Forum: General Assembly

Issue: Post-Conflict Power Vacuum in Failed States

Officer: Txell Reguant

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

1. The Conceptualization of the Power Vacuum 1
2. The Anatomy of State Failure 2
3. The Post-Conflict Dilemma 2
4. Geopolitical Implications and Multipolarity 3
5. The "Grand Strategy" of Reconstruction 3

Term Definitions **4**

Power Vacuum 4
The Weberian State 4
Failed State 4
Collapsed State 4
Fragile State 5
Negative Sovereignty 5
Shadow State 5
Incomplete Arrangements 5
Lootable Resources 5

Background Information **5**

Countries and Organisations Involved **8**

Sierra Leone: The Implosion and Rebuilding of the Neo-Patrimonial State 8
Iraq: The Clash of Imposed Liberalism and Identity Politics 9
Afghanistan: The Reconstruction Gap and Externally Financed Insecurity 10
Timor-Leste: UN Transitional Administration as a Complete Takeover 10
South Sudan: Infrastructure Disparities and the Resource Curse 11
DR Congo: Fragmented Authority and the Shadow State 12

Relevant UN Treaties/Resolutions **12**

Charter of the United Nations (1945) 12
The Brahimi Report (2000) 13
2005 World Summit Outcome (Resolution 60/1) 13
UNSC Resolution 1272 (1999) and the "Complete Takeover" Model 13
The Arusha Agreement (2000) and Sequential Burundi Missions 13

The Lomé Accord (1999) and Sierra Leone Resolutions 14
The Kimberley Process (2003) 14
The "Incomplete Arrangement" and Residual Rights 14
Previous Attempts to Solve the Issue 15
Possible Solutions 18
Bibliography 20

Introduction

In the contemporary international landscape, the most potent threats to global stability arise not from conventional military aggression between strong states, but from the implosion of weak or fragile states. This phenomenon has been described as a "sleeping giant" threat, as failed states can provide safe havens for terrorist organizations to conduct operations that endanger the lives of citizens residing far beyond their borders. The transition from the 20th century's bipolar or unipolar world to a multipolar order has significantly exacerbated this issue, as power vacuums increasingly become theaters for great power competition and proxy warfare.

1. The Conceptualization of the Power Vacuum

A power vacuum is defined as the fundamental absence of legitimate state authority over a geographic territory. It is a geopolitical space outside the control of a state where no actor enforces the law. Historically and theoretically, international politics reflects the Aristotelian principle that "nature abhors a vacuum". When a state fails to provide security and order, other political units (including opportunistic neighboring states, violent non-state actors (VNSAs), and organized criminal syndicates) inevitably vie for control.

In a post-conflict setting, this vacuum often presents as a perfect storm. As insurgent groups demobilize and central regimes collapse, the resulting void is frequently reoccupied by factions not participating in the peace process or by criminal organizations with the ability to supplant state functions. Territorial control and the domination of the population become the center of a zero-sum dispute where the benefits of controlling the area outweigh the costs of intervention.

2. The Anatomy of State Failure

State failure is the primary precursor to the emergence of a power vacuum. A failed state is a hollow polity where the government is paralyzed and inoperative, central security is no longer assured, and the socioeconomic balance is destroyed. It is

fundamentally defined by the loss of the Weberian monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within its territory.

Vulnerability to failure is often rooted in chronic economic underdevelopment, which inhibits a state's resilience to endogenous or exogenous shocks. Significant indicators of this fragility include:

- **Security Apparatus:** Threats from paramilitaries and a lack of civilian control over armed forces.
- **Factionalized Elites:** Fragmentation of the state along ethnic, religious, and economic lines.
- **State Legitimacy:** A loss of confidence in the government, often exacerbated by corruption and unfair electoral processes.
- **Human Flight:** A "brain drain" of educated human resources, further weakening the state's capacity to bounce back after a crisis.

