp.
>
> (Menkhaus 2003)

Similar to Menkhaus, many scholars have argued that one of the principal lessons of the events of September 11 was that failed states mattered not just for humanitarian reasons but for national security as well (Hamre and Sullivan 2002, 85; Rotberg 2002, 86; Grosdev and Takeyh 2002, 97). Behind this argument lies an assumption that state failure was simply a humanitarian concern before September 11, 2001. However, it is quite doubtful that US policy response to failed states had been simply based on 'humanitarian concerns' before that date. If state failure was simply a humanitarian concern before the events of September 11, then the following question arises: why did international community and US in particular intervene in some cases of state failure but not in some others during 1990s ?

[22] See the NIC papers and reports related to state failure in the context of Global Trends 2010, Global Trends 2015 and NIC's 2020 Project.

As a matter of fact, the answer lies in US official documents. For instance, in its April 2000 report, US Commission on National Security recommends that in 'helping' failed states, US should give priority to those whose stability is of major importance to US national interests. Selective rankings of nations according to their importance for US national interests is an indication that state failure is not simply evaluated within the framework of humanitarian concern.

> To address these spreading phenomena of failed states ... the United States needs to establish priorities. Not every such problem must be primarily a US responsibility...There are countries whose domestic stability is, for differing reasons, of major importance to US interests. These countries should be a priority focus of US planning in a manner appropriate to the respective cases.
>
> (U.S Commission on National Security 2000, 13)

State Failure Task Force also defines failed states in terms of whether they pose a threat to US national interests. It is clearly seen in these documents that so-called failed states are considered first and foremost as a question of national security and national interest by US administration without showing concern for the well-being of the populations living in failed states. State failure is problematized not in terms of the well-being of the populations in so-called failed states but in terms of their costs to the US:

> The costs of [failed states] to the United States are substantial. 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 ... Failed states can also harm US national security and impact American society ... through their active role in narcotics production and trafficking.
>
> (Rice 2003, 3)

Taken as a whole, the US official documents (*The National Security Strategy, Quadrennial Defense Review*), the reports of the advisory commissions (the US Commission on National Security and State Failure Task Force), and comments and

speeches of the US foreign policy makers mentioned above reveal that at the centre of the debates concerning state failure are not failed states themselves, but rather what these so-called failed states imply for the economic, political and security interests of developed Western countries in general and the United States in particular. They unanimously consider failed states first and foremost as threats to US political and economic interests and they all share the view that US national interests require intervention to these failed states whenever it is necessary.

Another important point that characterize the official publications of the US government and the reports concerning failed states that are published by government appointed advisory commissions is that they are all informed by a particular understanding which suppose that states are completely responsible for their own 'failure'. That is to say, they perceive state failure as an internal problem that is in need of external solution because 'failed states – if left to their own devices – can provide a safe haven for a diverse array of transnational threats … As such failed states can pose a direct threat to the national security of the United States and to the stability of entire regions' (Centre for Strategic and International Studies and Association of the US Army 2003). Although policy makers have offered different explanations for the causes of the problems experienced by failed states, they mostly agreed on the requirement for external actors to play a part in the conflicts and the restoration of order in failed states. US intervention, both unilateral and bilateral, in these failed states has been a central theme in the ongoing debate over the US global role for the 21st Century. Within this framework, nation building in failed or collapsed states is recommended as a solution by many foreign policy makers in the United States.

As I have pointed out, the calls for interventions to failed states are mostly justified on the grounds that failed states are the sources of terrorism. This relationship is mostly assumed without a convincing evidence. On the contrary, it is argued that effective terrorist networks have requirements that are not always available in failed states. For instance, Nguyen (2004) suggests that 'the September 11 attack is a reminder of an act of terrorism that, although conceived and planned in Afghanistan and other 'failing states', relied on many developed states for its operation'. He states that there are certain functions that a terrorist networks has to fulfill in order to operate effectively. These include recruitment, training, planning, hiding, logistics and transit, communication and access to resources and financial assets.[23] According to Nguyen (2004) 'each of these functions creates different requirements for an optimum operational base, not all of which are best served in failed states'. In a like manner, rejecting the conventional wisdom held in the West that failed states constitute a 'safe havens', Dempsey (2002, 13) suggests that 'in reality, failed states are not "safe havens", they are defenseless positions. Failed states are where the terrorists are most vulnerable to covert action, commando raids, surprise attacks, and local informants willing to work for a few dollars'.

3.2. Old Wine in a New Bottle : Failed State Discourse as a New Variant of the Concerns for 'Order and Stability' in the Postwar Era

In the early days of the post Cold War era, National Security Strategy of the United States expressed concerns for the new threats to the post Cold War 'new world order' which had replaced 'Communist threat' of the Cold war era : 'As we seek to build a new world in the aftermath of the Cold War, we will likely discover that the enemy we face is less an expansionist communism than it is instability itself'

[23] *9-11 Commission Report 2004* suggests that before the events of September 11, terrorists made 'extensive use of the extensive use of banks in the United States'.

(White House 1991, 13). Since then, 'instability itself' has been inscreasingly perceived and declared as a new challenge especially after September 11. As Leonard suggests, 'the Cold War dichotomy of freedom versus communism has been replaced with a new organising principle: order versus disorder' (Leonard 2002, 11).

In postwar period 'Western fear of communism was one of the prime motivating forces behind the development effort' (Abrahamsen 2000, 19). In the early postwar period poverty and poor conditions were widely regarded as a breeding ground for communism, and the Western policy makers feared that the persistence of material deprivation would drive Third World countries in to the hands of Moscow. At that time, the underdeveloped states of the Third World were widely regarded as a 'breeding ground for communism' which was considered to result mainly from poverty. Such thinking was evident in President Harry Truman's inaugural address in January 1949, the day on which Truman called for a 'bold new program' for the improvement, growth and development of underdeveloped areas (Abrahamsen 2000, 14).

> More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity posesses the knowledge and skill to relieve suffering of these people. The United States is pre-eminent among nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. The material resources which we can afford to use for assistance of other peoples are limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible. I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life.
>
> (quoted from Truman[24] in Abrahamsen 2000, 14)

Truman suggests that poverty of those 'underdeveloped areas is a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.' In the postwar period, underdeveloped countries

[24] H. Truman, Public Papers of the President, 20 January 1949.

were associated with unrest and instability, and increasingly appeared as a threat to the liberal world order. This association of poverty with danger and instability can also be found in the failed state discourse in the post Cold War era. Statements, comments and speeches of the US foreign policy makers related to 'failed states' reveal that at the centre of the debates concerning state failure are not failed states themselves, but rather what these so called failed states imply for the economic, political and security interests of developed Western countries and the United States in particular. While the states that are labelled as 'failed' or 'failing' are always evaluated by US administration within the framework of national security, there seems to be no concern for what people that live in these states experience. It is quite often overlooked that those who suffer most from the situation in these failed states are poor people living in these states through low living standards, crumbling infrastructure and limited access to basic services. What Woodward suggests is illustrative:

> The problem of failed states are not failed states themselves but our [the United States] lack of preparation for them. To borrow an old saying from the old comic strip Pogo, 'The enemy is us.'
>
> (Woodward 2001, 56)

Truman's concern for the threats to the 'prosperous areas' posed by poverty of 'underdeveloped areas' can be found in the *National Security Strategy* of USA which was issued by the President George W. Bush in September 2002. This document suggests that 'America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones.' Poverty of the non-western wold is once more depicted as a threat to the developed nations of the West. In the introduction part of the document, George W. Bush suggests:

> The events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong

> states. Poverty does not make poor people into terrorists and murderers. Yet, poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders.
>
> (US National Security Strategy, 2002)

Now, in the post Cold War era the poverty and unfavourable conditions in failed states are widely seen by the United States foreign policy makers as the 'breeding ground for terrorism' especially after September 11, 2001. Here the underlying assumption is that failed states provide 'safe havens' and 'shelters' for terrorist networks. Thus, the failed states discourse have became an indispensible part of the debates on global security in general and the US national security in particular. In fact they have become an easy target, a scapegoat not only for terrorism but also for the most serious global problems from instability, poverty, drugs trafficking to AIDS.

As Jones (2004) suggests, these concerns for chaos and threats posed by so-called failed states bear a striking resemblance to the the concerns for the need for 'order and stability' in the Third World countries after the emergence of radical, nationalist, leftist and progressive movements and initiatives, beginning with the very process of decolonization. In fact, this emphasis on order and stability from the mid-1960s onwards was a break with the earlier models of economic development theories.

Although not without historical antecedents, the 'development project' was a product of the immediate postwar period. During this period we see the emergence of the development organizations, the development experts, national development plans, and various university courses in development. The post-war period can therefore justifiably be termed and treated as the 'era of development' (Abrahamsen 2000). Projects of active intervention for the purpose of development in poor and backward countries that had undergone the experience of direct or indirect colonial

domination were now being widely discussed. As Saul (2004, 227) suggests, development in the postwar period evoked an 'intellectual universe and … moral community shared by rich and poor countres alike, built around the conviction that the alleviation of poverty would not occur simply by self-regulating processes of economic growth or social change [but rather] required a concerted intervention by the national governments of both poor and wealthy countries in cooperation with an emerging body of international aid and development organizations.'

'A master program of promoting a few specific kinds of 'development' through international assistance, mostly from the advanced capitalist countries was adopted in these areas and also appropriated by academics and conceptualized and systemized as "modernization theory" ' (Alavi and Shanin 1982, 2). Its essence lies in its claim to scientific objectivity. It assumed that all countries had to develop along a single upward slope and try to be roughly like United States, the idealized model and ultimate goal of development. Early theories and models perceived development as a relatively unproblematic process of transition from 'traditional' society to 'modernity' (Abrahamsen 200, 26). History was seen as a linear progression, and the countries of the Third World were expected to follow the same path as the developed countries.[25] In a contribution to this literature, Abrahamsen suggests that liberal democracy was regarded as the inevitable outcome of the process of modernization :

> Inspired by the structural functionalism of Talcott Parsons, these early development models were mainly concerned with stimulating economic growth, as all the essential features of modernity were expected to spring from economic prosperity … Once the required stage of development had been reached, it was assumed that democracy would materialize across the Third World in the same way as it had emerged in conjunction with capitalism and the process of industrialization in the West.
>
> (Abrahamsen 2000, 26-27)

[25] Rostow's (1960) well known 'stages of economic growth', where all countries would eventually reach the state of 'high mass-consumption' was only one articulation of the early development models' expectations that the Third World would follow in the footsteps of the first world.

