

# Rebuilding the state and global actors

Msc. NGADHNJIM BROVINA

International Relations and Diplomacy, ILIRIA College  
St. Gazmed Zajmi, no.75, 10060, Prishtina, REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO  
[ngadhnjim.brovina@uiliria.org](mailto:ngadhnjim.brovina@uiliria.org)

## Abstract

Human society is a phenomenon as subtle as well as present to resolve problematic backgrounds. This society as a starting point has its organization in geographically separate political communities and their relationship between conflict and cooperation resulting from their common political coexistence. International society should be understood also as a separate institutional responsibility to accommodate the reality of political coexistence. Since ancient times up to the present has experienced various forms but also found being a connection or relationship between independent political communities already conceived as a state.

History is not a science that deals with the past, it also brings many fruitful elements to build the future. Background experiences of developed countries can be taken as an example by countries which have entered into those phases and historical processes, which for the developed countries already belong to history. These experiences can adapt to today and thus avoid or overcome crises and problems in some countries in the developing world, by helping to establish or rebuild their countries. When it comes to the notion of state, we talk about a quite broad and complex topic in various fields.

But first, what is the state concept? The state is the concept with which most often is associated the very meaning of politics and many other fields, such as economy, culture, geography, history, geo-economics, geopolitics, the international relations, diplomacy, etc., as well as human society itself. At least until politics, power and even the government can exist outside the context of the state in general people associate these phenomena with the state. The state has been the central theme and key concept of every political thought from antiquity to World War II. After World War II the concept of "state" was reprimanded by many as inconvenient for political science especially in the U.S. but in the last two decades the returning this concept has returned in political science as well as in the debate and the development of politics, diplomacy, economy, military of any country of the world.

*Key words: state, global actors, great powers, institutions.*

## **1. The challenges of creating states in different historical periods**

First States by history were slave states, which were formed as a result of the long development of human history.

People who have created the state were not aware that they had created it, they were not aware that they had taken a giant step in the development of human society, had passed by a prehistory in the history, from the BARBARIS have entered into economic civilizations.

The state as an ancient human institution dates 6000 years ago, at the first agricultural societies that were created in Mesopotamia. All those countries in different historical periods have undergone changes in all areas of their development, as in the economic field, in the military field, and the political or different systems world

In China, the state bureaucracy has existed for thousands of years while the modern state in Europe with tatuese force, large army, and centralized bureaucracy that has exercised sovereign authority in a wide area is created much more later, about four or five hundred years ago, more specifically the empowerment of monarchies of France, Spain and Sweden, countries that were built as capable of ensuring law, order, security, and property rights, those states brought the modern economic world today.

When we talk about the modern policy of states, its task was mitigation of the power of state by directing its activities toward judged objectives, which for citizens are considered to be legitimate to serve them by the law.

Before the European colonization, this aspect was non-existent in large parts of the world, such as sub-Saharan Africa. After the World War II, decentralization brought a benchmark of state construction throughout the entire developing world like India and China, but this plan for other parts of Africa, Asia and the Middle East remained just plan on paper. The last European empire that was collapsed was the former Soviet Union, which began the process but faced with many problems.

The policies of twentieth century which began after the new liberal world order, headed by the world's most liberal state of Great Britain, were highly related when it comes to the size and power of the state, but also there was not enough expanded activity of state , nor in the other powers like Europe, except of in the military sphere whereas in the U.S. was even closer. At the

time when the century approached to the war, and revolutions, the liberal world order collapsed and as a result, the liberal state was replaced in more centralized and active state.

Trends that have attempted to draw the liberal civil society and to subdue individuals for their intentions ended in 1945 by defeat of Nazi Germany, and in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin Wall. The scope of the state, its size and functions also increased in non-totalitarian countries, including all democracies during the first three quarters of the twentieth century. However, this increase had the consequences of unexpected calls, which led on counteractions in the form of "Thatcherism" and "Reaganism".

The policies of the 1980s and 1990s were characterized by reinstating the liberal ideas in the developed world, to keep the increasing flow of state space. Afterwards the etatism problems, communism gave reverse momentum to the reduction of state in non-communist countries. This period of years 1980-1990 was the main theme of reducing the size of the state sector, when a large number of countries in the former communist world like Latin America, Asia, Africa were emerging from authoritarian rule, known as the third wave of democratization. In response to these developments was the package of measures by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and the U.S. government with the intention to reduce the degree of state intervention in economic affairs. The Washington Consensus in the beginning of XXI century, was criticized very firmly by anti-globalization as well as from the academic world critics.

