
CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES OF STATENESS ASSESSMENT OF RECOGNIZED AND NON-RECOGNIZED STATES

VIOLETTA MANUKYAN

The establishment of the state is the main aim of each nation as the main mechanism of its safety, prosperity, and natural development. It is noteworthy, that in the second half of the 20th century after the entry of the UN Charter in force, as a result of significant developments in international law, the people's right to self-determination has been recognized as the erga omnes and jus cogens norm¹ of international law and two active periods of state-building were recorded. The first was the raised decolonization wave in 60-70s, in the result of which more than seventy new states were established², the second was the beginning of the 90s, when after the collapse of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia more than two and a half dozen countries declared independence. But, it should be mentioned, that the independence of major of these countries was recognized immediately, whereas some still remain non-recognized.

However, the experience of both the countries established in the second half of the 20th century and the countries established until then shows that the establishment of the state and even its international recognition do not automatically lead to security, prosperity, and ensuring of natural development. Moreover, current situations and development tracks strictly diverse in states, which makes it even more difficult to improve the complex and at the same time fragile system, such as states. Thereby, in the context of the events of the last two decades, the drastic growth of the scientific studies dedicated to the issues of state effectiveness and stateness is quite natural. But the problem is even more complicated for the group of those countries, which haven't been recognized yet, as there exist additional difficulties for stateness, particularly, conditioned by challenges and consequences of conflict phase, stringent limitation of international relations and its consequences, lack of experience and knowledge of building sovereign state, etc. This bucket of problems is a prolific base for state fragility and failure – as a result imposing a great threat to domestic and regional stability and security, and hence requires precise study. But, instead, the issue of post-conflict stateness of non-recognized states hasn't been studied yet and is not assessed by existing assessment models, hence it's required to study what additional challenges and difficulties the prefix 'non' brings with it in addition to the existing difficulties of stateness. The aim of this article is not only to review and evaluate the existing approaches and methods but also to propose solutions to both the lack of comprehensive notion of stateness and integral assessment tool for simultaneously assessing stateness levels of recognized and non-recognized states. An attempt has been made

¹ **Torosyan, T.**, Conflict Resolution in the Framework of International Law. Case of Nagorno-Karabakh, Tigran Mets Publishing House, Yerevan, 2010.

² United Nations Judicial Yearbook 1980, pp. 182-183.

to develop an integral model of assessment of stateness – “Peace Index”, which will be applicable both for recognized and non-recognized states. Integral assessment of stateness allows recording simultaneously both progress and regress in all the fields of stateness hence giving an opportunity to the states and international community to focus on the problem areas and to promptly undertake their solution process. It’s also noteworthy that the index is composed of 4 field-indexes: political, economic, social and security, and their sub-indexes, which comprehensively represent the field. Such an approach would allow fighting against security threats and destabilization, thereby fostering peace and security (which conditioned the name of the index).

The main approaches to the notion of “stateness”

First and foremost, there are issues with the concept of “stateness” itself. It is noteworthy, that though the concepts and models of assessment of stateness have started to develop since the 60s of the past century, they are still in the stage of elaboration and improvement. The term of stateness was first suggested by J. Nettl in his article “The state as a conceptual variable”³ published in 1968, where he mainly focused on the idea of independence of variables of “stateness” and “nationness”. But still, the concept of stateness remains not distinct enough, as further tough work on its conceptualization and operationalization is needed. It can be explained by the objective difficulties of the formulation of the notion, which are associated with the complexity of the notion and the variety of views⁴.

The complexity of the solution of the afore-named problem is conditioned by a number of other factors as well. While talking about the features and capabilities of this or that state, the researchers quite often use such vague words as “strong”, “weak”⁵. It’s noteworthy that the perceptions of various authors about the formulations “strong” and “weak”, characterizing the states, greatly differ from one another: starting with the efficient functioning of state apparatus unto government’s apparent intervention to society’s life, authoritarian governance, developed public sector and the ability to prohibit exceedingly external influence⁶.

Sometimes for describing this or that country authors use controversial concepts like “control”, “power of the state” or “weakness of state”, “failed states”, “fragile states” and other formulations of this sort. In a number of studies the afore-named expressions, used to characterize a country or a group of countries, are substantiated by documentary materials. However, the empirical model, assessment tool, and clear fixation of data of the studied phenomenon are often missing. Additionally, the use of such words and phrases in empirical studies may lead to distortion of notions⁷ and, what is even more hazardous, to an arbitrary interpretation of research results for political purposes⁸.

³ Nettl J., The State as a Conceptual Variable, *World politics*, Vol. 20, N 4, 1968, pp. 559-592.

⁴ Мелешкина Е. Исследования государственной состоятельности: какие уроки мы можем извлечь? // Политическая наука, № 2, 2011, с. 9-27.

⁵ Мелешкина Е., *op. cit.*

⁶ Lauridsen L., The debate on the developmental state // Development theory and the role of the state in third world countries / J. Martinussen (ed.), Roskilde university centre, Roskilde, 1991, pp. 108–133.