3. The Post-Conflict Dilemma

The immediate aftermath of a conflict is a period of extreme institutional vacuum. Rules and norms no longer constrain politicians or non-state actors, and the social fabric has typically been shredded. During this phase, disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programs are critical. However, they inherently create a temporary power vacuum in the zones of influence formerly held by illegal armed groups. If the state cannot quickly fill this void with legitimate authority and service delivery, the risk of conflict reactivation remains high.

Furthermore, the criminal economy often becomes a destabilizing factor during peace implementation. Illegal actors who regulated daily life during the conflict through "rebelocracy", imposing social control through authoritarian and discriminatory practices, resist the re-establishment of formal state presence. This creates a shadow state where virtually all power is channeled through patronage systems based on a ruler's control over resources and violence.

4. Geopolitical Implications and Multipolarity

In the 21st century, power vacuums are no longer isolated domestic issues; they are systemic threats to the international order. The transition to a post-Westphalian world suggests that the norms of inviolable and equal state sovereignty are breaking down. Sovereignty is increasingly seen as conditional upon a state's ability to protect its population and meet international standards of governance.

In a multipolar system, power vacuums invite Great Power competition, as states seek to attain strategic advantage or deny it to adversaries. This can lead to proxy wars where regional and global powers fund militant groups to protect their interests, thereby prolonging the vacuum and preventing the emergence of a cohesive national identity.

5. The "Grand Strategy" of Reconstruction

Addressing these vacuums has evolved into a "grand strategy" for the international community. Post-conflict reconstruction now transcends mere humanitarian aid, aiming for global stability, democracy building, and the westernization of failed states. This involves a holistic approach to rebuilding the social, political, and economic fabric of the collapsed state.

However, this process faces a profound reconstruction gap, often due to increased spending on security needs and the persistence of ongoing conflict. Successful reconstruction requires careful sequencing: priority must be given to reconstructing security and the rule of law before introducing mass competitive elections, as democratizing in the wrong sequence risks further bloodshed and the mobilization of illiberal forces.

Ultimately, the goal is to transform the failed state into a "normal" state that can provide human security, expanding the definition of security beyond military threats to include economic stability, social justice, and political freedom.

Term Definitions

Power Vacuum

The fundamental absence of legitimate state authority over a geographic territory. It is a geopolitical space outside the control of a state where no actor enforces the law, creating an aberration that "nature abhors" and that neighboring states will inevitably seek to fill.

The Weberian State

A political entity defined by its successful claim to a "monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory".

Failed State

A hollow polity where the government is paralyzed and inoperative, central security is no longer assured, and the socioeconomic balance is destroyed. It is often characterized by a loss of physical control of its territory.

Collapsed State

An extreme version of state failure characterized by a total vacuum of authority. In these "black holes," social authority disintegrates, and a Hobbesian anarchy of "all against all" prevails.

Fragile State

A state on the brink of collapse due to overwhelming challenges to its ability to remain secure and survive in an anarchical environment. Such states can no longer protect citizens or provide services, making them appear illegitimate in the eyes of their population.

Negative Sovereignty

A normative framework that upholds the *de jure* legal sovereignty of a state (recognition by the international community) despite its lack of *de facto* functional capacity to provide order or public services.

Shadow State

A parallel political unit that emerges when neopatrimonial leaders challenge the formal state's hegemony, often fueled by corruption and private syndicates.

Incomplete Arrangements

Statebuilding contracts where not every contingency is specified, giving the post-conflict host state the residual rights of control over the mission's implementation.