However, the expectations that democracy and prosperity would be the inevitable outcome of modernization process were short-lived and were soon replaced by a new normative perspective that gave priority to political order and stability as its main values. This change in the discourse must be evaluated in the context of the intensification of Cold War rivalries in the mid-1960s. In the light of Cold War competition, the realities of Third World economic stagnation and social discontent were reinterpreted. What was regarded in the early development theories as a primarily economic challenge now came to be seen as a potential breeding ground of Communism. To allow political freedom to flourish in the Third World was suddenly perceived as a dangerous strategy, and a fundamental reordering of development priorities occurred during this period. 'The revolution in Cuba, followed by the accumulating humiliation of US policy in Vietnam and the revolutionary instability and increasing reaction in Latin America and South Asia, undermined the original optimistic assumption of ortodox development theory, that the process of development involved drawing the populations of Third World out of their trational isolation in to a modern system that would be participative, pluralistic and democratic' (Leys 1982, 65). To deal with this new situation, some scholars, such as Samuel Huntington, developed new theories attempting to create 'order' and stability' for the Third World regimes threatened by social upheavals by several liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Huntington (1968) rejected the early models of development. Instead he advanced a new concept, which he called 'social change' as a controlled process that would also at the same time ensure that the new countries did not slide into 'political decay,' by which he meant a state of unrest, violence, corruption, and military coups.[26] As Nabudere explains:

[26] Huntington's definiton of the 'political decay' shares a lot in common with 'state failure'.

> It was a concern for the need for 'order and stability' in the new nations threatened by new anti-colonial movements influenced by socialist ideology. This unrest, in his [Huntington's] view, was partially caused by the earlier optimism created by the 'political development' theories, which advocated 'rapid economic development'. This didn't take place and therefore the correct response to the new situation was to ensure the maintainance of order and stability of the institutions of the new states with liberal-minded leaders, so that they could impose their will on their societies.
>
> (Nabudere 2004)

The shift from from 'liberal democracy' to 'order and stability' as a political goal and ideal was a result of a rethinking of the relationship between modernization and political development, whereby 'the view of democracy as an inevitable and desirable byproduct of modernity was replaced by the perception of an essential conflict between the process of modernization and political development' (Abrahamsen 2000, 27). In this context, social phenomena like urbanization, high level of education and the increased social differentiation associated with rapid economic change were thought to result in popular demands for the distribution of the welfare and participation. While such demands were previously recognized as the essential characteristics of the modern society, in the Cold War competition they were considered as having destabilizing effects. As Abrahamsen states, 'the criteria for judging the desirability of social reforms can be seen to change from their perceived socio-economic benefits to their capacity to enhance political stability' (Abrahamsen 2000, 28).

When all these considerations are taken into account, we can argue that the modernization theorists of the post-colonial period were agreed that development had brought instability. What was now required was a 'controlled and forced-draft urbanization and modernization' that would ensure order and stability in the new states. (Huntington 1968, 650). With such high importance placed on order and stability, the United States supported the oppressive dictators, financed anti-socialist

guerilla movements as in the cases of Afghanistan, Nicaragua and sometimes intervened militarily to suppress popular oppositions against dictators. All these were justified as being carried out in order to advance freedom and stability against the Communist threat. The Western powers preferred the friendly regimes ruled by leaders who would act in accordance with their political, strategic and economic interests in the Third World. As long as these regimes provided a stable and predictable environment for the Western companies, they received financial and military support from the United States. This included financial and military support to oppressive regimes and dictators. Thus it is not surprising that, by the 1980s most African states were ruled by regimes who had come to power through military coups.[27]

With the arrival of neo-liberalism in the 1980s, structural adjustment programmes became the defining feature of Western policies towards the Third World. For developing countries, integration into the global economy through economic liberalization, deregulation and democratization was seen as the best way to overcome poverty and inequality. Huntington provides a useful summary:

> In the late 1950s and early 1960s, scholars in this area [developmental politics] were primarily concerned with the preconditions for democracy and the development of democracy, democracy defined almost exclusively in terms of Western models. In the later 1960s, as many observers have pointed out, political scientists working on development became more preoccupied with the problems of political order and stability.This concern remained dominant for the better part of a decade, until in the early 1980s the problem of transitions to democracy came to the fore. During the 1960s and 1970s, the trends in the economics and politics of development tended to move in opposite directions. In economics the shift was from aggregation

[27] Jones (2004) enumerates the authoritarian regimes in Africa supported and installed by the West: Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya 1963-1978), Daniel arap Moi (Kenya 1978-2002), Mobutu Sese Seko (Zaire 1965-1997), Idi Amin (Uganda1971-1979), Marcias Nguema (Equatorial Guinea 1969-1979), Jean-Bedel Bokassa (Central African Republic 1966-1979), Paul Biya (Cameroon 1982-present), Samuel Doe (Liberia 1980-90), Dr Hastings Banda (Malawi 1963-1994), Siad Barre Somalia (1969-91), Gaafar Mohamed el-Nimiery (Sudan 1971-85), Hissein Habre (Chad 1982-1990), as well as Apartheid South Africa.

> (that is, the creation of wealth) to distribution. In political science, the reverse shift occurred, from the problem of distributing power to achieve democracy to the problem of aggregating power to achieve political order, democratic or otherwise. The shift back to a focus on democracy in the early 1980s, in turn, paralleled the changing emphasis in developmental economics from planning to the market and implied gretaer willingness to accept the skewed incomme distribution that the operation of market forces might bring.
>
> (Huntington 1987, 5)

By the late 1980s, it became clear that the structural adjustment programmes had failed. Advocates of the structural adjustment programmes, and in particular the World Bank, needed to explain why economic growth had not occurred in the manner predicted by neo-liberal economists. The answer that they came up with was 'poor governance'. The World Bank's 1989 report *Sub-Saharan Africa:From Crisis to Sustainable Growth* it has been linked to continued economic liberalism or structural adjustment programmes. This report identified 'poor governance' as the main cause of Africa's underdevelopment, and the suggested solution was 'good governance': greater openness and accountability, the rule of law, freedom of the press, increased participation, and the building of legitimate and pluralistic political structures.

The importance of 'good governance' has been emphasized by the *Millennium Challenge Account* (MCA), submitted to Congress by President Bush in February 2003 and defined as 'a historic new vision for development based on the shared interests of developed and developing nations alike.' The goal of the *Millennium Challenge Account* is to reduce poverty by significantly increasing economic growth in recipient countries. The US government announced that the United States will provide aid only to countries that have proven their willingness to govern justly, invest in their people, and fulfill the requirements of good governance such as

'rooting out corruption, upholding human rights, and adherence to the rule of law' (USAID 2002).

However, today the primary goal of American foreign assistance is to fight terrorism through direct military and economic aid to allies in the 'war on terrorism.'. In the weeks after the September 11 attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C. the United States declared a worldwide war on terrorism and assembled an international coalition to support its efforts. To conduct the war that has followed, the government has relied extensively on its foreign military assistance program, which it defines as a means for 'friends and allies to acquire US military equipment, services, and training for ... legitimate self-defense and for participation in multinational security efforts' (Defense Security Cooperation Agency, 2002). As a result, the United States has increased counterterrorism assistance and general military aid to other countries around the world.

The United States has increased counterterrorism assistance and general military aid to authoritarian regimes in some of these so-called failed states in order to help them fight against terrorism and provide order and stability. The paradox here is that on the one hand the so-called failed states are expected to follow the principles of good governance such as accountability, legitimacy and the rule of law. On the other hand, they are expected to provide order and stability at the expense of those principles of good governance. In the good governance discourse, the dominance of the state is seen to have prevented civil society and democracy, which in turn enabled state officials in many countries to serve 'their own interests without fear of being called to account' (World Bank 1989, 60). Civil society is regarded as a 'counterveiling power' to the state, a means of countering authoritarian prectices and corruption. According to good governance discourse, the best way to enhance

democracy and development is to reduce the power of the state and expand the scope of market forces and open up new spaces for civil society, while at the same time the 'war on terrorism' letigimizes the support for authoritarian and corrupt regimes. For instance, the US provided $17million of military aid to the government of Nepal, funding around 20,000 M16 rifles and night vision equipment, in order to transform the Royal Nepalese Army into a modern counter-insurgency force. This increase of military aid, towards a new 'front-line' in the 'war on terrorism', has been legitimized in terms of preventing Nepal from becoming a 'failed state' (BBC News 2004c). All these are justified under the label of 'war against terrorism' and restoring order and stability. However, the US aid to authoritarian regimes leads to human rights abuses. Recently, a Human Rights Watch report titled *Dangerous Dealings: Changes to US Military Assistance After September 11* expressed concerns about post-September 11 US foreign policy because of its increasing military assistance to governments that have engaged in a pattern of gross violations of international human rights and democratic practices.

> The US record of foreign military assistance since September 11 shows a trend toward lowering arms control standards and increasing military aid, especially for broadly defined counterterrorism efforts. Although Human Rights Watch does not take a position on the granting and transfer of military assistance in all circumstances, it does oppose giving such assistance to governments that engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of international human rights and humanitarian law. In this time of international conflict, the United States should carefully monitor its military assistance programs and should not loosen controls without regard to human rights consequences.
>
> (Human Rigths Watch 2002)

It is at this point that The United States' policies towards failed states seem to be in contradiction. The US government is now providing arms and military training to authoritarian regimes as partners in the global war against terrorism, while at the

same time emphasizing the importance of connections among good governance, the rule of law and poverty reduction in failed states. In this context, the question remains: How will good governance be realized in 'failed states', while the basic requirements of good governance are subordinated to the the goal of providing 'order and stability' ?