## **2. The functioning of the institutions after reconstruction**

State building is the creation of new government institutions and empowerment of existing ones. State building is a very important issue for the world community, because of the small poor countries which are resources for many world serious problems starting from poverty, terrorism, etc.

The community of development policies after the Cold War began under the intellectual dominance of economists, who exerted pressure for liberalization and reduction of state.<sup>1</sup> But, after 10 years, many economists have concluded that a lot of the variables associated with the development of a state were not only an economic, but also have been closely linked with the institutions and policies. It was understood that there were missing dimensions and which should be explore, i.e. State building was the vision of its narrow scope.

Already is well known that institutions are vital variables to development, thing that is also proven by many studies. Democracy, federalism, decentralization, social participation capitalist, culture, gender, ethnicity and ethnic conflicts are attached as a component of development of the state. To the formation and development of state is not final the importance of institutions, therein took place many elements but which in some ways are related with the functioning of respectable institutions.

According to Francis Fukuyama exist four aspects or areas of the country that should be treated for the functioning of offerings of the institutions. These four aspects are:

- 1.) Organizational and management plan;
- 2.) Plan of the political system;
- 3.) Bases of legitimacy;
- 4.) Structural and cultural factors

## **2.1 Organizational and Management Plan**

This aspect corresponds on the study of management of the state, when it comes to the private sector and comparison with public administration and public sector.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, “Ndërtimi i shtetit (qeverisja dhe rendi i ri botëror në shekuulin e njëzet e një)”, Tiranë, 2008, p.49.

<sup>2</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, “Ndërtimi i shtetit (qeverisja dhe rendi i ri botëror në shekuulin e njëzet e një)”, Tiranë, 2008, p.51.

By entering in more detail in this plan, we are dealing with public administration, which is very wide and very developed area that has a lot of specialized sub-branches each in its respective function. Public administration in fact is an expertise in which anyone can be trained and evaluated. It is a social discipline, which mostly remains in problem analysis stage. Public administration opposes a private one and within it is not included the business administration. In American literature, the distinction between public and private administration is expressed in their character, because public administration is considered political while private ones are devoid of politics. The function of public administration is broad because it incorporates the activities of the state administration and institutions with public character work. Public administration differs from other forms of governance by competence and the fact that its ultimate goal is the general interest.

However, is not so simple the function of public administration. There are also other issues that require political choices for the administration problems, choices these that should be local.

## **2.2 Political System Plan**

This plan has to do with institutional leadership at the state level, rather than by particular agencies that comprise it. Until the 1980s was stated that institutions did not matter or were determined from sub social-economic structures. However the Institutionalization returned during the last years as a sub-field of comparative politics, in studies of the economic growth of parliamentary system versus the presidential, as well as different electoral systems as federalism, party systems, etc.<sup>3</sup>

When we consider economic objectives, which in most of the societies are competing with others: as fair division or ethnic balance, cannot exist an optimal set of institutions, but may have only institutions that favor one group of goods alongside one another. Here we can say that in practice the same institution can promote economic growth or curtail depending on the existence of complementary institutions that promote their operation. An example of this case is

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 53.

that federalism and decentralization are emerged as the ways of making government more politically responsible wrapper of economic growth.

The plan of political system to enrich with theoretical presentation, relies on a research in which tendencies towards exploitative and the participating policies encourages under a variety of conditions, with a lot of regional members, as well as geographically small electoral zones and representation with open lists, even though ranking of the membership system depends on historical sphere of expanding the right to vote and bureaucratic reform.

### **2.3 Basis of legitimacy**

The state's third sphere consists on the issue of systemic institutional plan, including normative dimension. Thus state institutions should work from the administrative point of view, and that society should perceive as legitimate. However according to the book of Samuel Huntington, "Political order in changing societies" argued that countries can be governed and have state attributes regardless of the basis of legitimacy.<sup>4</sup> Example is the former Soviet Union and the U.S. as highly developed political societies, even though that one functioned in the form of communist dictatorship while the other in the form of liberal democracy. But still we cannot say that state capacity (political development) can be easily separated from legitimacy, it is because the former Soviet Union began its disintegration as a result of the dictatorial leadership which had put his system as illegitimate in life its people.

In historical terms, the legitimacy had different forms, but nowadays in period that we are living today the only source of legitimacy is democracy.

However, even in this case we have contradictions that analyze the issue of good functioning of democracy and authoritarianism. For example: when we talk about democracy is known that a good state institution, is the one that serves with transparency and efficiency the needs of its people, we can mention here monetary policy objectives which are generally simple and accessed independently, therefore central banks operate on a manner which protects from political pressure, otherwise this from other state sectors such as education, which depends

---

<sup>4</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, "Ndërtimi i shtetit (qeverisja dhe rendi i ri botëror në shekuulin e njëzet e një)", Tiranë, 2008, p.55.

heavily on government information services, therefore democracy in addition of protecting the legitimacy also performs a useful function in government.