Lootable Resources

Natural resources like alluvial diamonds or timber that are easily extracted and transported, often attracting decentralized armed groups and fueling "lootable" war

Background Information

The emergence of a power vacuum in a failed state is generally characterized by a fundamental breakdown of law and order, where state institutions lose their monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force and become unable to protect their citizens. This loss of the Weberian monopoly on force is a primary defining feature of state failure, creating a geopolitical space free of governance where no central authority enforces the law. Historically and theoretically, these ungoverned spaces reflect the Aristotelian principle that nature abhors a vacuum, as such territories inevitably present state and non-state actors with opportunities to clash for territory and influence. Many modern failed states were born weak as artificial constructs hewn from colonial empires during events like the Berlin Conference of 1884/5, which partitioned territories without regard for ethnic boundaries. This colonial legacy often involved partial state construction, where European administrators focused resources on useful urban centers while neglecting the interior, thereby establishing long-term patterns of political and economic marginalization. These inherited asymmetries denied post-independence leaders the ability to adjust to market conditions, as urban populations often acted collectively whenever their specific interests were threatened. The stability of these newly independent states was further challenged during the Cold War when superpower rivals propped up corrupt or incompetent leaders for strategic reasons, only to abruptly withdraw support after the end of the bipolar era. This withdrawal left many states to sink or swim in a system that no longer prioritized their survival, often leading to rapid collapse when unfavorable systemic circumstances prevailed. Chronic economic underdevelopment serves as a structural driver of this fragility, as it inhibits a state's resilience to both endogenous and exogenous shocks. Underdeveloped states are frequently agrarian and rely on one or two primary export products, making government revenue highly volatile and unpredictable due to fluctuating global prices. In such environments, the presence of lootable resources like diamonds or coltan can prolong conflict by providing the financial means for non-state actors to sustain long-term insurgencies. Conversely, infrastructure-intensive resources such as oil often lead to centralized but opaque governance characterized by elite rent-seeking and the

exclusion of local communities from economic benefits. Within the state, failure is frequently marked by the rise of neopatrimonialism or warlord politics, where leaders systematically weaken formal institutions to consolidate power through personal patronage networks. This can result in a shadow state where virtually all real power is channeled through highly organized but formally unrecognized systems based on a ruler's control over resources and violence. When these formal structures collapse, citizens may de-link from the formal economy and turn to violent non-state actors or traditional customary authorities to provide the security and services the state has failed to deliver. The transition from conflict to peace presents a perfect storm for the creation of new vacuums, as the demobilization of insurgent groups creates a void that may be re-occupied by factions not participating in the peace process or by criminal organizations seeking to control illegal markets. Sustainable post-conflict reconstruction requires a holistic approach to rebuilding the social, political, and economic fabric of the state, yet it often faces a profound reconstruction gap where institutional capacity fails to meet citizens' basic expectations. Most contemporary interventions are dominated by a liberal peacebuilding model that emphasizes top-down institutional reform and market liberalization, though these efforts often face resistance in deeply religious or polyethnic societies. In a multipolar world, these power vacuums are increasingly viewed as systemic threats to international security because they provide havens for terrorist organizations and invite Great Power competition. This competition can lead to proxy wars as global and regional powers seek to attain or deny strategic advantage, thereby prolonging the state of anarchy and preventing the emergence of a cohesive national identity. Ultimately, the challenge of reconstruction involves shifting inter-societal relations away from the collective myths of injustice and resentment that often supersede mere economic greed in fueling protracted social conflicts.

Countries and Organisations Involved

Sierra Leone: The Implosion and Rebuilding of the Neo-Patrimonial State

The emergence of a power vacuum in Sierra Leone was the culmination of a systematic dismantling of state institutions during the long reign of Siaka Stevens between 1968 and 1985. Stevens introduced a model of "warlord politics" where he intentionally weakened the state's capability to govern its territory to maximize personal power and wealth through private patronage networks. This created a "shadow state" where the formal bureaucracy was a hollow sham, and the state's monopoly on violence was privatized among loyalists to secure diamond-producing enclaves. The subsequent civil war, which lasted from 1991 to 2002, was driven by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), an insurgent group that leveraged the "lootability" of alluvial diamonds to finance a campaign of terror against the government and civilians. As the national army disintegrated, the government was forced to rely on private military corporations like Executive Outcomes to regain control, illustrating the privatization of security in a total vacuum of formal authority. Post-conflict reconstruction, largely led by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DfID), initially focused on a "security-first" model that prioritized the disarmament of over 45,000 combatants. Agencies like the National Commission for Social Action (NaCSA) implemented decentralized infrastructure projects to rebuild trust, yet the restoration of traditional Paramount Chiefs remained controversial as they were seen by some as part of the original corrupt structures that marginalized youth and sparked the war. Ultimately, Sierra Leone demonstrates that while external intervention can restore order, sustainable legitimacy requires addressing the underlying grievances of a population that has survived a decade of institutional collapse.