As I have already pointed out, as from the 1960s, development have been given a secondary position in comparison with concerns for order and stability in the traditional societies. Similarly today development is subordinated to the concerns for order and stability and seen not as an end in itself but rather as a means to counter the security threats posed by chaos and instability stemming from failed states (US Agency for International Development 2004; Center for Global Development 2004). Since the early post Cold War period, new development strategies aiming at restoring order and stability in so-called failed states have been articulated in various ways in various sites - within academia, by international economic organizations, governmental and non-governmental organizations and policy think-tanks.

Accordingly, today, achieving security in failed states, and hence global security, is now seen as lying in the activities of development agencies and networks, which are designed to reduce poverty, satisfy basic needs, strengthen economic self-sufficiency, promote human rights and so on. In this context, underdevelopment is seen as a threat to national and global security by, for example, fuelling illicit drug-trafficking, supporting the transnational spread of terrorism, and increasing uncontrolled population mobility. The World Bank report *Breaking the Conflict Trap*, for example, describes conflict and its associated security problems as a failure of development and cites development assistance as an effective instrument for preventing state failure. In other words, it is argued that the development concerns

have begun to overlap with the concerns of the foreign policy and security communities (see Duffield 2001a, 2001b, 2002).

A report titled On the Brink: Weak States and US National Security from a commission established by the Washington-based Center for Global Development (CGD) is noteworthy in terms of illustrating how development strategies are illustrated as the solution to the 'problem' of state failure. The report, which was published in June 2004, suggests that 'the fundamental foreign policy challenges of our time-terrorism, transnational crime, global poverty and humanitarian crises are diffuse and complex with widely varying causes.' But what they have in common according to the report, is that 'these crises originate in, spread to, and disproportionately affect developing countries where governments lack the capacity, and sometimes the will, to respond.' For this reason, weak and failed states are labelled as the new security threat for the world in 21th century. The report also suggests that 'the security challenge they present cannot be met through security means alone; the roots of this challenge - and long-term hope for its resolution - lie in development, broadly understood as progress toward stable, accountable national institutions that can meet citizens' needs and take full part in the workings of the international community' (Center for Global Development 2004, 1).

> The US foreign policy architecture was created for a world in which development policy was a low-level challenge, one in which development might have served diverse strategic purposes but was not in and of itself a strategic imperative for US security or economic interests. As a result, in this new environment the United States is ill-equipped for rapid action to recognize state weakness or failure, respond to its immediate consequences, and prioritize and finance the long-term interventions necessary to help prevent and mend it. US foreign policy must break its habit of inertia toward weak states. US leaders must commit to using their political capital and channeling the nation's institutional power so that the development challenges of weak states can be effectively managed before they produce security crises.
>
> (Center for Global Development 2004, 2)

In this passage, we see an emphasis on development as a cure for security threats posed by weak and failed states. In other words, development is given a new strategic role in preventing state failure. Development is now seen, for example, as having the capacity to counter the security challange posed by failed states. It is also as essential as diplomacy and defence for struggling weapons of mass destruction and transnational crime, the surge of HIV and AIDS and other infectious diseases which spread from failed states.

Roughly around the same time when the CGD report was published, US Agency for International Development (USAID) issued a report titled *US Foreign Aid: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty First Century.* This report is very similar to CGD report in its approach to state failure. It suggests

> Today we are witnessing the most significant shift in the awareness and understanding of international development that's been since the end of World War II. The demise of the Soviet Union, the integration of global communications and markets, the growing menace of global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and transnational crime, the surge of HIV and AIDS and other infectious diseases-all these are hallmarks of an altered 21st century landscaoe for development. Failed states and complex emergencies now occupy center screen among the nation's foreign policy and national security officials. Americans now understand that security in their homeland greatly depends on security, freedom and opportunity beyond the country's borders. Development is now is as essential to US. National security as are diplomacy and defence.
>
> (US Agency for International Development 2004, 3)

Here we once more see the illustration of development as a strategic tool for the security threats posed by weak and failed states. The report emphasizes that it is the need for providing order and stability for the threat of failed states that makes development as crucial as diplomacy and defence.

As we can see despite having a secondary position in comparison to concerns for order and stability, development has continued to have a place in the discussions concerning the failed states and the threats they pose to the international order. As a

matter of fact, 'state failure' does not describe a new situation. It just seems to provide new labels for old problems such as poverty and underdevelopment. In this sense, the development discourse and the failed state discourse share a number of features in common.

Development discourse and the failed state discourse create hierarchical and unequal relationships that facilitates and legitimizes certain forms of intervention (Abrahamsen 2001). Development discourse place the First World above the Third World. In a similar vein, in the failed state discourse, the category 'failed' state implies the existence of a 'successful state' against which the failed state can be measured and judged. This 'successful' state is the very same as the developed, first world state of development discourse . As Abrahamsen rightfully observes:

> In the case of development, intervention is justified by the assumption that it was necessary that developed countries and international organizations take an active role to overcome the general backwardness and economic underdevelopment of poor countries which were seen as trapped in a vicious circle of poverty and lack of capital. In the name of development, the right of the North to intervene and control, adapt and reshape the practices and ways of life in the South is justified. It is also the case with the failed states in the post Cold War period. In order to rid the world of the danger of the failed states, different forms of interventions have been called for.
>
> (Abrahamsen 2001)

As Crush has suggested, 'the texts of development have always been avowedly strategic and tactical-promoting, licensing and justifying certain interventions and practices, deligitimizing and excluding others' (Crush 1995, 5). This is also the case with the texts of state failure. This can be clearly seen in some official documents concerning state failure. US Commission on National Security (2000) recommends that in 'helping' failed states, US should give priority to those whose stability is of major importance to US national interests. What is important at this point is that the commission makes a ranking among failed states according to their importance to US

policy interests and suggests that failed states, which are more important for US national interests, must have priority in getting external aid. Selective rankings of nations according to their importance for US interests is an indication that state failure is not simply evaluated within the framework of humanitarian concern.

'Given the predominant evolutionary paradigm in development discourse, in order to explain why the West has developed and non-European world had not, scholars were driven to seek for some 'missing factor' which was absent in the societies of the Third World and would account for their failure to develop' (Roxborough 1979, 20). Similarly, the phrase 'failed state' contains an implicit acknowledgement of a 'successful' state which serves as a criterion for determining whether a state is failing or failed. Central feature of development discourse is the description of underdevelopment as a series of absences. In development discourse the Third World is described primarily by what it is not rather than by what it is. Its definition tells what it lacks, not what it possesses. The same thing can be found in discourses on state failure. The phrase carries a conception of a 'successful' state which serves as a criterion for determining whether a state is 'failing' and implicitly suggests that where certain criteria are not realized, something has gone wrong. In other words, the 'failure' is a result of divergence from the path that 'successful' states had followed. As a result, failed state's central characteristics become what it lacks. What Bromley suggests becomes relevant at this point:

> Analysis of societies of non-European world has generally operated with a series of categories derived from the analysis of the West...non-European societies are negatively evaluated vis-a-vis the West, and their (lack of) development is explained by listing those features which are taken to account for the dynamism of the West, and by asserting their absence elsewhere. As it offers a description of non-European societies in terms of what they are not, it inevitably provides strictly residual, even circular accounts of their history. The West developed because it had the following features- and the non-Eurpean world remained underdeveloped because it

> lacked them. But what is the evidence that it was this lack that accounts for the fortunes of the non-European world? Why, its absence of development. The teleology is complete.
>
> (Bromley 1994, 6-7)

By substituting the West for the 'succesful states' and the non-European with the 'failed states' in Bromley's argument, we can say that today the failed state discourse reproduces this teleology.

The similarities between the development discourse and the failed state discourse mentioned above should not lead one to conclude that the latter is a new variant of the early development theories which saw stability and prosperity as the inevitable outcome of modernization process. Rather, the failed state discourse, as I have already mentioned, can be seen as a new variant of the concerns for order and stability in the 'traditional societies' which emerged in the West -especially in America- as a challenge to the early development models.

To sum up, the failed state discourse, as Jones (2004) argues, is a new variant of a set of concerns about political order and stability in 'traditional societies' which emerged in the 1960s. This concern for political order and stability was a response to the intensification of Cold War rivalries as well as the emergence of radical, nationalist, leftist and progressive movements and initiatives throughout the Third World, beginning with the very process of decolonization. At that time, the underdeveloped states of the Third World were widely regarded as a 'breeding ground for communism' which was considered to result mainly from poverty. Now, in the post Cold War era the poverty and unfavourable conditions in failed states are widely seen by the United States foreign policy makers as the 'breeding ground for terrorism' especially after September 11, 2001. Here the underlying assumption is that failed states provide 'safe havens' and 'shelters' for terrorist networks. Thus, the

failed states discourse have became an indispensible part of the debates on global security in general and the US national security in particular. In fact they have become an easy target, a scapegoat not only for terrorism but also for the most serious global problems from regional instability, poverty, drugs trafficking to AIDS. It is through this logic of blame that failed states serve as a category to legitimize 'preemptive' military interventions both in individual cases and in the construction and legitimation of a 'more interventionary and preemptive world order' (Jones 2004). The notion of failed state is used in the American foreign policy discourse in a way that gives rise to a new acknowledgement that the powerful states like the United States have the right to make unilateral interventions As a matter of fact, there seems to be no concern for people's low living standards, crumbling infrastructure and limited access to basic services in these failed states. On the contrary, the US foreign policy makers evaluate failed states within the framework of certain interests.

Actually, all these can be connected to the ahistorical and atomistic nature of the failed state discourse. That is to say, taking states as totally responsible for their own 'failure', the dominant explanation of state failure in the US foreign policy discourse has been an atomistic one. This atomistic approach has contributed to the formation of an ideological consensus in the US about its 'right' to 'save' failed states through political, economic and military interventions. Without describing a new situation and denoting a new classification of states, the failed state discourse provides a new label for old problems (such as poverty, civil war and underdevelopment) and for a new world order - based on preemption and unilateral intervention by the hegemonic powers- which has been tried to be created and legitimized especially since the September 11, 2001.