In another case when we talk about authoritarianism, then it is not the element that determines economic output, but rather the quality of authoritarian leaders, and therefore these cases have larger fluctuations than democratic ones in the case of development results. This is because in democracy it is right to be opposed to inadequate leadership skills, meanwhile in authoritarianism you cannot take away the leader with free vote, and therefore these countries with this kind of regime legitimacy have long-term problems.

However, watching and the other side of the coin, the relationship between democracy and development is still with some uncertainty that will be resolved in the future. This is justified by the fact that although democracy has shown great success in increasing the low levels of development in many countries, it is also linked to negative consequences in average levels of GDP per capita, as e.g. looting and clientelism in Turkey, Brazil, Argentina, populism in Venezuela, corruption in Pakistan, etc. These are state legitimacy challenges to between democracy and authoritarianism, which urge solution in cases of uncertainty.

## **2.4 Structural and cultural factors**

This area is of great importance for the institutional and sub political capacity, associated with the norms, values and culture of the state. These elements are quite influential in the achievements of state national and international aspects.

We must be clear that the development of formal institutions is greatly influenced by cultural factors. As an example, we have quite argumentative institutional quality of economic planning agencies in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan that had roots in the bureaucratic century old tradition, specific tangerine for each country, where the elite who led these agencies had tremendous impact on the ultimate success.<sup>5</sup>

In cases where the state agencies are responsible to the public, in fact are matters of institutional planning (or internal checks and balances), but in the end are the people to whom the government serves. This could be another example of how unofficial habits affect official institutions related to the role of social capital.

---

<sup>5</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, “Ndërtimi i shtetit (qeverisja dhe rendi i ri botëror në shekuulin e njëzet e një)”, Tiranë, 2008, p.60.

Society organized in different groups either observers or various forms of organized, can affect its demands to the government, but on the other hand, a society without organized in separate groups of individuals, can bring different problems that lead to huge disorders in the functionality of institutions. This can be expressed differently as an effect of customs of that society or how it is used to work in her state through years; in an organized or unorganized way, a case that argues the extent the influence of cultural and structural factors.

### **3. Germany as an example of building and reconstruction in certain periods**

A region named Germany, inhabited by several German is known and documented before AD 100. From the tenth century, German territories formed the central part of the Holy Roman Empire, which lasted until 1806. During the sixteenth century, northern Germany became the center of the Protestant Reformation. As a modern nation state, the country was first unified amidst the Franco-Prussian War in 1871.

After World War II, Germany was divided into two separate states along the lines of occupation by the Allies in 1949. The war resulted in the deaths of about 10 million German soldiers and civilians with territorial losses, the expulsion of about 15 million Germans from the former eastern territories and other countries and the destruction of many large cities.

Berlin was divided into four military occupation zones, controlled sector of France, Great Britain, and the United States, where all these on May 23, 1949 merged to form the Federal Republic of Germany. On October 7, 1949, the Soviet Zone established the German Democratic Republic. These two were not officially recognized as "West Germany" and "East Germany" as well as parts of Berlin as "West Berlin" and "East Berlin". However, West Germany declared the status of its capital as temporary, in order to emphasize its stance that the two-state solution was an artificial "status quo" that someday would be overcome.<sup>6</sup>

West Germany, established as a federal parliamentary republic with a "social market economy" became allied with the United States, Great Britain and France. The state eventually began to enjoy economic growth in the 50's, where West Germany was attached to NATO in 1955 and was a founding member of the European Economic Community in 1958.

---

<sup>6</sup> Kissinger, Henry, "Diplomacia", Tiranë, 1999, p.569.



East Germany was an Eastern bloc state under political and military control of the USSR through its occupation forces and the Warsaw Pact. While pretended to be a democracy, political power only executed by leading members of the PSU (Socialist Union Party of Germany) controlled by communists.