Iraq: The Clash of Imposed Liberalism and Identity Politics

The 2003 invasion of Iraq and its subsequent reconstruction serve as a primary example of the dangers inherent in imposing a top-down liberal democratic model on a complex,

polyethnoreligious society. The US-led Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) operated under the flawed assumption that removing the Saddam Hussein regime would leave behind a functioning state apparatus ready for rapid democratization. One of the most significant strategic errors was the "de-Ba'athification" policy, which purged skilled civil servants and military officers from the bureaucracy, effectively hollowing out the state's administrative capacity and driving marginalized Sunnis toward insurgency. In the resulting institutional vacuum, religious actors such as Grand Ayatollah Sistani and Muqtada al-Sadr emerged as the primary sources of authority and social services for the population. These leaders effectively mobilized their constituencies, demonstrating that in post-colonial contexts, legitimacy often resides with traditional and religious figures rather than secular राजनीतिक elites. The reconstruction process became a zero-sum game of identity politics, where ethnic and sectarian groups organized for control over nascent state institutions, further entrenching social cleavages. The unresolved status of oil-rich territories like Kirkuk remains a potent driver of instability, highlighting that state-building efforts that ignore historical identity grievances often fail to produce national cohesion.

Afghanistan: The Reconstruction Gap and Externally Financed Insecurity

Afghanistan illustrates the profound "reconstruction gap" that occurs when massive external investment is disconnected from local realities and conflict dynamics. Early international intervention relied on a "light footprint" strategy that prioritized military objectives over robust state-building, allowing regional warlords and the Taliban to reoccupy ungoverned spaces outside of the capital. Billions of dollars were spent on large-scale infrastructure like the Kabul–Kandahar highway, but these projects often failed because they were perceived as military targets rather than neutral public goods. The failure of the formal state to deliver basic services in the provinces forced citizens to turn to local commanders and insurgent groups for protection and dispute resolution. Furthermore, the international aid system inadvertently created a "dual bureaucracy" that caused a brain drain from the managerial tier of the national government into

higher-paying NGO positions. Regional stakeholders, particularly Pakistan and Iran, acted as "spoilers" by providing havens or support for militant groups to protect their own strategic interests within the vacuum. This case demonstrates that infrastructure and technical assistance alone cannot stabilize a failed state if they bypass the development of indigenous institutional legitimacy and local ownership.

Timor-Leste: UN Transitional Administration as a Complete Takeover

Timor-Leste represents a canonical case of a "complete takeover" or transitional administration where the United Nations assumed full executive and legislative authority. Following the 1999 independence referendum, pro-Indonesian militias executed a "scorched earth" policy that destroyed virtually every government building and school in the territory, leaving it with no functioning state attributes. The UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) acted as the *de facto* state, importing its own laws, courts, and administrators to restore order. While successful in the short term, this top-down model often sidelined Timorese voices and ignored local customary practices, which provided the only form of trusted social organization during the occupation. This exclusion created a "dependency relationship" where the nascent state remained reliant on external experts and donors rather than developing local capacity. The fragility of this model was exposed during the 2006 crisis when regional tensions and military desertions led to a widespread collapse of security. Timor-Leste teaches that even the most well-resourced neo-trusteeship risks producing dysfunctional dynamics if it fails to ground state-building efforts in the lived experiences and cultural norms of the host population.