CHAPTER IV

THE FAILED STATE DISCOURSE AT THE SERVICE OF IMPERIALISM

In this study, failed state discourse has been critically examined in terms of its methodological and ontological flaws. In rejecting its atomistic and essentialist approach, I intended not to deny the existance of the crises and problems (such as poverty, civil war, instability, etc.) associated with what is called 'state failure'. Rather, I have argued that the problem with the failed state discourse lies in characterizing and explaining the causes of such crises in so-called failed states. At this point the dialectical method grounded on the notion internal relations, which rejects the dichotomy between the 'internal' and 'external', was suggested as an alternative to explain what is called 'state failure'.

With these in mind, I have critically evaluated the official US government documents and reports concerning 'failed states'. Afterwards, I sought the traces of failed states discourse in the concerns for political order and stability which emerged in American political science in the 1960s. I argued that failed state discourse is a new variant of the concerns which was a response to the intensification of Cold War rivalries and the rise of the national liberation movements in theThird World during the 1960s. Taking into account all these considerations, I concluded that, by blaming the so-called failed states for terrorism and instability in the post Cold War era, failed states discourse legitimizes a new world order based on preemptive and unilateral intervention. In the following, all these considerations will be related to the

contemporary discussions on the US imperialism. This relation will be based on the following premises.

As I have already pointed out in the second chapter, rather than being isolated units that are externally related to each other, nation-states should be considered as 'integral moments of global capital accumulation'. However, each nation-state has a different relation to global capital.This is the ground on which the problems and crises associated with 'failed states' can be explained. That is to say, serious problems experienced by so-called failed states are in fact the manifestations of the crises of the global capitalism. The way that these crises manifests themselves in each nation-state depends on its relation to global capital. The failed state discourse legitimizes not only this unequal and 'non-identical' relation of nation-states to the global capital, but also the hierarchical relations among the national components of global of global capitalism. I think this is where the discussion on 'failed states' requires a debate on imperialism, which, Wood (1999) states, is no longer a matter of direct colonial domination but a relation between the national components of global capital.

The September 11 terrorist attack had a tremendous impact on strategic thinking, both at the global and national level. The issue of state failure began to be widely discussed and became an indispensible part of the security discussions since so-called failed states were considered as the 'natural homes' and 'breeding grounds' of terrorist organizations. These discussions on security have been accompanied by new conceptualizations of imperialism developed by scholars, analysts and politicians who are unashamed to articulate an explicit defense for a return to the imperial management or trusteeship of 'failed states'. As such, the failed states discourse seems to serve as an ideology for legitimizing political, economic and

military, interventions. Following Jones (2004), it might be considered as the latest version in a long history of imperial ideologies. This is apparent when we observe the use of the term by both the US foreign policy makers and by scholars who increasingly offer a return to the imperial management or trusteeship of failed states.

One of the most detailed accounts advocating the resurrection of some form of imperialism is that outlined by Robert Cooper, a senior British diplomat and the shaper of Tony Blair's new doctrine of internationalist interventionism. Cooper sees the post Cold War era as being characterized by the presence of 'two new types of state' On the one hand 'there are states where in some sense the state has almost ceased to exist: a "premodern" zone where the state has failed and a Hobbesian war of all against all is underway' (Cooper 2002, 12). He cites countries such as Somalia and Afghanistan as prime examples. On the other hand, 'there are the post imperial, postmodern states who no longer think of security primarily in terms of conquest.' The classic examples of these, he suggests, are the states of the European Union and Canada. Thirdly, 'there remain the traditional "modern" states who behave as states always have, following Machiavellian principles and raison d'ètat' where countries such as India, Pakistan and China are representative of the category (Cooper 2002, 12). Cooper's premodern world is a world of failed states. Here the state no longer fulfills Weber's criterion of having a monopoly on the legitimate use of force. These 'premodern' states can provide a base for non-state actors who may represent a danger to the postmodern world. What is needed to respond to these threats, according to Cooper, is a new kind of imperialism, or what he calls 'defensive imperialism', which is supposedly 'acceptable to a world of human rights and cosmopolitan values … an imperialism which, like all imperialism, aims to bring

order and organization but which rests today on the voluntary principle' (Cooper 2002, 18).

Mazrui (1994) offers a trusteeship system which he calls 'benign colonization'. He argues that administering powers for this kind of trusteeship should come particularly from the region where the country in concern is located and he refers to this system as 'self-colonization'. Pfaff (1995, 2), on the other hand, suggests that the failed states of Africa needs what he calls a 'disinterested neo-colonialism' instead of self-interested foreign interventions. Helman and Ratner (1993) call for a reinstitution of colonial forms of governance trusteeship. The authors remind us that 'when domestic polities confront 'persons who are utterly incapable of functioning on their own, the law often provides some regime whereby the community regulates the affairs of the victim' (Helman and Ratner 1993, 3). 'Forms of guardianship and trusteeship are a common response to broken families, serious mental or physical illness, or economic destitution ... It is time the United Nations consider such a response to the plight of failed states' (Helman and Ratner 1993, 12). In fact, UN report titled *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* shows that United Nations started considering such a response. The report (UN 2004) outlines a framework for a new more interventionary United Nations in order to provide collective security in the face of the problems of 'weak states' among other threats. This has been considered as the most far-reaching and fundamental reform of the United Nations system and thus of the formal structure of legitimacy underlying the world order since 1945.

Another formulation comes from Mallaby (2002). He thinks that in modern history, imperialism was the solution to threats posed to the great powers by power vacuums created by failed states. He suggests that the current world disorder obliges

the US to follow imperialist policies. He describes theThird World, its failed states, endemic violence and social decay and maintains that the only rational choice is a return to imperialism. He concludes that 'non-imperialist options, notably, foreign aid and various nation building efforts, are not altogether reliable. The logic of neo-imperialism is too compelling for the Bush administration to resist' (Mallaby 2002).

These explicit calls for the resurgence of the imperial management or trusteeship of failed states are fueled by the belief that the post-colonial state can no longer survive. As a matter of fact, the underlying premise is that decolonization should never have taken place:

> Failed states are a consequence of the end of empire. They are a price of unrestricted self-determination of former – usually colonial – dependencies. They have an international existence only because their independence is underwritten by international society including the great powers'
>
> (quoted from Jackson[27] in Jones 2004)

Ahmad emphasizes the historical specificity of the current form of imperialism, but he also underlines the historical longevity of imperialism in the historical development of capitalism. Therefore, he uses the phrase 'imperialism of our time' with the aim of 'avoiding terms like "New Imperialism" which have been in vogue at various times, with various meanings' (Ahmad 2004, 43). He suggests that 'imperialism has been with us for a very long time, in great many forms, and constantly re-invents itself, so to speak, as the structure of global capitalism changes' (Ahmad 2004, 43). If 'new imperialism' is not so new but in line with the entire history of the US and the world capitalism, then Foster's question becomes relevant: 'Why has the US imperialism become more naked in recent years to the point that it has suddenly been rediscovered by proponents and opponents alike ?' (Foster 2003).

[27] R. Jackson (1998), p. 3

A convincing answer to this question comes from Harvey. According to Harvey (2003, 183) 'imperialism of the capitalist sort arises out of a dialectical relation between territorial and capitalistic logics of power.' Territorial source of power lies in state organisations, whereas the capitalist logic of power is the control of money, assets, and the flow and circulation of capital. These two sources, he argues, can not be reduced to each other and the relation between them 'should be seen as problematic and often contradictory (that is, dialectical) rather than as functional or one-sided' (Harvey 2003, 30). As such, they sometimes support each other and sometimes run against each other but they are always in tension with each other. Harvey writes:

> what sets imperialism of the capitalist sort apart from other conceptions of empire is that it is the capitalistic logic that dominates, though … there are times in which the territorial logic comes to the fore. But this then poses a crucial question: how can the territorial logics of power, which tend to be awkwardly fixed in space, respond to the open spacial dynamics of endless capital accumulation? And what does capital accumulation imply for the territorial logics of power? Conversely, if hegemony within the world system is a property of a state or collection of states, then how can the capitalist logic be so managed as to sustain the hegemon?
>
> (Harvey 2003, 33-4)

Harvey (2003) tries to answer these questions in the light of Arendt's observation that 'the process of never-ending accumulation of capital requires a never-ending accumulation of power' (quoted in Harvey 2003, 34). He goes on to note that Arendt's theoretical observation corresponds to Arrighi's empirical account of the succession of leading hegemonic powers that have promoted and sustained the formation of a world capitalist system, from the Italian city-states through the Dutch, the British and now the US phases of hegemony :

> Just as in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the hegemonic role had become too large for a state of the size and resources of the United Provinces, so in the early twentieth century that role had become too large

> for a state of the size and resources of the United Kingdom. In both instances, the hegemonic role fell on a state—the United Kingdom in the eighteenth century, the United States in the twentieth century—that had come to enjoy a substantial 'protection rent', that is, exclusive cost advantages associated with absolute or relative geostrategic insularity . . . But that state in both instances was also the bearer of sufficient weight in the capitalist world-economy to be able to shift the balance of power among the competing states in whatever direction it saw fit. And since the capitalist world-economy had expanded considerably in the nineteenth century, the territory and resources required to become hegemonic in the early twentieth century were much greater than in the eighteenth.
>
> (quoted from Arrighi[28] in Harvey 2003, 34)

In light of these theoretical and empirical observations, he suggests that the attempt of hegemonic states to maintain their position in relation to endless capital accumulation inevitably induce them to expand and intensify their powers militarily and politically to a point where they endanger the very position they are trying to maintain. Harvey reformulates his questions concerning the relationship between the territorial and the capitalist logics with specific reference to the present condition of the US hegemony.

Harvey (2003) argues that the US has never been interested in particular territories but it has always been interested in constructing a global regime of power with the US at the centre. This indirect method of imperialism became the fundamental way the US operated, particularly after the Second World War. It was a system of indirect control, with the US constantly fighting low level guerilla warfare. The one big area it could not control was that which was controlled by the Communist bloc during the Cold War.