⁷ Сартори Дж. Искажение концептов в сравнительной политологии. *Полис*, № 3, Москва, 2003, с. 67-77.

⁸ Мелешкина Е., *op. cit.*

The diversity of the viewpoints on the "stateness" concept can be clearly demonstrated by the study of works dedicated to this issue. According to the fact, how the works represent stateness, or it would be more appropriate to say, how they represent the segregated fields of stateness, the works worthy of remembrance can be divided into the following groups:

- Works defining the two main features of state – statehood and stateness, as well as the influence of statehood and stateness on the formation of territorial units; in particular, participation in international processes and the role of these units in the following processes⁹.
- Works representing the strategic types of stateness with the major focus on ethno-political homogeneity policies and its variants¹⁰.
- Studies focusing on communities' political construction conceptualization and operationalization, the socio-political demarcation concept, representing the most important social riots, which in its turn has a profound institutional reflection in the political system and is able to form the system of government-people relations as a political "body" of the state¹¹.
- The works, which offer conceptual definitions to the process of creation of states and nations, mainly focusing on the alternatives of creation of states¹², the relations between center and periphery, as well as between other socio-political

⁹ **Nettl J.**, The State as a Conceptual Variable, *World politics.*, Vol. 20, N 4, Princeton, 1968, pp. 559-592; **Tilly Ch.**, Reflections on the History of European State-Making, The Formation of National States in Western Europe, Ch. Tilly (ed.), Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1975; **Tilly Ch.**, War Making and State Making as Organized Crime, Bringing the State Back in/ Ed. by Evans P., Rueschemeyer D., Skocpol T., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985; **Spruyt H.**, The Sovereign State and its Competitors. An Analysis of System Change, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996; **Lindberg S.**, Forms of State, Governance and Regime: Reconceptualising the Prospects for Democratic Consolidation in sub-Saharan Africa, *International Political Science Review* 22 (2), 2001, pp. 173-199; **Lindberg S.**, Democratization by Elections: A New Mode of Transition?, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2009; **Lehmbruch G.**, Consociational Democracy and Corporatism in Switzerland, *Publius: The journal of federalism*, Vol. 23, N 2, Oxford, 1993, pp. 43-60; **Fukuyama F.**, State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2004; **Fukuyama F.**, Building Democracy After Conflict, "Stateness" First, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2005, pp. 84-88; **Bartolini S.**, Restructuring Europe: Centre Formation, System Building, and Political Structuring between the Nation State and the European Union, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005; **Мельвиль А., Ильин М., Мелешкина Е. и др.**, Политический атлас современности: Опыт многомерного статистического анализа политических систем современных государств. М., МГИМО–Университет, 2007.

¹⁰ **Rae H.**, State Identities and the Homogenisation of Peoples, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002; **Brubaker R.**, Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996; **Linz J., Stepan A.**, Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Postcommunist Europe, John Hopkins university, Baltimore, London, 1996.

¹¹ **Lijphart A.**, Thinking about Democracy: Power Sharing and Majority Rule in Theory and Practice, Routledge, New York, 2007; **Lijphart A.**, Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration, Yale University Press, New Heaven, London, 1977; **Lijphart A.**, Consociational Democracy, *World Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1969, pp. 207-225; **Daalder H.**, The Consociational Democracy Theme, *World politics*, Vol. 26, N 4, 1974, pp. 604-621; **Lehmbruch G.**, Consociational Democracy and Corporatism in Switzerland, *Publius: The journal of federalism*, Vol. 23, N 2, Oxford, 1993, pp. 43-60; **Lipset S., Rokkan S.**, Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives, The Free Press, New York, 1967; **Caramani D.**, The Nationalization of Politics: The Formation of National Electorates and Party Systems in Western Europe, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2004.

¹² **Moore B.**, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, Beacon, Boston, 1968.

units¹³ and representing the creation of nations as a resume of national standardization and social mobilization¹⁴.

- Works of historical institutionalization supporters, among which worth sticking to are the ones, which take as a subject of analysis the impact of institutional heritage on the process of state development, as well as on extreme situations arisen throughout history and their influence on institutional decision-making actors¹⁵.

- Works trying to represent more or less multilateral study of stateness, but, in fact, still have problems with comprehensiveness¹⁶.

So, the studies dedicated to the issue of stateness focus on giving definitions to separate components of stateness process (attempts offering conceptual definitions of statehood, conceptualization, and institutionalization of communities' political construction, the search of strategic types of stateness, the process of creation of states and nations), but comprehensive conceptual works and empirical comparisons are still missing.

Methods of Stateness Assessment

In political sciences there exist two methods of stateness assessment:

- assessment of segregated fields of stateness by separate indexes¹⁷,
- the assessment of stateness by integral models¹⁸,

¹³ **Rokkan S.**, *Cities, States and Nations: A Dimensional Model for the Study of Contrast in Development*, *Building states and nations: Method and data resources*, Vol. 1., Sage, Beverly Hills, 1973, pp. 13-38; **Rokkan S.**, *Territorial Structures in Western Europe: An Overview and Possible Model*, *Center Periphery Structures in Europe: An ISSC Workbook in Comparative analysis.*, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1987; **Rokkan S.**, *The Center-Periphery Polarity, Center Periphery Structures in Europe: an ISSC Workbook in Comparative analysis*, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1987; **Rokkan S.**, *Territories, Centres, and Peripheries: Toward a Geoethnic-Geoeconomic-Geopolitical Model of Differentiation within Western Europe, Centre and Periphery*, *Spatial Variation in Politics*, ed. by J. Gottmann, Sage Focus Editions, Beverly Hills, London, 1980; **Rokkan S., Valen H.**, *The Mobilization of the Periphery, Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*, Michelsen Institute, Bergen, 1962.