South Sudan: Infrastructure Disparities and the Resource Curse

South Sudan exemplifies a fragile state where the centralized governance of an infrastructure-intensive resource (oil) failed to build grassroots legitimacy. Since gaining independence in 2011, the state has relied on oil for over 90% of its revenue, yet this wealth remained opaque and centralized among a ruling elite. Infrastructure delivery was often viewed through the lens of identity politics, with perceptions that investments

favored dominant Dinka regions while leaving Nuer and Shilluk zones underdeveloped. This inequitable distribution of resources and services served as a catalyst for renewed violence in 2013 and 2016 as marginalized groups contested the state's authority. The state's extreme fiscal vulnerability was further exacerbated by fluctuating global oil prices and contested pipeline access through Sudan, which limited the government's ability to provide a "peace dividend" to its citizens. Localized peacebuilding initiatives, such as community-driven reconstruction in Jonglei State, have shown potential, but they struggle against the backdrop of fragmented national governance. Ultimately, South Sudan shows that resources that require high capital investment can fuel centralized corruption and conflict if they are not managed through inclusive and transparent institutional frameworks.

DR Congo: Fragmented Authority and the Shadow State

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) presents a scenario where a multiplicity of "lootable" and "combinational" resources has fostered a permanent governance vacuum. Decades of venal leadership under the Mobutu regime depleted state capacity and encouraged international "adventurism" during the subsequent Congo Wars. High-value resources like coltan and gold are governed through a fragmented mix of formal, informal, and illegal structures, allowing armed groups to extract rents through coercion and protection rackets. This fragmentation has contributed to a "shadow state" where private syndicates fulfill functions normally reserved for state institutions. The persistence of violence has led to a massive depletion of leadership capacity, as many talented individuals fled the country as refugees. Furthermore, the conflict in the DRC has repeatedly drawn in neighboring countries, making it a regional dilemma that cannot be resolved through domestic policies alone. The DRC case underscores that when governance structures are misaligned with the realities of resource extraction and local authority, the state remains trapped in a cycle of institutional atrophy and conflict.

Relevant UN Treaties/Resolutions

Charter of the United Nations (1945)

The Charter is the foundational document of international law, designating the Security Council as the body with primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Chapter VI focuses on the "Pacific Settlement of Disputes," emphasizing non-binding measures like negotiation and mediation to resolve conflicts before they escalate. However, the primary tool for addressing failed states is Chapter VII, which allows the Council to authorize the use of force, sanctions, or military intervention to "restore international peace and security". In the 21st century, the application of these Chapters has shifted toward a post-Westphalian model, where the traditional norm of absolute, non-interfering sovereignty is challenged by the reality that state failure and internal civil war are now the primary threats to global stability.

The Brahimi Report (2000)

Formally known as the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, this document was the first comprehensive review to establish post-conflict statebuilding as a core function of UN peace missions. It recognized that simple peacekeeping was insufficient in failed states where institutional voids must be filled to prevent a return to violence. The report urged the Security Council to provide missions with clear mandates and sufficient resources to address the reconstruction gap, the disparity between promised stability and the actual functional capacity of a host state to deliver services.

2005 World Summit Outcome (Resolution 60/1)

This resolution is a milestone in international law as it formally codified the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). It asserts that state sovereignty is not an absolute right but is conditional upon a state’s ability and willingness to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. If a state "fails" this responsibility, RtoP grants the international community the authority to intervene through collective action, effectively moving the international system away from the Westphalian norm of

non-interference toward a solidarist norm based on human rights and standards of governance.

UNSC Resolution 1272 (1999) and the "Complete Takeover" Model

This resolution established the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) following the "scorched earth" campaign by pro-Indonesian militias. UNTAET is the canonical example of a "complete takeover" statebuilding contract, or neo-trusteeship, where the UN assumes full executive and legislative authority. Under this model, the IO (International Organisation) possesses the residual rights of control, meaning it makes all decisions not specified in the initial contract, acting as a *de facto* state to import laws, courts, and administrative structures. While effective at restoring order, this model is often criticized for creating a "dependency relationship" that can sideline local voices.