Adopting Gramsci's concept of hegemony to interstate relations, Harvey notes that over the last half-century the US has frequently relied on coercive means to

[28] G. Arrighi, the Long Twentieth Century, 1994, p.62

subjugate antagonistic groups at home and especially abroad. Nevertheless, coercion was 'only a partial, and sometimes counterproductive, basis for US power'. An equally indispensable foundation was the US capacity to mobilize consent and cooperation internationally, by acting in such a way as to make at least plausible to others the claim that Washington was acting in the general interest, even when it was really putting narrow American interests first. In this regard, as Harvey writes:

> The Cold War provided the US with a glorious opportunity. The United States, itself dedicated to the endless accumulation of capital, was prepared to accumulate the political and military power to defend and promote that process across the globe against the communist threat . . . While we know enough about decision-making in the foreign policy establishment of the Roosevelt–Truman years and since to conclude that the US always put its own interests first, sufficient benefits flowed to the propertied classes in enough countries to make the US claims to be acting in the universal (read 'propertied') interest credible and to keep subaltern groups (and client states) gratefully in line.
>
> (Harvey 2003, 39)

However, the end of the Cold War led to a reassessment of the US imperialist practices. Harvey (2003, 49-74) argues that the US postwar hegemony rested on four institutions: industrial production, finance, the military and cultural production. The US dominated production in 1945, but it began to lose that dominance in the late 1960s and early 1970s. By the 1980s much of the world's production had moved outside the US. Once the US lost its dominance over production, it thought it could dominate through finance. Essentially, as from the 1980s the financialisation was part of a US-led strategy to construct its domination through institutions such as the US treasury, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

The end of the Cold War suddenly removed a long-standing threat to the global accumulation. During the 1990s, the power of the US is extended over the world through financial globalization. However, towards the end of the decade 'we saw the

gradual erosion of the US dominance in the world of finance'. At this point, Desai (2004) summarizes Harvey's point quite well:

> the East Asian financial crisis, the bursting of the dot.com bubble and the launching of the war on terrorism can be seen as three aspects of a single historical moment that marks the passage from one strategy of the US imperialism to another. No longer based primarily on financial globalisation as the means through which the power and control of the corporations and government of the USA is extended over the world, as it was in the 1990s, US strategy is now more openly based on the direct control of productive assets and territory.
>
> (Desai 2004, 169)

As Harvey (2003, 71-72) convincingly argues, the current internal budget and current account deficits of the United States are turning the US into a chronic debtor. Although the US financial institutions are still very powerful and significant in the world, today most of the US's debt is held by foreigners. In the area of finance the United States is no longer as dominant as it once was. Thus, its hegemony in the area of finance is declining, being replaced by militarism which is an attempt to maintain the US –dominated global system.

Another insightful analysis of 'new imperialism' has come from Ellen Meiksins Wood. She suggests that ' we may be hearing more about imperialism than we have for a long time, and theories of globalization as a form of imperialism are not in short supply' (Wood 2003, 152). Against trendy but superficial theories of globalization which characterize globalization as the disappearance of the nation-state[29], Wood maintains that global capitalism increasingly relies on territorially based nation-state system. Rather than dissolving the state, or creating a single world state[30], global capital articulates itself with local nation-states that exercise sovereignty over discrete

[29] The best representative of these theories were hyperglobalizers (see Held 1999).
[30] See Hardt and Negri (2000)

territories. Indeed, international capital depends upon such a network of states to enforce property rights, stabilize monetary transactions, insure the subordination of labor, contain social unrest and so on. She argues that 'the very essence of globalization, is a global economy administered by a global system of multiple states and local sovereignties, structured in a complex relation of domination and subordination' (Wood 2003, 141). Accordingly, the nation-state system becomes more essential to capital than ever before, since it provides the local preconditions for accumulation.

Wood (2003) refers to an empire that must be administered by powers that have territorial boundaries. She reminds that in a globalized economy 'capital depends more, not less on a system of local states to manage the economy, and states have become more, not less, involved in organizing economic circuit' (Wood 2003, 168). As a consequence the absence of 'strong' and 'effective' states, which will provide the stable environment for capital accumulation, becomes a threat to this US-dominated global system.

> Global capital needs local states. But, states acting at the behest of the glbal capital may be more effective than old colonial settlers who once carried capitalist imperatives throughout the world, they also pose great risks. In particular, they are subject to their own internal pressures and oopositional forces; and their own coercive powers can fall into wrong hands, which may oppose the will of imperial capital. In this globalized world where the nation state is supposed to be dying, the irony is that, because the new imperialism depends more than ever on a system of multiple states to maintain global order, it matters more than ever what local forces govern them and how.
>
> (Wood 2003, 155)

Wood mentions an imperialism in which 'military power is designed neither to conquer territory nor defeat rivals' (Wood 2003, 144). However, she, by no means, suggests that military conflict withers away in the new form of capitalist empire.

However, she implies that war between the economically dominant nation-states no longer has the inevitability ascribed to it by Lenin and others. ‘Given the always unfinished job of capital accumulation, war becomes continuously necessary’ (Wood 2003, 144-45). Consequently, the dominant players need to send out a message everywhere –particularly in those regions of the world that are hostile to the power of Western capital and states – that resistance to the rule of global capitalist markets will not be tolerated. Since popular protests, regional conflicts and nationalist insurgencies can all create conditions hostile to imperial power, globalized capital can not invariably rely on local states to secure all the conditions of stable accumulation. So, they need to demonstrate that imperial power, most decisively that of the American state, will intervene anywhere, any time. Indeed, this is precisely the position that George W. Bush laid out in his infamous post- 9/11 speech in which he claimed that forty percent of the nations on the planet might be on America's hit list. Elaborating on Bush's doctrine,the US officials proclaimed that the American state had entered a permanent war "without constraint of either time or geography." Wood argues that this is exactly what the new phase of capitalist globalization should lead us to expect. Rather than dominating specific parts of the globe, imperialism today is about policing the entire global space of capitalist accumulation. She writes:

> It is an imperialism that seeks no territorial expansion or physical domination of trade routes. Yet it has produced this enormous and disproportionate military capability, with an unprecedented global reach. It may be precisely because the new imperialism has no clear and finite objects that it requires such a massive military force. Boundless domination of a global economy, and of the multiple states that administer it, requires military action without end, in purpose or time.
>
> (Wood 2003, 144)

The result is an endless proliferation of military interventions and occupations whose focus shifts across space and time. The new doctrine of ’war without end’

applied by the Bush administration seeks to create a climate of permanent fear, of aggression without any time limits or definite objectives.

> In any case, since even military power cannot be active everywhere at once … , the only option is to demonstrate , by frequent displays of military force, that it can go anywhere at any time, do great damage. This is not to say that war will be constant – which would be too destructive to the economic order … It is the endless possibility of war that imperial capital needs to sustain its hegemony over the global system of multiple states.
>
> (Wood 2003, 165)

Wood (2003, 168) suggests that today 'there is a growing gulf between the global economic reach of capital and the local powers it needs to sustain it, and the military doctrine of the Bush regime is an attempt to fill the gap.'[31]

Given Wood's observation that the US-dominated global system depends more than ever on a system of multiple states to maintain global order, it matters more than ever how states are governed since the disorder and instability engendered by so-called failed states endanger the stable and predictable environment that capital needs.[32] In this context, 'failed states' are considered as 'problems' since they are

---

[31]This concern with the growing gap between the global economic reach of the capital and the local powers needed to maintain the global order is well examplified in Thomas Barnett's frequently-cited study 'Pentagon's New Map'. Barnett (2003), a former advisor to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, divides into 'the functioning core' and the 'non-integrating gap'. 'The functioning core' consists of those stable countries those states or regions already integrated into or attempting to connect to the global economy. 'The gap', on the other hand, consists of 'failed states' and 'rogue states' where connectivity to the globalization is weak or non-existant. There is little threat of war in the 'core', because its members enjoy the benefits of globalization, specifically rising standards of living, whereas the states in the gap are the source of war, terrorism, disease, mass migration and environmental degradation. In those areas there is a great deal of violence, instability and disorder, because they are not connected to 'the core'. Due to this lack of connectivity 'the gap' becomes the primary security threat to the 'core'. The United States, as the sole superpower, can only counter the threats posed the gap by 'connecting' all states in the gap into global economy. Barnett argues that America's challenge for the twenty-first century is to 'shrink' the area of the world that is disconnected from globalization. When the US provides security in the Gap, it reduces the operating environment from which dangerous threats can emerge. New social, political, and economic systems will emerge in the different Gap countries, but they will all be guided by the principle of connectivity with the functioning Core, to which they will all eventually belong. Barnett believes that this will be only possible through military force.

[32] In explaining its global strategy, for instance, the Pentagon declared in 1993 that 'a prosperous, largely democratic, market-oriented zone of peace and prosperity that encompasses more than two-thirds of the world's economy requires the stability that only American leadership can provide' (Schwarz and Layne 1999).

seen as threats to the 'stability' that the global economy requires and their problems are subordinated to the security of populations and economies in the West, subsequently leading to the rise of the category of 'failed states' mainly as a security concern for the Western countries.

'Although capitalism is a global system, the operation of global economic forces manifest themselves in specific national and regional forms' (Wood 1999). However, its systemic contradictions and crises, are not national in origin, they are rooted in capitalism's basic laws of motion. This means that 'no specific national policy caused them, nor can any specific national strategy resolve them' (Wood 1999). But at the same time, the global dynamics continue to be driven by forces within, and relations among, national economies and nation-states.

> The global crisis is shaped by the specific national forms of its constituent parts, each with its own history and its own internal logic, and by the relations among those national entities. It is also shaped by the uneven development among the national components of global capitalism. All capitalist families today are unhappy, and all for the same fundamental reasons, but each is unhappy in its own way.
>
> (Wood 1999)

Today's so-called failed states in Africa, Southeast Asia, Pacific and Europe are all 'unhappy in their own way'. It is certainly true that Liberia, Rwanda, Congo, Somalia, Sudan, Angola, Kosova, East Timor, etc. have been places of conflict and disorder in recent years. However, rather than being the causes of 'failure', poor conditions, poverty and civil wars in these so-called failed states should be recognized and explained as manifestations of the crisis of global capitalism.