¹⁴ **Deutsch K.**, *Social Mobilization and Political Development*, *American political science review*, Vol. 55, N 3, 1961, pp. 493-514.

¹⁵ **Pierson P.**, *Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics*, *American political science review*, Vol. 94, N2, 2000, pp. 251-267; **Pierson P.**, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 2004; **Ma-honey J.**, *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2001; **Collier R., Collier D.**, *Shaping the Political Arena*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1991; **Skocpol T.**, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979; **Ziblatt D.**, *Structuring the State: the Formation of Italy and Germany and the Puzzle of Federalism*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 2006; *States and Development. Historical Antecedents of Stagnation and Advance*, Ed. by Lange M., Rueschemeyer D., Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005.

¹⁶ **Fritz V.**, *State-Building: A Comparative Study of Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, and Russia*, Central European University Press, Budapest, New York, 2007; **Bartolini S.**, *The Political Mobilization of the European Left, 1860–1980: The Class Cleavage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

¹⁷ See, e.g. *Worldwide Governance Indicators*, The World Bank Group, <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>, 14.01.2020); *Human Development Index*, United Nations Development Programme, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi>, (14.01.2020); *State Fragility Index and Warfare*, Center for Systemic Peace, <http://www.systemicpeace.org/warlist/warlist.htm>, (14.01.2020); *Index of Economic Freedom*, The Heritage Foundation in Partnership with Wall Street Journal, <http://www.heritage.org/index/>, (14.01.2020); **Melville A., Polunin Yu., Ilyin M., Mironyuk M., Timofeev I., Meleshkina E., Vaslavskii Y.**, *Political Atlas of the Modern World*, Southern Gate: Willey and Blackwell, 2010.

¹⁸ See, e.g. *Fragile States Index*, The Fund for Peace, Available from:

Assessment of segregated fields of stateness by separate indexes allows us to accomplish a detailed and throughout the study of each field of the state, as a result giving the opportunity to identify and whereat to rectify the problems and shortcomings existing in that field. However, in order to compile a complete picture of the stateness of a precise country, the afore-named indexes of assessment are non-applicable, as it is extremely hard to combine all separate indexes assessing various fields of stateness. This is conditioned by the fact that it will take plenty of time, effort, and, what is of exceptional importance, the results got through combining data from various indexes can be disputable, as these indexes have different research groups, methodology, and standards. An additional difficulty to this process is added by the fact that there exist several indexes that assess the one and the same field of stateness (e.g. Human Development Index¹⁹ and Quality of Life Index²⁰, Freedom in The World²¹ and Institutional Basis of Democracy²²) and it is necessary to choose which of them to use.

The assessment of stateness by integral models gives the opportunity to present the full picture of stateness of this or that state by exploring all the fields of stateness altogether. Integral models of assessment of stateness are formed with the help of both statistical and expert assessments. Expert assessment requires the solution of a number of problems concerning the operation of the gathered information, i.e. identity of assessment standards, assessment validity, and reliability for all the countries. Forsooth, the most difficult one is the problem of validity, as the purpose of the research, as well as the researcher's personal experience, may lead to periodic (sometimes at all non-accidental and non-realized) errors recorded during the assessment process, which, in their turn, lead to assessment's distortion and lack of validity. The quality and objectivity of expert assessment can be evaluated through a number of parameters: the transparency of the coding algorithm, the accessibility, and availability of provenance required for a checkup, experts' qualifications, etc. Nevertheless, it's worth mentioning that expert assessment is an inseparable part of political empirical studies. Suffice to note that the most popular democracy level assessing indexes represented by Polity IV²³ and Freedom House is based practically entirely on expert assessment.

However, all the existing indexes – both integral and segregated field assessment, with the exception of "Freedom in the World" – represented by Freedom House, do not represent the assessment of non-recognized states. Hence, the peculiarities and possibilities of their assessment should be studied.

Nevertheless, there is growing interest in the assessment of non-recognized states, which is yet expressed only within scholar studies, in particular, in a number of scientific articles attempts are made to study and, what is more important, to assess the non-recognized states through various criteria. One of the most interest-

<https://fragilestatesindex.org/>, (14.01.2020); [Accessed 15.05.2016]; Стукал Д., Хавенсон Т., Моделирование государственной состоятельности постсоциалистических стран, *ПОЛИТЕКС* № 1, 2012; Мельвиль А., Стукал Д., Условия демократии и пределы демократизации. Факторы режимных изменений в посткоммунистических странах: опыт сравнительного и многомерного статистического анализа, *Полис*, № 3, 2011.