The Arusha Agreement (2000) and Sequential Burundi Missions

The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement provided the comprehensive framework for Burundi's transition from civil war to democracy, establishing a three-year transitional period. It formed the legal basis for sequential UN missions: ONUB (Resolution 1545) and BINUB (Resolution 1719). Unlike complete takeovers, these were "incomplete arrangements": statebuilding contracts in which the host government retained residual control rights. This allowed the Burundian government to use its procedural repertoire tactics, like demanding the removal of UN envoys or requesting early mission withdrawal, to ensure the intervention aligned with their domestic political interests.

The Lomé Accord (1999) and Sierra Leone Resolutions

The Lomé Peace Accord effectively ended the war in Sierra Leone by bringing the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) into a power-sharing government. It was highly controversial because it granted a "complete amnesty" for war crimes to incentivize the rebels to demobilize. To monitor this accord, the UN passed Resolution 1181, establishing UNOMSIL, which was later replaced by the much larger UNAMSIL force.

These resolutions illustrate the transition from a security-first focus to a broad mandate involving the reintegration of 45,000 combatants and the extension of state authority throughout the territory.

The Kimberley Process (2003)

This international framework was established to break the link between the illicit trade in rough diamonds and the financing of armed conflict. By creating a certification scheme to prevent "blood diamonds" from entering the legitimate market, the agreement targeted the economic drivers of power vacuums. In states like Sierra Leone, this treaty allowed for a hybrid governance model, where the state partnered with traditional chiefs and international actors to ensure that "lootable" resources were used for community development rather than fueling insurgencies.

The "Incomplete Arrangement" and Residual Rights

Most contemporary treaties and resolutions regarding statebuilding are now viewed through the lens of incomplete arrangements. Because it is impossible to specify every contingency in a post-conflict environment, the host state typically maintains the residual rights of control. This gives seemingly "weak" states significant institutional power, allowing them to influence what activities the UN implements, where it operates, who it hires, and when it must exit. This shift underscores the growing norm of "local ownership", where international interventions must negotiate their presence continuously with the host government.

Previous Attempts to Solve the Issue

Previous efforts to address post-conflict power vacuums reveal a clear evolution in international practice: from the limited, consent-based model of traditional peacekeeping toward a far more ambitious project of reconstruction and state-building. Since the 1990s, these interventions have largely been guided by what is commonly described as the liberal peace paradigm. At its core lies a deceptively simple proposition: that the transplantation of market democracy, rule-of-law institutions, and liberal economic reforms will not only stabilize fractured polities but also reintegrate them into the international system. In practice, however, this model has repeatedly struggled to deliver on its promises. What emerges instead is a persistent "reconstruction gap": a mismatch between externally designed institutional blueprints and the state's actual capacity to perform basic governance functions. In many cases, this gap has proven wide enough to allow old patterns of violence to reassert themselves.

The most far-reaching expression of this approach has been the establishment of international transitional administrations, which are sometimes termed "neo-trusteeships." In cases such as Timor-Leste under the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor and Kosovo under the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, the United Nations assumed sweeping executive and legislative authority, effectively governing as a surrogate state. These missions were, in a narrow sense, successful: they restored order in the aftermath of extreme violence and re-established the basic machinery of governance. Yet their longer-term legacy is far more ambivalent. Critics have described them as forms of "benevolent despotism," noting how decision-making structures often marginalized local actors and privileged external expertise. In Timor-Leste, for instance, the reliance on standardized, technocratic solutions frequently overlooks indigenous systems such as *lisan*, which had sustained social order under conditions of occupation. The limits of this model became evident when, despite the apparent institutional consolidation, underlying social and political tensions resurfaced soon after international withdrawal.