Wood's another argument, crucial for the purpose of our study, is that the new ideology of 'war without end' serves the particular needs of imperial capital. No longer based primarily on financial globalization, which was a means through which the power of the USA is extended over the world during 1990s, the United States now seems to use massive displays of military power to maintain its global

dominance.[33] These preemptive interventions serve as a warning to all nation-states that the ones which resist the US-dominated global system will have to suffer the consequences. It is at this point the failed state discourse comes to the scene with its legitimizing function not just in individual cases of intervention but, more importantly, in the creation of a more interventionary and preemptive world order led by the United States[34]. This is clearly expressed especially in the *The National Security Strategy*, which identifies the US's main threat as failing states. Discounting the Cold War strategies of deterrence and containment as ineffective in the post Cold War world where terrorist networks are the biggests threats, this document argues that these threats spreading mainly from failed states present 'a compelling case for taking anticipatory actions to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack'.[35]

The category 'failed state' has already been used to legitimize specific interventions, such as the US invasion of Afghanistan after the events of September

[33] At the end of 1990s, Thomas Friedman warned that 'The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist — McDonald's cannot flourish without a McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps' (New York Times Magazine, 1999).

[34] In his speech to the United Nations on 21 September 2004, George Bush called for a new world order based on a new definition of security, urging that 'every nation that seeks peace has an obligation to help build that world. Eventually, there is no safe isolation from terror networks, or failed states that shelter them, or outlaw regimes, or weapons of mass destruction' (Bush 2004). Similarly, Prime Minister John Howard, before Australia's intervention to Solomon İslands in 2003, suggests: 'We know that a failed state in our region, on our own doorstep will jeopardize our own security. The best thing we can do is to take remedial action and take it now ... I recognize that the action we are proposing represents a very significant change in the way we address our regional responsibilities and relationships' (ABC Online 2003)

[35] In fact, preemption -striking an enemy as it prepares an attack- has long been an important and widely accepted policy option for the United States. But the Bush administration argues that preemption must be extended to include 'preventive' attacks even in the absence of an specific evidence of a threat (O'Hanlon et al 2002). In the introduction of *the National Security Strategy* president Bush writes, '… as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against [such] emerging threats before they are fully formed.'

11 Australia's intervention in the Solomon Islands in 2003, and the recent US intervention in Haiti.[36]

Although military interventions, state-building or rearranging of territories have long been with us, the theories used to legitimize these aims and methods to achieve them change according to historical circumstances. In the nineteenth century colonialism brought the discourse of 'civilizing mission', 'the white man's burden,' whereas in the postwar period there were concerns with 'order and stability'. The features of the failed state discourse have a lot in common with these discourses and it functions as an 'ideology of imperialism of our time' (Jones 2004).

[36] Jones (2004) shows that the category of failed state has also acquired formal legitimacy in official legal discourse in the United States. She suggests that the notion of failed states 'has served as a key component of the legal defence of the detainment and torture of prisoners held in Guantanamo Bay' (Jones 2004). Although the prolonged detainment of the prisoners at Guantanamo is against the international law, the US has made use of the concept of the failed state to refuse the applicability of the Geneva Conventions to the al-Qaeda detainees held at Guantanamo or elsewhere. The US Department of Justice Office of the Assistant Attorney General declared that 'Afghanistan's status as a failed State is sufficient ground alone for the President to suspend Geneva III, and thus to deprive members of the Taliban militia of prisoners of war status' (quoted in Jones 2004).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, failed state discourse has been critically examined in terms of its methodological and ontological flaws. In rejecting its atomistic and essentialist approach, I intended not to deny the existence of the crises and problems (such as poverty, civil war, instability, etc.) associated with what is called 'state failure'. Rather, I have argued that the problem with the failed state discourse lies in characterizing and explaining the causes of such crises in the so-called failed states. It tries to explain state failure by focusing simply on the local conditions and takes states as atomistic units which are externally related to each other. Besides, state failure is described in therapeutic terms like a disease which needs to be treated. As a result, state failure is seen as a problem of internal origin which is in need of an external solution. Rejecting this atomistic approach, I also tried to avoid falling into the trap of the approaches which emphasize the 'external' environment. After having rejected focusing on the internal or external dynamics, the dialectical method grounded on the notion internal relations, which rejects the dichotomy between the 'internal' and 'external', was suggested as an alternative to explain what is called 'state failure'.

With these in mind, I have critically evaluated the official US government documents and reports concerning 'failed states'. Afterwards, I sought the traces of failed states discourse in the concerns for political order and stability which emerged in American political science in the 1960s. I argued that failed state discourse is a

new variant of the concerns which was a response to the intensification of Cold War rivalries and the rise of the national liberation movements in the Third World during the 1960s.

The therapeutic approaches and what Jones calls 'the logic of blaming the victim' show, ironically, that the central focus of the failed state discourse is not the state. In explaining the crises and poor conditions in the so-called failed states, the failed states discourse focuses more on society than the state. The discourse explains what is called 'state failure' by pathologizing and blaming the populations living in the so-called failed states. The various official reports and policy recommendation documents, which I have already mentioned, implicitly or explicitly suggest that recovering from 'state failure' involves changing the behavior and mentality of local populations. Accordingly, the state's transition from 'failure' to 'success' is seen as being dependent on changing the society's reasoning, values, behavior, etc. Therefore, the failed state discourse can be considered as a critique of society rather than that of the state. When these are taken into account, we can argue that failed state discourse suffers from a lack of analysis of the state.

Through the use of the medical metaphors, the therapeutic approaches to state failure create a hierarchy between the so-called failed states and the 'successful' states as patients and doctors respectively. State failure is compared to a physical and mental illness and the failed states are described as mentally defective individuals, spreading cancer viruses, handicapped people who need care, etc. By labelling the populations in the failed states as mentally and emotionally dysfunctional, these therapeutic approaches problematize their right to self-government, legitimizing external supervision and intervention. Accordingly, the only solution for these abnormal and deficient people of failed states become the external ones in the form of

state-building, military occupations, trusteeship, protectorates, etc. All these are accompanied by new definitions of imperialism with the adjectives like 'benign', 'humanitarian', 'disinterested', etc. As Hughes and Pupavac (2001) argue, failed state discourse, which legitimizes the disciplinary and rationalizing intervention of outside forces, closely parallels colonial discourses which awarded rights only to 'mature' populations. In this sense, these 'well-intentioned' calls for the imperial management of failed states can be considered as a return of the 'white man's burden' in another guise.

An evaluation of the official US government documents and reports concerning 'failed states' has revealed that the US foreign policy approach towards the failed states is also informed by the atomistic and therapeutic approaches. Moreover, the the analyses of state failure are usually accompanied by discussions on the need for a world order in the context of which unilateral intervention and preemption is the norm. In fact, these attempts to create such a world order, should be evaluated within the framework of the change of the US imperial strategy at the end of the 1990s.

As Wood (2003) argues, the global economy dominated by the US depends on a system of multiple national states structured in a relation of domination and subordination. The nation-state creates and maintains the basic conditions for the capital accumulation. As the guarantor of social order and property relations, it provides order, stability and predictibility that the global capital requires. It is for this very reason that how and by whom the states are governed becomes quite important. In this picture, the so-called failed states come to the scene as the ones which fail to provide the 'order and stability' that the global capital requires, and which fail to respond to the changing needs of the global capital. In other words, the failed states are the 'black holes' of the global economy. In this framework, the proper

functioning and maintainance of the global system is seen as being dependent on prevention and preemption of the threat of failed states through external interventions. It is in this context that the therapeutic approaches are used as a means to legitimize political, economic and military interventions, which are, in fact, the attempts to keep all these nation-states in line with the changing requirements of capital accumulation.

Since the early postwar period and increasingly since the beginning of the post Cold War era, United States has imposed its conditions to the developing world not by direct colonial rule, but rather by market-based domination. With the end of the Cold War, 'globalization' was welcomed with enthusiasm. There was sense of a 'new beginning' supported by a widely shared belief that the post Cold War period would be an era of peace and prosperity under the US leadership. Therefore, as the leader of 'globalization', the United States was able to maintain its hegemony through market power during 1990s. However, towards the end of 1990s, global financial system dominated by the United States was widely considered to be the main cause of the increasing poverty and inequality in the world. Especially after the East Asian financial crisis, the United States' reliance on market power began to weaken as a result of the developments in the global economy such as financial crises, economic slowdown, stock market failures combining with the ascendance of anti-globalization movements and reactions against American foreign policy. All these developmments led the US administration to move, in Gramscian terms, from 'consent' to 'coercion' by abandoning treaties, declining participation in multilateral discussions and involving in unilateral interventions[37]. For instance, the US

[37] In fact, the two concepts, namely 'consent' and 'coercion' are the two main pillars of Gramsci's concept of hegemony. Although Gramsci used 'hegemony' to refer to the relations between social classes, the term is also used to explain inter-state relations by many scholars. For instance, despite

administration withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty, refused the Kyoto protocol, suspended its relations with North Korea and did not respect international laws and norms during Second Gulf War. These developments have shown that The United States, which is no longer able to use the financial globalization as a means to extend its power to the rest of the world, resorts more and more to coercion to dominate the global economy.

However, as Wood (2003) argues, despite its enormous military power, the United States cannot impose itself every day, everyhere throughout the world. Since the military power cannot be active everywhere at once, the only option is to discourage and intimidate all nation-states, which are fundamental to the global system, through the medium of preemptive strikes and the never-ending possibility of military interventions. The failed state discourse serves as a means to justify this preemptive world order.

---

not using the terms, 'consent' and 'coercion', Nye 's concepts of 'soft power' and 'hard power'closely parallel these terms. Nye describes soft power as the ability to get what you want by attracting and persuading others to adopt your goals, whereas 'hard power' implies the use of military power to make others follow your will.

REFERENCES

ABC Online (2003) *PM - Australia's New Foreign Policy Outlook,* 2 July. Online. http://news.abc.net.au/pm/content/2003/s893384 (accessed 2 December 2004).

BBC News (2004a) *Summit Tackles Pacific Security,* 6 April. Online. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/world/asia_pacific/3602901 (accessed 2 December 2004).