¹⁹ Human Development Index and its components, *Ibid*.

²⁰ Political Atlas of the Modern World, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-120.

²¹ Freedom in the World, Freedom House, http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world#.U_io2cV_vVc_ (14.01.2020).

²² Political Atlas of the Modern World, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-131.

²³ Polity IV Project, Center for Systemic Peace, <http://www.systemicpeace.org/polityproject.html> (14.01.2020).

ing ones is the article assessing "the success of secession", which carries the evaluation within the range of -3/+3 points through 10 criteria:

1. the status of autonomy;
2. the objective to preserve its status within the former federal state;
3. the independence from the patron state during making the decision on secession process;
4. the existence of a common border with the patron state;
5. military aggression from the "mother" state;
6. effectiveness of inner autonomy;
7. peacekeeping forces' access to the conflict zone;
8. existence of own language;
9. existence of ethnic majority;
10. recognition by UN member state²⁴.

In another work – representing the assessment of non-recognized states – a tool for identifying and classifying conflict factors has been developed through a comparative analysis of ethnopolitical conflicts in different states and regions of the world. The development of that tool has been carried out with the logic to allow classifying that conflict, grounding, and coordinating the criteria of conflict modernization and activation and identifying effective mechanisms of their solution. Thus, the authors single out the following types of ethnopolitical conflicts: political-administrative, political-institutional, political-territorial. The following factors of actualization of ethnopolitical factors have been singled out:

- historical memory;
- disproportion in economic development and distinct social disbalances;
- cultural-linguistic factor;
- factor of religious (interfaith) contradictions, religious fundamentalism;
- foreign policy factor-including the factor of the struggle for strategic unrenewable resources²⁵.

Of special interest are the works representing the assessment of non-recognized states of post-Soviet space – Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Transnistria. Particularly, work assessing the special role of images of heroes and idols in the formation and certification of group identity, both in-group solidarity and out-group exclusion²⁶. Yet another work represents citizen assessment of public good provision and physical security – providing a measure of how state-building is perceived internally²⁷. Of special interest is the work representing internal political and social dynamics in the afore-mentioned 4 non-recognized states of post-Soviet space. Three main dimensions of their current status and orientation are examined using nine comparative questions:

1. relations with Russia;

²⁴ **Токарев А.**, Сравнительный анализ сецессий на посткоммунистическом пространстве: квантификация факторов влияния, *Полис. Политические исследования*, N4, 2017, с. 106-117.

²⁵ **Семенко И., Лапки В., Пантин В.**, Типология этнополитической конфликтности: методологические вызовы "большой теории", *Полис. Политические исследования*, N6, 2016, с. 69-94.

²⁶ **O'Loughlin J., Kolosov V.**, Building Identities in post-Soviet "de facto states" cultural and political icons in Nagorno-Karabakh, South Ossetia, Transnistria and Abkhazia, *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, Vol. 58, N 6, 2017, pp. 691-715.

²⁷ **Bakke K., Linke A., O'Loughlin J., Toal G.**, Dynamics of state-building after war: External-internal relations in Eurasian de facto states, *Political geography*, 63, 2018, pp. 159-173.

2. support for local institutions;
3. possibilities of post-war reconciliation²⁸.

Challenges of Stateness Assessment of Non-Recognized States

Not only the processes of state-building and stateness (especially the post-conflict ones) are cumbersome: the assessment of post-conflict stateness is also abundant with precise challenges and difficulties. Before launching this research, we have already studied the key factors that condition the process of state-building and stateness, as well revealed their importance and difficulties that they may face after the military phase, i.e. the peculiarities of post-conflict state-building and stateness, as the non-recognized states have emerged in the result of armed conflicts²⁹. The disclosure and study of these processes led this project to a search of an integral index that would present and evaluate the afore-mentioned processes and allow identifying the level of state-building and stateness in the non-recognized states as well. But when launching the initiative of assessment of stateness of non-recognized states alongside recognized ones, a number of difficulties emerged.

First and foremost, the only model that represents the assessment of non-recognized states is “Freedom in the World”, which, in its turn, is only a segregated field assessment model and hence doesn’t refer to other fields, which are of pivotal importance for the assessment of stateness of this or that country. Therefore, as it was already mentioned, for the formation of a complete notion of stateness (of non-recognized states as well), the assessment should be carried out by an integral model of assessment. For this purpose, initially, an attempt was made to assess non-recognized states with the help of Fragile States Index³⁰ (previously Failed State Index), the choice of which was conditioned mainly due to the fact, that the assessment of stateness and state fragility is the reverse manifestation of the same phenomenon. However, it turned out, that all the assessment models of stateness (except for “Freedom in the World”) referring exclusively to recognized states, are using sub-indexes, which do not entirely represent and disclose the problems of stateness of the newly created and non-recognized states and in an each already existing index there were specific fragile points, which would significantly hinder the assessment of stateness of non-recognized states. Fragile States Index was not an exception as well.