Alongside these maximalist interventions, more technocratic strategies have sought to strengthen what practitioners refer to as the “centre of government”, the executive core surrounding heads of state. Agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and the UK’s Department for International Development have invested heavily in administrative capacity-building in contexts including Afghanistan, Iraq, and Liberia. While such programs have occasionally improved formal coordination and policy planning, they have also produced unintended distortions. The creation of parallel administrative structures, often better resourced and more attractive to skilled professionals, has contributed to a hollowing-out of domestic institutions. The resulting “dual bureaucracy” not only undermines state cohesion but also exacerbates dependency on external actors. In environments like Afghanistan, these technocratic fixes proved particularly fragile, as they failed to engage with the underlying political economy of power, where authority frequently resides not in formal institutions but in networks of regional strongmen operating beyond the reach of the state.

Security-focused interventions, particularly Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) programs, have likewise played a central role in stabilizing post-conflict environments. In Sierra Leone, joint efforts by the United Nations and the United Kingdom succeeded in disarming tens of thousands of combatants, marking a significant operational achievement. Yet even here, early setbacks underscored the fragility of such gains: demobilization sites were attacked, and ex-combatants readily crossed porous borders to join conflicts elsewhere in the region. These dynamics highlight a recurring limitation: interventions framed within national boundaries often fail to account for the transnational character of violence. Parallel efforts to promote decentralization and subnational governance have encountered similar difficulties. Legislative reforms such as Sierra Leone’s 2004 Local Government Act, or externally supported initiatives like Iraq’s Local Governance Project, were intended to bridge the gap between state institutions and local communities. In practice, however, these reforms frequently struggled to establish legitimacy. For many citizens, newly created structures appeared either as externally imposed constructs or as extensions of entrenched patronage systems, rather than as genuine vehicles of representation.

More recently, there has been a discernible shift away from comprehensive international control toward more negotiated, limited forms of engagement. These so-called “incomplete arrangements” leave ultimate authority with the host state, granting it what might be termed residual control over the scope and direction of external involvement. In contexts such as Burundi, through successive UN missions, and Guatemala with the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala, governments have exercised this leverage to shape mandates, restrict operational space, and ultimately curtail international presence. While this model is often justified in the language of “local ownership,” it also introduces new constraints. Host governments, particularly where political elites benefit from weak accountability, can deploy procedural tools to resist reforms that threaten their interests. In this sense, local ownership may function less as an emancipatory principle than as a mechanism through which domestic power structures reassert themselves.

Taken together, these experiences point to a consistent underlying problem. Interventions have tended to privilege state-building, the construction of formal institutions, over nation-building, understood as the more elusive process of reconstructing social trust, political legitimacy, and shared identity. Where this imbalance persists, the result is often a state that appears institutionally complete yet remains politically hollow: capable of mimicking the outward forms of governance, but lacking the societal foundations necessary for durable peace.

Possible Solutions

Addressing the challenge of post-conflict power vacuums requires a multi-dimensional strategy that moves beyond the traditional, top-down liberal peace model toward a more nuanced approach centered on strategic reform sequencing and local institutional legitimacy. The first priority in any successful reconstruction effort must be the re-establishment of the state's monopoly on the legitimate use of force through comprehensive Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) programs. This "security first" mandate is a necessary precondition, as without basic order, interaction among actors is reduced to a function of strength, and economic growth remains elusive. However, to avoid the "sequencing fallacy," policymakers must prioritize rebuilding the rule of law and administrative infrastructure before introducing mass competitive elections, which, if held prematurely, risk the mobilization of illiberal forces and a relapse into conflict. Rebuilding effectiveness involves aiming for "good enough governance" rather than attempting to implement an overwhelming menu of Western-style reforms that the fragile state lacks the capacity to absorb. This includes focusing support on the "centers of government"—such as the offices of presidents or prime ministers—to rationalize decision-making while ensuring that international donors do not appear to be running these key positions.