_____ (2004b) *Pacific Forum Opens Samoa Talks,* 7 August. Online. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/world/asia_pacific/3543762 (accessed 2 December 2004).

_____ (2004c) *US Courts Nepal as Anti-terror Partner,* 6 April. Online. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/world/south_asia/ (accessed 5 December 2004).

Abrahamsen, R. (2000) *Disciplining Democracy: Development Discourse and Good Governance in Africa*, London : Zed Books.

_____ (2001) 'Democratisation – Part of the Problem or the Solution to Africa's 'Failed States?' Paper presented at the conference 'The Global Constitutionof Failed States: The Consequences of a New Imperialism ?', 18-20 April 2001, University of Sussex.

Ahmad, A. (2004) 'Imperialism of Our Time', *Socialist Register,* 43-62.

Alavi, H. and Shanin,T. (1982) 'Introduction', in H. Alavi and T. Shanin (eds) *Intoduction to the Sociology of Developing Countries,* London: Macmillan.

Almond, G. (1970) *Political Development: Essays in Heuristic Theory*, Boston: Little, Brown.

Anghie, A. (2005) *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arendt, H (1968) *Imperialism,* New York: H.B. Janovich.

Arrighi, G (1994) *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times*, New York: Verso.

Barnett, T. (2003) 'The Pentagon's New Map'. Online. http://www.thomaspmbarnett.com/published/pentagonsnewmap.htm (accessed 18 September 2003).

Benn, H. (2004) 'A Shared Challenge: Promoting Development and Human Security in Weak States', Speech at Center for Global Development, Washington DC: 23 June 2004.

Bilgin, P. and Morton, A. D. (2004) 'From "Rogue" to "Failed" States? The Fallacy of Short-termism', *Politics,* 24(3): 169-180.

Blum, W. (1987) *The CIA: A Forgotten History*, London: Zed Books.

_____ (2003) *Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions since World War II*, Monroe ME: Common Courage Press.

Boot, M. (2004) 'The Case for Wise Liberal Imperial Rule,' Financial Times*,* 14 July 2004

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1996) 'Introduction', in *The United Nations and Somalia* (1992-1996), The United Nations Blue Book Series. New York: Department of Public Informationof the United Nations.

Bromley, S. (1994) *Rethinking Middle East Politics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bush, G. W. (2004) *Speech to the United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Headquarters, New York,* Office of the Press Secretary, White House. Online. http://whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/20040921-3.html (accessed 12 December 2004).

Carnegie Commission.(1997) Preventing Deadly Conflict. Washington DC: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict.

Center for Global Development (2004) *On the Brink: Weak States and US National Security,* Washington.

Centre for Strategic and International Studies and Association of the US Army (2003) *Play to Win, Final Report of the Bi-Partisan Commission on Post-Conflict Reconstruction,* Washington: CSIS and AUSA.

Chege, M. (2002) 'Sierra Leone: The State that Came Back from the Dead', *The Washington Quarterly*, 25(3): 147-60.

Chimni, B. S. (1987) *International Commodity Agreements: A Legal Study*,

_____ (1993) *International Law and World Order: A Critique of Contemporary Approaches*, New Delhi: Sage.

_____ (1999) 'Marxism and International Law: a Contemporary Analysis', *Economic and Political Weekly*, (Feburary 6): 337-49.

Chomsky, N. (1997) *World Orders, Old and New*, London: Pluto Press.

Chossudovsky, M. (1997) *The Globalization of Poverty, Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms*, London: Zed Books.

Clapham, C. (2000) 'Failed States and Non States in the International Order.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 7-10 April 2000, Florence, Purdue University.

Clarke, W. and Herbst, J. (1997) (eds.) *Learning from Somalia: The Lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention*, Colorado: Westview Press.

Cohen, S. P. (2002), 'The Nation and the State of Pakistan', *The Washington Quarterly*, 25(3): 109-22.

Cooper, R. (2002) 'The Post-Modern State' in M.Leonard (ed), *Re-Ordering the World*, London: The Foreign Policy Centre.

Cowen, M. and Shenton, R. (1995) 'The Invention of Development' in J.Crush (ed) *The Power of Development*. London: Routledge; 27-43.

Crush, J. (1995) (ed) *Power of Development,* London: Routledge.

Demir, İ. (2001) 'The Global Constitution of "Failed States" The Consequences of a New Imperialism?'. Online. http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/review/202demir.htm (accessed 10 January 2003).

Desai R. (2004) 'From National Bourgeoisie to Rogues, Failures and Bullies: 21st Century Imperialism and the Unravelling of the Third World' *Third World Quarterly,* 25(1): 169–185.

DiPrizio R. C. (2002) *Armed Humanitarians. U.S. Interventions from Northern Iraq to Kosova,* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Dorff, R. H. (2000) 'Addressing the Challenges of State Failure'. Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 7-10 April 2000, Florence, Purdue University.

Duffield, M (1997) 'Relief in War Zones: Toward an Analysis of the New Aid Paradigm', *Third World Quarterly*, 18(3): 290-314.

_____ (2001a) *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. London: Zed Books.

_____ (2001b) Governing the Borderlands: Decoding the Power of Aid. Paper

presented at the conference 'Politics and Humanitarian Aid: Debates, Dilemmas and Dissension', 1 February 2001, Commonwealth Institute, London.

_____ (2002) 'Social Reconstruction and the Radicalisation of Development: Aid as a Relation of Global Liberal Governance', *Development and Change*, 33(5): 1049-1071.

European Commission (1996) 'Communication of April 30 from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on. Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)'. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

Fenton, A. (2004) 'From Monroe to Bush...to Martin? Failed State Doctrine in Haiti', *Zmag*. Online. http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2004-09/22 (accessed 14 May 2005).

Fituni, L. (2004) 'Der Begriff des "Staats am Rande des Zusammenbruchs" - Herausforderungen und Antworten aus russischer Perspektive', *Politische Studien*, 55(393): 26-37.

Foster (2003) 'Naked Imperialism', *Monthly Review*. Online. http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm. (accessed 10 September 2005).

Foucault, M. (1981) 'The Order of Discourse.' in R. Young, (ed), *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reade*r, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

_____ (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Brith of the Prison*, London: Penguin.

Frost, M. (1991) 'What Ought to be Done about the Condition of States?' in C. Navari (ed), *The Condition of States,* Philadelphia: Open University Press, 183-196

Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*, London: Hamish Hamilton.

_____ (2004) *State Building,* London: Profile.

Gendzier, I. L. (1985) *Managing Political Change: Social Scientists and the Third World*, Boulder and London: Westview.

Giddens, A. (1987) *The Nation State and Violence.* Berkeley, CA: California University Press.

Goldsworhty (2003) 'Invention and in(ter)vention: The rhetoric of Balkanization'. Online. http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2003-05-08-goldsworthy-en. (accessed 10 October 2004)

Gordon R. E. And Sylvester J. H. (2004) 'Deconstructing Development', *Wisconsin İnternational Law Journal*, 22 (1): 1-97.

Gros, J.G. (1996) 'Towards a Taxonomy of Failed States in the New World Order: Decaying Somalia, Liberia, Rwanda and Haiti', *Third World Quarterly*, 17(3): 455-71.

Haass, R. N. (2002) 'Reflections a Year After September 11'. Remarks to International Institute for Strategic Studies' 2002 Annual Conference, 13 September 2002, London, the United Kingdom.

Halliday, F. (1989) *Cold War, Third World,* London: Hutchinson Radius.

Hamre J. and Sullivan G. R. (2002) 'Toward Postconflict Reconstruction', *The Washington Quarterly,* 25(4): 84-96.

Hardt, M., and Negri, A. (2000) *Empire*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism*, London: Oxford University Press.

Helman, G. and Ratner, S. (1993) 'Saving Failed States', *Foreign Policy*, 89: 3-20.

Higgot, R. A (1983) *Political Development Theory*, London: Groom Helm.

Holloway, J. (1995) 'Global Capital and the National State', in W. Bonefeld and J. Holloway (eds), *Global Capital and the National State and the Politics of Money*, London: Macmillan, 116,139.

Holm, H. H. (1998)'The Responsibility That Will Not Go Away: Weak States in the International System.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 25-27 April 1998, Florence, Purdue University.

_____ (1999) 'The Disaggregated World Order: Foreign Policy Towards Failed States.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 8-11 April 1999, Florence, Purdue University.

_____ (2000) 'Is There a Failed State Order? Foreign policy towards failed states.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 7-10 April 2000, Florence, Purdue University.

_____ (2001) 'Writing the Rules for Disaggregated World Order.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 11-14 April 2001, Florence, Purdue University

Hoyt P. D. (2000) 'The Rogue State Image in American Foreign Policy', *Global Society*, 14(2): 297-308.

Hughes,C. And Pupavac, V. (2001) 'Framing Post-conflict Societies: A Critique of International Risk Mnagement in Cambodia and the post-Yugoslav States'. Paper presented at the conference 'The Global Constitutionof Failed States: The Consequences of a New Imperialism ?', 18-20 April 2001, University of Sussex.

Huntington, S. P. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Human Rights Watch (2002) Dangerous *Dealings: Changes to US Military Assistance After September 11.* Online. http://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/usmil/ (accessed 17 August 2005).

Lake, A. (2000) 'Our Place in the Balkans', *New York Times,* October 8, 2000.

Ignatieff, M. (2002) 'Intervention and State Failure', *Dissent*, 114-123.

International Alert (1999) 'March 6 Memorandum from International Alert', in *IDC Sixth Report, Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction,* London: The Stationary Office, 2: 73-9.

Jackson, R. H. (1990) *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1998) 'Surrogate Sovereignty? Great Power Responsibility and 'Failed States', Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia, Working Paper no. 25

Jones, B.G. (2001) 'Blaming the Victim: Ideologies Arising from the Global Separation of the 'Economic' and the 'Political'.' Paper presented at the conference 'The Global Constitutionof Failed States: The Consequences of a New Imperialism ?', 18-20 April 2001, University of Sussex.

_____ (2004) '"Failed States": An Ideology of the Imperialism of Our Time'. Paper presented at 'BISA 2004 Conference', 20-22 December 2004, University of Warwick.