In addition to the afore-named problems, some drawbacks were detected in the indexes themselves: e.g. Fragile States Index focuses on an economic sphere only by evaluating the irregularity of economic development of social groups, as well as drastic and/or burdensome economic decadence, whereas in the process of state-building and stateness the importance of promotion of economic development is indisputable, as the state should create favorable conditions for trade, investments, employment, and economic development. But the study of indicated factors in the case of assessment of stateness of non-recognized states is even more fatal (espe-

²⁸ O’Loughlin J., Kolossov V., Toal G., Inside the post-Soviet de facto states: a comparison of attitudes in Abkhazia, Nagorny Karabakh, South Ossetia and Transnistria, *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, Vol 55, N5, 2014, pp. 423-456.

²⁹ Petrosyan V., From Conflict to Peace: The Features of Post-Conflict State-Building, *Armenian Journal of Political Science*, 1 (4), 2016, pp. 15-44. /Author changed her surname from Petrosyan to Manukyan in 2018/.

³⁰ Fragile States Index, <https://fragilestatesindex.org/>, (14.01.2020).

cially the issues of trade and investments), particularly conditioned by stringent limitation of any type of international relations, when in this cumbersome plight they should develop their economy along with the “ideal” pack of challenges: reconstruction and rehabilitation of the whole country after the military phase, worldwide deepening of the globalization process, and in the case of the countries of Post-Soviet space the pack accrues with the process of Post-Soviet transformation.

Another problem of assessment of stateness of non-recognized states, which is of no less importance, is the lack and in some cases total absence of information. It should be noted, that the majority of indexes use both official information, statistical data, reports from the official websites of the countries, scientific articles and monographs, and at the same time carry out their own expert assessment; and the total of the afore-named two types of research (analysis of the quantitative data and the input of qualitative data) presents the final assessment of countries of the particular index (within the scope of our model we use the same format of assessment). However, sometimes it is extremely difficult to find the necessary information on the official websites of the non-recognized states; particularly extensive difficulties arose while reviewing the non-recognized states of Post-Soviet space. Gratifying exceptions are the Nagorno-Karabakh’s official websites. Simultaneously, the scientific articles, monographs, and publications dedicated to non-recognized states are few and contradictory, whereas these countries also require evaluation and review of their process of stateness.

The above-mentioned circumstances, in its turn, drive to another onerous problem: in terms of the absence of statistical data (assessment indexes, official data, scientific articles and monographs concerning non-recognized states) the assessment of stateness of non-recognized states should be carried out mainly by expert analysis, which for its part leads to already discussed problems that fetch with it expert assessment. But as we have already mentioned expert assessment, despite the existing problems, truly has an essential importance in the assessment of stateness and it’s arduous to compose an assessment model without it, and our proposed model is not an exception as well. So in the framework of our proposed model, we do not strive to minimize the role and the impact of expert assessment, instead, we see the cradle of the solution of the problem in the elimination of personalization while assessing stateness.

But another problem still hangs in the air: the equivalence of assessment criteria for all the states, no matter if they are recognized or non-recognized. But in the current situation, we have recognized states, which do not have problems with established international relations, whether, on the other hand, we have also non-recognized ones, which do have those problems. Hence the question is: is it fair to assess the non-recognized states alongside the recognized ones, especially taking into account the fact that being not or partly recognized they still completely or greatly lack international relations and the opportunities the latter tend to bring with them. But “every medal has two sides”. At the same time, some recognized states (mainly European) have a lack of military strength, whereas some non-recognized states do not. For instance, in a number of recognized states (e.g. Switzerland) the existences of the armed forces, especially its size, are indeed not a vital factor for stateness. These countries successfully use other mechanisms, particularly supranational bodies and security guarantees. On the other hand, the existing military potential may become the primary means of ensuring state sovereignty and national

security, in particular in the cases of major failures of international administration bodies and efforts of peace maintenance, especially in the context of the current rise of terroristic attacks. However, there are some states, where the size of military forces is bigger comparing to the population (e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh), but still, it doesn't guarantee the absence of problems associated with stateness in these countries. While observing the question from another angle, it can be stated, that the military potential, which doesn't get precise economic support, can become fragile and quickly lose its significance, as the process of extensive and intensive armament is expensive and at the same time encounters the problem of an unceasing equipment upgrade. But should it mean that we need to eliminate from the stateness assessment model the indicators for established international relations or military strength? Definitely no! So what are the perspectives for the solution to these problems?