A sustainable solution also requires a shift in how international organizations (IOs) contract with host states, moving away from intrusive "complete takeovers" toward "incomplete arrangements". Under this model, the host government retains the residual rights of control, giving it the institutional power to shape what the mission does, where it operates, and whom it employs. This approach empowers local leaders to remain in the "driver's seat," ensuring that the intervention aligns with domestic political realities and increases the local ownership necessary for long-term stability. Furthermore, rebuilding governance must account for socio-spatial structures by ensuring spatial equity in infrastructure delivery. Targeting historically marginalized regions or borderlands for services like electrification and roads can signal inclusion and rebuild

trust in the state, transforming infrastructure from a symbol of exclusion into a catalyst for reconciliation.

Parallel to building state institutions, a resolute focus on nation-building is required to repair the shredded social fabric of post-conflict societies. This involves shifting from mere restorative justice (such as trials and punishment) toward a more holistic model that includes collective forgiveness, financial reparations, and re-education programs for former regime supporters. Nation-building policies should utilize religious actors and customary authorities, who often retain genuine legitimacy in the eyes of the population, to promote inter-communal dialogue and cooperation through community projects. Integrating these customary institutions (such as traditional chiefs) into formal state structures can provide "output legitimacy" and a more stable form of social organization than imported models. Additionally, resource-rich states must implement transparent hybrid resource governance models, ensuring that "lootable" resources like diamonds are managed through joint state-community mechanisms that provide clear benefit-sharing and prevent them from fueling renewed insurgencies.

Finally, because state failure is often a regional dilemma, possible solutions must incorporate regional stakeholder integration. This requires the creation of formal forums where neighboring states, who may have deep strategic or sectarian interests in the conflict, are provided with incentives, such as monetary aid or a seat at the table, to coordinate their efforts rather than act as "spoilers". By embedding conflict analysis and peace-informed development into every stage of the reconstruction process, the international community can help transform an anarchical vacuum into a stable, legitimate, and functionally effective state.

Bibliography

Interim governance arrangements in post-conflict and fragile settings. Available at: https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/interim-governance-arrangements-in-post-conflict-and-fragile-settings.pdf.

(PDF) conceptualizing "post-conflict reconstruction" and "Ongoing conflict reconstruction" of failed states. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257571700_Conceptualizing_Post-Conflict_Reconstruction_and_Ongoing_Conflict_Reconstruction_of_Failed_States.

Rebuilding governance in failed states and post-conflict societies: Core Concepts and cross-cutting themes - brinkerhoff - 2005 - public administration and development - wiley online library. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pad.352/pdf.

Failed states and international order: Constructing a Post-Westphalian World. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13523260903326479.

Bridoux, J.F. (1970) *U.S. power and post-conflict reconstruction: The cases of Japan and Iraq*, *Kent Academic Repository*. Available at: https://kar.kent.ac.uk/86392/).

Campbell, S.P. and Matanock, A.M. (2024) *Weapons of the weak state: How post-conflict states Shape International Statebuilding - the review of International Organizations*, *SpringerLink*. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11558-024-09546-3.

Canter, M.J. *et al.* (2015) *Perceptions of education change in post-conflict environments and fragile states: The case of timor-leste*.

The failures of post-conflict reconstruction in Sierra Leone and the threat to peace (no date) *Masthead*. Available at: https://www.beyondintractability.org/casestudy/freeman-failure).

Garzón-Vergara, J.C. (2015) *Avoiding the perfect storm: Criminal economies, spoilers, and the post-conflict phase in Colombia: Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, *Stability*. Available at: https://stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.fx.

Heilbrunn, J.R. (2006) *Paying the price of failure: Reconstructing failed and collapsed states in Africa and Central Asia: Perspectives on politics*, *Cambridge Core*. Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/abs/paying-the-price-of-failure-reconstructing-failed-and-collapsed-states-in-africa-and-central-asia/3ECDA163E7AEE189B15107E605B7F598.

KASSAB, H.S. (2024) *Power vacuums and global politics: Areas of state and non-state competition in multipolarity*. S.l.: ROUTLEDGE.