Tensions between the two Germanys were reduced slightly in the 1970s by Chancellor Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik, which included "de facto" an admission for Germany's territorial losses in World War II.<sup>7</sup>

Under the increasing migration of East Germans to West Germany via Hungary and mass demonstrations in the summer of 1989, East German authorities unexpectedly facilitated the border restrictions in November, allowing East German citizens to travel to the west. Originally intended as a pressure valve to retain East Germany as a state, the opening of the border actually led to an acceleration of the reform process in East Germany, which finally concluded with the Two Plus Four Treaty, a year later on September 12, 1990 and the reunification of its 3 October 1990.<sup>8</sup>

Since reunification, Germany has taken a leading role in the European Union and NATO. Germany sent a peacekeeping force to secure stability in the Balkans and sent a force of its troops in Afghanistan as part of a NATO effort to provide security in that country by Taliban threats. Today Germany is part of the borderless Schengen zone and adopted the European currency Euro in 1999.<sup>9</sup>

## 4. Conclusions

In entire, this paper is talking about society as an initial, that one that has created the state and everything within its, then about the state, since its creation in ancient times until today, as in

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p.587.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p.592-593.

<sup>9</sup> Julian Borger, (2012), "Germany slowly comes to terms with sending its armed forces abroad", The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/sep/18/germany-military-modernise-foreign-intervention> (16.04.2013).

the historical terms as well as in the legal system, continuing with further with cooperations, possible international cooperations under the influence of global actors to diplomacy. All of these areas we see every day, live among their elements and mutually adapt to them, but if we not perceive them as legitimate then continue counter responses to cause problems, which later will continue to handle global players again. In a secret side of the coin, it looks like a wheel that continues to revolve, deals with different issues and problems by bringing changes throughout society going through long periods of time. However, the same wheel still continues to revolve more modernized in appearance, but in essence with same problems that sometimes look different, while in fact are only adapted to the historical wheel of modernity. Saying directly the wheel of stone, then the wood one, then iron, and then with even more modernized technology.

We say it so implicitly to see how historical events revolve around the countries of the world since their inception until today, how the struggle for existence then subsequently continues with the fight for expansion, development and dominance.

As conclusion for all this, we can use this brief analyze: Economy struggle for development; Diplomacy war through peaceful means; Army confrontale war, Economy war of the territory and resources.

These components have always been the beginning and expansion of various crises, or as people say: "What happens when in the fire pours gasoline?"

## **5. Bibliography**

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *“Zgjedhja – dominim global apo udhëheqje globale”*, Prishtinë, 2006.

Buzan, Barry, “*From international to world society (English school theory and the social structure of globalisation)*” CAMBRIDGE University Press, 2004.

Deudney, D. and Ikenberry G. J., (2009-2010), “The Unravelling of the Cold War Settlement”, The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS),  
<http://www.iiss.org/publications/survival/survival-2009/year-2009-issue-6/the-unravelling-of-the-cold-war-settlement/?locale=en>

Ferraj, Hysamedin, “*Hyrje në shkenca politike*”, Tiranë, 2007.

Fukuyama, Francis, “*Ndërtimi i shtetit (qeverisja dhe rendi i ri botëror në shekullin e njëzet e një)*” Tiranë, 2008.

Globalization 101, “Intervention in Kosovo”, A project of SUNY LEVIN Institute,  
<http://www.globalization101.org/intervention-in-kosovo/>

Iram Khalid, (2011), “Politics of Intervention: A Case of Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq”, International Journal of Business and Social Science, University of Punjab Lahore Pakistan,  
<http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol. 2 No. 11 %5BSpecial Issue-June 2011%5D/10.pdf>

J.Baylis and S.Smith “*The globalization of world politics (an introduction to international relations)*” second edition, OXFORD University Press.

[Julian Borger](#), (2012), “Germany slowly comes to terms with sending its armed forces abroad”, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/sep/18/germany-military-modernise-foreign-intervention>

Kagan, Robert, “*Pushtet dhe parajsë*”, IDEART, 2005.

Kissinger, Henry, “*Diplomacia*” shtëpia botuese“, LAERT, Tiranë, 1999.

Nikolson, S. Harold, “*Diplomacia*”, Prishtinë, 2005.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), “NATO’s relations with Albania”,  
[http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\\_48891.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48891.htm)

Plevnik, Jasna, “*Pas globalizmit*”, Prishtinë, 2003.

S.Goldstein, Joshua, “*Marrëdhënie Ndërkombëtare*”, DITURIA, Tiranë, 2003.

Stoessinger, G. John, “*Përse kombet shkojnë në luftë*”, Tiranë, 2007.

The Guardian leader, (2011), “12 September 2001: America under attack”, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/from-the-archive-blog/2011/jun/08/guardian190-september-11th-attacks-9-11>

The Trans Adriatic Pipeline (TAP), “Concept”, <http://www.trans-adriatic-pipeline.com/en/projekti-tap/koncepti/>

Vukadinović, Radovan, “*Marrëdhëniet politike ndërkombëtare*”, botues Kolegji Universitar “Victory”, Prishtinë, 2006.