Perspectives of Stateness Assessment of Recognized and Non-Recognized States

The solution of the afore-named problems requires a set of comprehensive actions. The first step should be the presentation of an integral model of assessment of stateness, the main evaluative and analytical tool of which should be the ***"state-ness" – as the state's capacity of performing its main functions, becoming a full member of the international community and a subject of international law.*** This definition has been elaborated on in the result of a comprehensive study of all the factors ensuring the processes of state-building and stateness. That same study led to the idea, that statehood/legal personality is a constituent part, particularly, in fact, the very basis and driving force ensuring state development and sustainability. The lack of it inevitably leads to a number of problems for stateness, which will be hereinafter practically shown on the example of the reviewed non-recognized states. So, one can assume that non-recognized status is a real challenge for a state, but the dilemma is that a number of states - both recognized a pretty long time ago and comparatively freshly recognized – are in a way worse situation than some non-recognized states, though they enjoy the privileges of being recognized and do not have to face the challenges deriving from being non-recognized. Just an enumeration of these states is quite sufficient, as their number is not that little: Somalia, Central African Republic, Sudan, Pakistan, Burundi, Iraq, Chad, Afghanistan, Haiti, Guinea, Nigeria, Yemen, Zimbabwe, Niger, Myanmar, North Korea, Guinea Bissau, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Libya, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Uganda, as well as states relatively recently emerged and recognized on self-determination principle – Eritrea, Timor Leste, and South Sudan. And the aforementioned list can still be continued. So, though statehood/legal personality is a must and basis for the efficiency of state-building and stateness processes, the existence of it is not automatically ensuring development and sustainability.

This is the reason why the index aims to represent an integral model of assessment of stateness, which will be applicable both for recognized and non-recognized states. The creation of a model, which will have a practical implementation, can become a truthfully helpful tool for identifying the existing and potential problems. Integral assessment of stateness allows recording simultaneously both progress and regress in all the fields of stateness hence allowing the states and the international community to focus on the problem areas and to promptly undertake their solution process. Such an approach would allow fighting against security

threats and destabilization, thereby fostering peace and security (which conditioned the name of the index – ‘Peace to the World’ Index). For fulfilling the outlined aim, an attempt was made to solve the following problems:

- While composing the model include all the basic features conditioning and underpinning the processes of state-building and stateness, with the emphasis on the comprehensive study of stateness level of both recognized and non-recognized states, without separating them or giving any type of privilege to any of them.
- Select as sub-indexes the features conditioning stateness and collocate them within the outlined indexes representing all the fields of stateness:
 - Political Index,
 - Economic Index,
 - Social Index,
 - Security Index.

These indices portray all the key spheres for stateness assessment. Each of them, in its turn, is represented through sub-indexes, which thoroughly render the outlined sphere and of course all the necessary prerequisites conditioning the effective determination and assessment of stateness level. It should be noted, that the latter have been chosen taking into account the core features and conditions of state-building and stateness³¹, as well as the study of segregated field and integral stateness assessment models. To avoid problems with the equivalence of assessment criteria for all the states and assessment objectivity, it’s necessary to ensure the universality, i.e. applicability of each sub-index to all the states.

- Draw special attention to the security sphere. As a rule, in integral models security sector is not represented as a separate sphere. Instead, they represent security indicators within the political index - only with one or maximum two irrelevantly included sub-indexes. But taking into account the fact, that the index would also assess the stateness level of non-recognized states, which in post-conflict phase in the terms of absence or underdevelopment of international and local control mechanisms over the state become a truthfully prolific ground for the emergence and development of illegal groups and activities, the factors conditioning security long for peculiar attention. Moreover, given the current threats to international security and peace, non-stable entities (no matter recognized or non-recognized states), the study of the security sector should be raised to a new level.

“Peace Index”

Political Index	30
• State legitimacy	5
• Political stability	5
• Governance effectiveness	5
• Constitutionality and rule of law	5
• The right to vote	5
• Effective Mechanisms against corruption	5

³¹ **Petrosyan V.**, From Conflict to Peace: The Features of Post-Conflict State-Building, Armenian Journal of Political Science, 1 (4), 2016, pp. 15-44; **Petrosyan V.**, The Dilemma of International Recognition of States Emerged on the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination: The World after Yugoslavia, Armenian Journal of Political Science, 2 (5), 2016, pp. 107-132. /Author changed her surname from Petrosyan to Manukyan in 2018/; **Manukyan V.**, The Challenges of Post-Conflict Stateness: The Case of Artsakh, Scientific Artsakh, N1, 2018, pp. 243-248.

<u>Economic Index</u>	<u>35</u>
• GDP per capita /USD/	5
• GDP annual growth rates	5
• Income / Expenses GDP	5
• Import / Net exports /GDP %/	5
• External debt to GDP ratio % /	5
• Efficient income distribution /Gini coefficient and expert assessment/	5
• Economic freedom	
<u>Social Index</u>	
	<u>30</u>
• Employment indicator	5
• Quality of public services	5
• Accessibility and quality of health care and mandatory medical insurance	5
• Literacy rate and quality of education	5
• Minimal social conditions and protection of rights of refugees and IDPs	5
• Environmental protection	5
<u>Security Index</u>	
	<u>30</u>
• Quality and Efficiency of Security Agencies	5
• Border and customs control	5
• Absence of secessionist tendencies, civil wars, units having territorial claims, illegal armed units, not self-determination conflicts and domestic armed conflicts	5
• Absence of foreign military bases and peacekeeping missions	5
• Absence of illicit activities (drugs, illegal arms, trafficking)	5
• Absence of external threats	5

The Methodology

Within the “Peace to World” stateness assessment index a precise methodology has been developed, which would allow to carry out as objective evaluation as possible for each state. As the index assesses stateness level of both recognized and non-recognized states, there was a need to develop a methodology, which could have been implemented for both. The latter, was indeed a real challenge, as for comprehensive study we should use both qualitative and quantitative data, which is possible to fulfill by collecting the following three types of information:

- official information, statistical data, reports from the official websites of the countries,
- scientific articles and monographs,
- carried out own expert assessment.