Kansteiner, W. H. (2002) 'Weak States and Terrorism in Africa: U.S. Policy Options in Somalia'. Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on African Affairs. 6 February 2002, Washington, DC.

Kaplan, R. D. (1993) *Balkan Ghosts. A Journey through the History*, New York: Vintage Books.

_____ (1994) 'The Coming Anarchy: How Scarcity, Crime, Overpopulation and Disease are Rapidly Destroying the Social Fabric of Our Planet', *Atlantic Monthly*, (February) 44–76.

Khan, M. H. (2002) State Failure in Developing Countries and Strategies of Institutional Reform.' Paper presented at 'the ABCDE Conference', 24-26 June, 2002, Osla.

Kipling, R. (1899) The Whiteman's Burden. Online. http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~wldciv/world_civ_reader/world/kipling. (accessed 21 April 2004).

Klare, M. (1992) 'The Development of Low-Intensity Warfare Doctrine', in Peter Schraeder (ed.), *Intervention into the 1990s: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Third World,* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 37-53.

Lake, A. (2000) 'Our Place in the Balkans', *New York Times,* October 8, 2000.

Lambach, D. (2004) 'Failed States and Perceptions of Threat in Europe and Australia', Paper presented at the conference 'New Security Agendas: European and Australian Perspectives', 1-3 July 2004, London.

_____ (2005) 'State Failure and Regional Security: Theoretical Considerations and the Limits of Security Studies', Paper presented at the WISC International Studies Conference, 24-27 August 2005, İstanbul.

Layne, C. and Schwarz B. (1999) The Case Against Intervention in Kosovo', *Nation.* Online. http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml%3Fi=19990419&s=schwarz (acessed 17 November 2004)

Leonard, M. (ed.) (2002) *Re-Ordering the World*, London: The Foreign Policy Centre.

Lobe, J. (2004) *Weak States Are 'Sleeping Giants' for US Security.* Online. http://www.dissidentvoice.org (accessed 18 May 2005)

Loomba, A. (1998) *Colonialism / Postcolonialism,* London:Routledge.

Maass, G., Siftung, F.E. and Mepham, D. (2004) 'Promoting Effective States : A Progressive Policy Response to Failed and Failing States', London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Mallaby, S. (2002) "The Reluctant Imperialist," *Foreign Affairs*, 81(22): 2-7.

Marx, K. (1842) 'Defence of the Moselle Correspondent' (Article in *Rheinische Zeitung*), in McLellan, D., 1977, *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*, Oxford University Press, 24-25.

_____ (1865/1968) 'Wages, Price and Profit.' in Marx and Engels. *Selected Works* (in one volume). Moscow: Progress.

Masud, K.A. (2004) 'State of Governance in Bangladesh'. Online. http://www.thedailystar.net/2004/06/20/d40620020436.htm (accessed 18 September 2005).

Mazrui, A. (1994) 'Decaying parts of Africa need benign colonization', *International Herald Tribune*, August 4: 6.

Menkhaus, K. (2003) 'The Security Paradox of Failed States", *National Strategy Forum Review,* 12:36-48.

Milliken, J. and Krause, K. (2002) (ed.) 'Special Issue: State Failure, Collapse and Reconstruction', *Development and Change*, 33(5): 753-1072

Mitchell, T. (1998) 'Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order,' in N. Mirzoeff (ed), *The Visual Culture Reader*, New York: Routledge, 293-94.

Mortimer, R. A. (1984) *The Third World Coalition in International Politics*, Second edition, Boulder, Co and London: Westview Press.

Nicholson, M. (1994) *Natasha's Story*, London: Pan.

Nye, J.S. (2002) *The Paradox of American Power,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (1987) *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Africa: Essays in Contemporary Politics*, London: Zed Books.

O'Brien, R. and Williams, M. (2004) *Global Political Economy: Evolution and Dynamics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

OECD (1998) *Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation on the Threshold of the 21st Century*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Ollman, B. (1992) *Dialectical Investigations,* London: Routledge.

Pfaff, W. (1995) 'A New Colonialism? Europe Must Go Back into Africa', *Foregin Affairs*, 74 (1): 2-6.

Pupavac, V. (2001) 'Therapeutic Governance: Psychosocial Intervention and Trauma Risk Management', *Disasters*, 25(4): 358-72.

_____ (2002) 'Pathologizing Populations and Colonizing Minds: International Psychosocial Programs in Kosovo.' *Alternatives,* 27(4): 489-511.

_____ (2004) 'The Emotionology of the New International Security Paradigm.' *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7(2): 149-170.

Ransom, H. H. (1989) 'Covert Intervention', in Schraeder, P. J. (ed.) *Intervention in the 1980s: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Third World*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Rajan, R. (2004) 'Failed States, Vicious Cycles, and a Proposal', Manuscript. International Monetary Fund.

Rice, C. (2000) 'Promoting the National Interest', *Foreign Affairs,* 79(1): 45-62.

Rice, S. E. (2003) *The New National Security Strategy: Focus on Failed States*, Policy Brief #116. Online. http://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb116.htm (accessed 25 May 2004). (accessed 18 February 2004)

Rotberg, R. I. (2002a) 'Failed States in a World of Terror', *Foreign Affairs*, 81(4): 1-13.

_____ (2002b) 'The New Nature of Nation-State Failure', *The Washington Quarterly*, 25 (3): 85-96.

_____ (ed.) (2003a) *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror*, Washington D.C.: World Peace Foundation and Brookings Institution.

_____ (ed.) (2003b) *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____ (2003c) 'Nation-State Failure: A Recurring Phenomenon?', An Essay for NIC 2020 Project, Inaugural Workshop, November 2003. Online. http://dmoz.org/Society/Issues/Warfare_and_Conflict/Future_Issues/ (accessed 20 September 2005)

_____ (2004) 'Weak and Failing States: Critical New Security Issues', *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 3 (2): 57-69.

Roxborough, I. (1979) *Theories of Underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan.

Said, E. (1979) *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Short, C. (2002) *Speech by the Rt. Hon. Clare Short MP, Secretary of State for International Development,* British Council Auditorium, Free Town, Sierra.

State Failure Task Force. 1995 *Working Papers: State Failure Task Force Report*. Mclean, VA: SAIC.

_____1998. *State Failure Task Force Report: Phase II Findings.* Mclean, VA: SAIC.

_____2003. *State Failure Task Force Report: Phase III Findings.* Mclean, VA: SAIC.

Stohl, R. (2000) 'Protecting the Failing States', *Weekly Defence Monitor*, 3(1), 17-18.

_____ (2001) "Bush Policy on Failed States is Lacking" *Weekly Defence Monitor,* 5(2), 7-11

Stohl R. And Stohl M. (2001) 'The Failed and Failing States and the Bush Administration: Paradoxes and Perils'. Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States and Global Governance, 10-14 April 2001, Florence, Italy.

Straw, J. (2002) 'Failed and Failing States', Speech given by Foreign Secretary Jack Straw at the European Research Institute, University of Birmingham: 6 September 2002. Online. www.eri.bham.ac.uk/events/jstraw060902.pdf (accessed 10August 2005).

Takeyh, R. and Gvosdev, N. (2002) 'Do Terrorist Networks need a Home?', *Washington Quarterly*, 25(3): 97-109.

Thomas, C. Y. (1984) *The Rise of the Authoritarian State in Peripheral Societies*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Truman, H. (1949) *Public Papers of the President*, 20 January, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Tuastad, D. (2003) 'Neo-Orientalism and the New Barbarism Thesis', Third World Quarterly, 24(4): 591-99.

Turner, B. (1994) *Orientalism, Postmodernism & Globalism*, London: Routledge.

United Nations, (2004) *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility Report of the High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*, New York: United Nations.

UN Security Council (1992a) 'Note by the President of the Security Council'. S/235000 of 31 January.

UN Security Council (1992b) S/PV.3145 of 3 December.

US Agency for International Development (2004) *U.S. Foreign Aid: Meeting the Challenges of the Twenty First Century.* Washington.

US Commission on National Security (2000) *Seeking a National Strategy:A Concert for Preserving Security and Promoting Freedom.* Washington.

US Department of Defense (2001) *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review*. Washington, DC.

US Department of State and US Agency for Internationald Development (2003) *Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2004 – 2009. Security, Democracy, Prosperity*, Washington DC.

Wallensteen, P. (2000) 'Beyond State Failure: On Internal and External Ways of Ending State Failure.' Paper presented at the Conference on Failed States, 7-10 April 2000, Florence, Purdue University.

White House (2002) 'The National Security Strategy of the United States of America', September 2002. Online. http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf (accessed 14 February 2004).

Wise, M.W. (2004) 'American Perspectives on the Threat Posed by Weak and Failing Asian States'. Paper presented at 'The U.S.-China Conference on Areas of Instability and Emerging Threats', February 23-24, Beijing.

Wolf, M. (2004) 'We Cannot Ignore Failing States', *Financial Times*, 9th June.

Wood, E. M. (1995) *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

_____ (1999) 'Unhappy Families: Global Capitalism in a World of Nation-states', *Monthly Review*. Online. http://www.monthlyreview.org/799wood.htm (accessed 20 May 2005).

_____ (2000) 'Kosovo and the New Imperialism', in T. Ali (ed), *Masters of the Universe? NATO's Balkan Crusade*, Verso, London, 190-200.

_____ (2003) *Empire of Capita*l, New York: Verso.

Woodward, S. L. (1999) 'Failed States,' *Naval War College Review*, 52: 55-69.

World Bank (2003) Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy, A World Bank Research Report, Washington DC, 2003. Online. http://econ.worldbank.org/prr/CivilWarPRR/text-26671/ (accessed 12 November 2004).

World Bank and the Carter Centre (1997) *From Civil War to Civil Society: The Transition from War to Peace in Guatemala and Liberia*. Washington DC, and Atalanta: World Bank and Carter Centre.

Yannis, A. (2002) 'State Collapse and its Implications for Peace-Building and Reconstruction',*Development and Change*, 33(5):816-35.

Zartman, W. (ed.) (1995) *Collapsed States*, London : Lynne Rienner.