However, a portion of the outlined information, mainly official and statistical data, reports from the official websites of the countries, as well as scientific articles and monographs, is quite problematic, especially in the case of non-recognized states, as the latter is either unavailable or is entirely missing. As an initial solution

to the problem of official information and statistical data will be used the method of direct connection with the non-recognized states and the official request for information. The effectiveness of this solution regarding practical implementation would be evaluated during the application of the model. The goals and objectives of the index would be represented to the authorities of non-recognized states, but certainly, there is concern that some non-recognized states can disagree to provide the requested information. Apparently, in this case, the solution may be the expert assessment mission to that non-recognized state. What about the scientific articles and monographs: it's planned to develop a special search program, which could find all the articles and monographs available on the internet. However, the scientific works dedicated to non-recognized states have quantitative and qualitative shortcomings and we will try to fill this gap through expert assessment.

The index presents a three-level system of assessment and processing of results:

1. case-study,
2. cluster analyses – according to the regions (with both recognized and non-recognized states within the region), as well as separate cluster analyses only for the non-recognized states,
3. global comparison.

For each of the outlined assessment levels has been developed a precise methodology, which would allow solving the proposed tasks within each level as efficiently as possible. At the same time, within the scope of each level of assessment and processing of results detailed reports are planned to be published.

Case-Study

Within the “Peace to World” model each sub-index has a precise assessment criterion. I.e., if each sub-index is assessed within 5 points, then there should be a pre-determined criterion for each point (0-5) representing in which case this or that condition within the sub-index will be given this or that score. A special five-level positional ranking methodology is developed, which will help to group the results according to the following levels:

1. sustainable – 100-125,
2. middle level of sustainability – 75-100,
3. fragile – 50-75,
4. under the threat of failure – 25-50,
5. failed – 0-25:

The results for the first level of assessment – case-study, would be represented by sub-indexes. The majority of the existing indexes don't represent the content part of the assessment of stateness level of each country – instead, in front of each sub-index publishing only numerical scores and of course their sum – the final score rating of each state. In this case, it's impossible to get information about the results of the carried assessment, to assess their objectiveness and validity, as well as apply them for within our research. To avoid these problems, all the results obtained in the scope of the “Peace Index” will be published represented by the sub-indexes in very detailed reports.

Cluster analysis

For the second: cluster analysis, level of assessment a special methodology of evaluation and comparison is developed. To avoid inferiority and possible distortion of the results recorded during the stateness level assessment, it is necessary not to

compare the final scores of assessment, but to perform the comparison amongst the sub-indexes, which is of course relatively more time consuming, but still more efficient.

Global comparison

For the third: global comparison, level of assessment, taking into account the huge volume of information need to be cultivated, as well as the fact, that during the first and second levels of assessment the results for each state and the results of cluster analyses have already been comprehensively represented, it is more reasonable to limit the comparison within numerical scores recorded for each sub-index.

It is also planned to publish a report representing annual development dynamics, which will allow representing chronologically (by years) both progress and regress dynamics of recorded results within sub-indexes and final scores of each state. Such reports are also important due to the rating comparison among the states, which is quite comprehensible, as without rating and content comparison it is practically impossible to compile a comprehensive picture of developments in the state, in the region and the whole world. A number of existing models publish annual development (or in some cases - regression) dynamics reports, however, the aforementioned models represent the results of the states neither by sub-indexes nor even final scores, instead only representing various charts with just numerical values recorded during different years.

Conclusion

- The study on stateness has shown that authors often use controversial terms, sometimes allegories and not very efficient tools while defining stateness, or the definition is simply missing. This approach is widespread not only in political science, but also in the scientific circles, which is not only due to the complexity of the problem but also because of the absence of precise criteria of assessing stateness. The afore-mentioned leads to arbitrary political assessments on states' "strength", "weakness", disintegration, capacity/incapacity, influence, etc. That type of approach does not allow to objectively studying the phenomenon of stateness. As a result, the studies dedicated to the study of stateness issue focus solely on giving definitions to separate components of stateness process, but comprehensive conceptual works and empirical comparisons are still missing.

- The comprehensive study of all the basic features conditioning and underpinning the processes of state-building and stateness led to the proposition of a conceptual and functional definition of the term "stateness", which essentially solves the problem of an insufficiently clear definition of the term. "Stateness" is defined as 'the state's capacity of performing its main functions, becoming a full member of the international community and a subject of international law'. Within the proposed definition, statehood/legal personality is viewed as a constituent part of stateness, particularly; in fact, the very basis and driving force ensuring state development and sustainability.

- According to the inclusion of assessment results, there are two forms of stateness assessment: assessment of segregated fields by separate indexes and assessment by integral models. Stateness assessment of segregated fields by separate indexes allows accomplishing a detailed study of a separate field of state activity – revealing the existing problems. The solution to that problem would undoubtedly improve the stateness level; however, to compile a complete picture of stateness of a precise country, there would be a problem of combining data from various in-

dexes. Though integral assessment models solve that problem, information processing requires the solution of other – even more, complex problems concerning the operation of the gathered information, assessment validity and reliability for all the countries, etc. Integral assessment models can be rightfully called the best practices of compound assessment, each of them has several shortcomings. First of all, it concerns the justification of indicators selection and combination mechanisms.

- The process of stateness assessment of non-recognized states is inevitably accompanied by a number of issues, particularly: the only model that represents the assessment of non-recognized states is “Freedom in the World” is only a segregated field assessment model and hence doesn’t refer to other fields, which are of pivotal importance for the assessment of stateness of this or that country. Some drawbacks are detected in the existing indexes themselves – making them useless for the assessment of non-recognized states. There is a lack and in some cases total absence of information – both quantitative and qualitative. The scientific articles, monographs, and publications dedicated to non-recognized states are few and contradictory, whereas these countries also need evaluation and review of their process of stateness. In the terms of absence of statistical data (assessment indexes, official data, scientific articles, and monographs concerning non-recognized states) the assessment of stateness of non-recognized states should be carried out mainly by expert analysis, which for its part leads to the problems that fetch with it expert assessment. And finally, there is a problem of the equivalence of assessment criteria for all the states, no matter if they are recognized or non-recognized.

- The afore-mentioned problems and the challenges registered while starting the initiative of stateness assessment of non-recognized states can be managed through the proposed integral assessment model - “Peace Index”. The methodology of the index is designed to avoid problems with the equivalence of assessment criteria for all the states and assessment objectivity - ensuring the universality, i.e. applicability of each sub-index to all the states /both recognized and non-recognized/. The sub-indexes have been selected to represent the basic features conditioning and underpinning the processes of state-building and stateness, and unlike other already existing indexes, the “Peace Index” draws special attention to the security field – representing it through the separate index and its sub-indexes. A three-level system (1. case studies, 2. cluster analysis, 3. global comparison) of assessment and processing of results is developed to give the opportunity to get information about the results of the carried assessment, to assess their objectiveness and validity, as well as apply them within researches of other scholars. All the results obtained in the scope of the “Peace Index” will be published represented by the sub-indexes in very detailed reports.

Key words: Stateness, assessment methods, assessment of segregated fields of stateness, integral assessment models, indexes, peace

ՎԻՈՒԵՏՏԱ ՄԱՆՈՒԿՅԱՆ – Ճանաչված և չճանաչված պետությունների կայացածության գնահատման մարտահրավերներն ու հեռանկարները – Հոդվածում ներկայացված են «պետության կայացածություն» եզրույթի հիմնական մոտեցումները, ինչպես նաև թե՛ ճանաչված, թե՛ չճանաչված պետությունների կայացածության մակարդակների գնահատման մարտահրավերներն ու հեռանկարները: Թեև պետության կայացածության խնդիրն ակտիվ քննար-

կումների առարկա է սկսած անցած դարի 60-ական թթ., և այդ ընթացքում մշակվել են պետության կայացածության գնահատման մի շարք հայեցակարգեր ու մոդելներ, դրանք դեռևս լրամշակման ու կատարելագործման փուլում են: Խնդիրն այն է, որ պետությունների կայացածության հայեցակարգը դեռևս ոչ բավարար է հստակեցված, դրա հայեցակարգային և գործառնությանին ձևակերպումների վրա հետագա աշխատանքի կարիք կա: Խնդիրը պահանջում է «պետության կայացածություն» եզրույթի հստակեցում, ինչը ենթադրում է համապարփակ ուսումնասիրություն և պետության կայացածության գնահատման գործիքի առաջարկ: Այսպիսով, հողվածում փորձ է արվում ներկայացնել պետության կայացածության ինտեգրալ գնահատման մոդել, որը կիրառելի կլինի թե՛ ճանաչված, թե՛ չճանաչված պետությունների համար:

Բանալի բառեր – *«պետության կայացածություն», գնահատման մեթոդներ, առանձին ոլորտների գնահատման մոդելներ, ինտեգրալ գնահատման մոդելներ, ցուցիչներ, խաղաղություն*

ВИОЛЕТТА МАНУКЯН – Проблемы и перспективы оценки государственной состоятельности признанных и непризнанных стран. – В статье рассматриваются основные подходы к государственной состоятельности признанных и непризнанных государств. Хотя этот вопрос стал предметом политического анализа с 60-х годов прошлого века и с тех пор разработан ряд концепций и моделей, они всё ещё находятся в процессе совершенствования. Проблема возникает из-за того, что сама концепция государственной состоятельности остаётся недостаточно чёткой. Её решение требует уточнения понятия, что подразумевает всестороннее исследование и новый инструмент оценки.

Ключевые слова: *«государственная состоятельность», методы оценки, модели оценки отдельных спектров, интегральные модели оценки, индексы, мир*

Ներկայացվել է՝ 27.01.2020, Գրախոսվել է՝ 25.02.2020, Ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 25.05.2020